

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE  
ON RULES REGARDING AMEND-  
MENTS TO H.R. 1851, NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of May 23rd to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. The Committee on Armed Services ordered the bill reported late last night and is expected to file its report in the House tomorrow, May 20.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy with a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 24.

Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services which should be available tomorrow for their review on the Web site of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2361.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2361.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO assume the chair temporarily).

□ 1213

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mrs. CAPITO (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, today we present for consideration by the House the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies fiscal year 2006 Appropriations bill as approved by the House Committee on Appropriations.

The bill provides a total of \$26.2 billion in funding for programs for the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, Forest Service, Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and several other environmental and cultural agencies and commissions.

□ 1215

The bill is \$823 million below the fiscal year 2005 level, and \$435 million above the administration budget request.

This is a balanced, bipartisan bill. It provides significant increases for our national parks, Indian schools, hospitals and clinics, wildfire programs; forest health is a high priority, and the Healthy Forest Initiative is fully funded.

The Payments in Lieu of Taxes program has a healthy increase of \$30 million above the budget request, and more than \$3 million above the 2005 level. Despite our very tight allocation, the Committee believes it is important to provide this increased funding for PILT.

There is an increase of \$64 million for operations of our National Park System, including a \$30 million increase specifically designed for individual units of the National Park Service. This targeted park base increase will benefit all of our parks.

The bill also restores critical funding for science programs, historic preservation programs, National Forest Systems programs, and Save America's Treasures grants. Finally, we have restored critical environmental education, research and rural water programs in the Environmental Protection Agency, and provided some limited increases for initiatives proposed in the budget request, including Superfund, homeland security, school bus retrofits, the Clean Diesel Program, Methane to Markets Initiative, and the Brownfields Program.

The budget request for EPA, while substantially below last year's level and proposed increases in that budget request, were funded by elimination of many critical mission essential programs.

We heard from nearly every Member of the House asking that we provide funding for EPA programs that were eliminated or reduced in the budget. The program restoration and increases for the various programs and agencies in this bill are offset by the decreases in land acquisition, construction, and State grant programs, and by lowering the amount provided for the increases proposed in the budget request.

This is a balanced bill. It is within the 302(b) allocation for budget authority and outlays. It provides the needed funding to keep the agencies in the bill operating at a reasonable level.

It does not provide a lot of funding for new initiatives. The choices made by the Committee were tough and fair and responsible. I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

At this point, I would like to ask that a table detailing the accounts in the bill be inserted in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
<b>Bureau of Land Management</b>					
Management of lands and resources.....	836,826	850,177	845,783	+8,957	-4,394
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	258,939	286,701	272,852	+13,913	-13,849
Fire suppression operations.....	218,445	234,167	234,167	+15,722	---
Additional appropriations (Title IV).....	98,611	---	---	-98,611	---
Other operations.....	255,300	235,696	254,545	-755	+18,849
Subtotal.....	831,295	756,564	761,564	-69,731	+5,000
Central hazardous materials fund.....	9,855	---	---	-9,855	---
Rescission of balances.....	-13,500	---	---	+13,500	---
Construction.....	11,340	6,476	11,476	+136	+5,000
Land acquisition.....	11,192	13,350	3,817	-7,375	-9,533
Oregon and California grant lands.....	107,497	110,070	110,070	+2,573	---
Range improvements (indefinite).....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite).....	20,055	32,940	32,940	+12,885	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-20,055	-32,940	-32,940	-12,885	---
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite).....	12,405	12,405	12,405	---	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	1,816,910	1,759,042	1,755,115	-61,795	-3,927
<b>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</b>					
Resource management.....	962,940	985,563	1,005,225	+42,285	+19,662
Construction.....	52,658	19,676	41,206	-11,452	+21,530
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	40,552	---	---	-40,552	---
Land acquisition.....	37,005	40,992	14,937	-22,068	-26,055
Landowner incentive program.....	21,694	40,000	23,700	+2,006	-16,300
Private stewardship grants.....	6,903	10,000	7,386	+483	-2,614
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund.....	80,462	80,000	84,400	+3,938	+4,400
National wildlife refuge fund.....	14,214	14,414	14,414	+200	---
North American wetlands conservation fund.....	37,472	49,949	40,000	+2,528	-9,949
Neotropical migratory birds conservation fund.....	3,944	---	4,000	+56	+4,000
Multinational species conservation fund.....	5,719	8,300	5,900	+181	-2,400
State wildlife grants.....	69,028	74,000	65,000	-4,028	-9,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service..	1,332,591	1,322,894	1,306,168	-26,423	-16,726
<b>National Park Service</b>					
Operation of the national park system.....	1,683,564	1,734,053	1,754,199	+70,635	+20,146
United States Park Police.....	80,076	80,411	82,411	+2,335	+2,000
National recreation and preservation.....	60,973	36,777	48,997	-11,976	+12,220
Historic preservation fund.....	71,739	66,205	72,705	+966	+6,500
Construction.....	302,180	307,362	291,230	-10,950	-16,132
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	50,802	---	---	-50,802	---
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---	---
Land acquisition and state assistance.....	146,349	54,467	9,421	-136,928	-45,046
Total, National Park Service (net).....	2,365,683	2,249,275	2,228,963	-136,720	-20,312
<b>United States Geological Survey</b>					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	935,464	933,515	974,586	+39,122	+41,071
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
<b>Minerals Management Service</b>					
Royalty and offshore minerals management.....	270,550	283,146	275,406	+4,856	-7,740
Use of receipts.....	-103,730	-122,730	-122,730	-19,000	---
Oil spill research.....	7,006	7,006	7,006	---	---
Total, Minerals Management Service.....	173,826	167,422	159,682	-14,144	-7,740

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</b>					
Regulation and technology.....	108,269	110,435	110,435	+2,166	---
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite).....	99	100	100	+1	---
Subtotal.....	108,368	110,535	110,535	+2,167	---
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) Legislative proposal.....	188,205 ---	188,014 58,000	188,014 ---	-191 ---	---
Subtotal.....	188,205	246,014	188,014	-191	-58,000
<b>Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.....</b>	<b>296,573</b>	<b>356,549</b>	<b>298,549</b>	<b>+1,976</b>	<b>-58,000</b>
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>					
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,926,091	1,924,230	1,992,737	+66,646	+68,507
Construction.....	319,129	232,137	284,137	-34,992	+52,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	44,150	24,754	34,754	-9,396	+10,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	6,332	6,348	6,348	+16	---
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....</b>	<b>2,295,702</b>	<b>2,187,469</b>	<b>2,317,976</b>	<b>+22,274</b>	<b>+130,507</b>
<b>Departmental Offices</b>					
<b>Insular Affairs:</b>					
Assistance to Territories.....	47,861	46,543	48,843	+982	+2,300
Northern Marianas.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
Subtotal.....	75,581	74,263	76,563	+982	+2,300
Compact of Free Association.....	3,450	2,862	3,362	-88	+500
Mandatory payments.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Subtotal.....	5,450	4,862	5,362	-88	+500
<b>Total, Insular Affairs.....</b>	<b>81,031</b>	<b>79,125</b>	<b>81,925</b>	<b>+894</b>	<b>+2,800</b>
Departmental management.....	95,821	120,155	118,755	+22,934	-1,400
Subtotal, Departmental management.....	95,821	120,155	118,755	+22,934	-1,400
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	226,805	200,000	230,000	+3,195	+30,000
Central hazardous materials fund.....	---	9,855	9,855	+9,855	---
Office of the Solicitor.....	51,656	55,752	55,340	+3,684	-412
Office of Inspector General.....	37,275	40,999	39,566	+2,291	-1,433
<b>Office of Special Trustee for American Indians</b>					
Federal trust programs.....	193,540	269,397	191,593	-1,947	-77,804
Indian land consolidation.....	34,514	34,514	34,514	---	---
<b>Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....</b>	<b>228,054</b>	<b>303,911</b>	<b>226,107</b>	<b>-1,947</b>	<b>-77,804</b>
Natural resource damage assessment fund.....	5,737	6,106	6,106	+369	---
<b>Total, Departmental Offices.....</b>	<b>726,379</b>	<b>815,903</b>	<b>767,654</b>	<b>+41,275</b>	<b>-48,249</b>
<b>Total, title I, Department of the Interior:</b>					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)...	9,944,128	9,792,069	9,808,693	-135,435	+16,624
Appropriations.....	(9,881,774)	(9,822,069)	(9,838,693)	(-43,081)	(+16,624)
Emergency appropriations.....	(92,354)	---	---	(-92,354)	---
Rescission.....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>					
Science and technology.....	744,061	760,640	765,340	+21,279	+4,700
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(35,808)	(30,605)	(30,606)	(-5,202)	(+1)
Environmental programs and management.....	2,294,902	2,353,764	2,389,491	+94,589	+35,727
Pesticide fees (legislative proposal).....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	37,696	36,955	37,955	+259	+1,000
(By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund)...	(12,896)	(13,536)	(13,536)	(+640)	---
Buildings and facilities.....	38,688	40,218	40,218	+1,530	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
Hazardous substance superfund.....	1,247,477	1,279,333	1,258,333	+10,856	-21,000
Transfer to Office of Inspector General.....	(-12,896)	(-13,536)	(-13,536)	(-640)	---
Transfer to Science and Technology.....	(-35,808)	(-30,605)	(-30,606)	(+5,202)	(-1)
Leaking underground storage tank program.....	69,440	73,027	73,027	+3,587	---
Oil spill response.....	15,872	15,863	15,863	-9	---
Pesticide registration fund.....	19,245	12,000	15,000	-4,245	+3,000
Pesticide registration fees.....	-19,245	-12,000	-15,000	+4,245	-3,000
State and tribal assistance grants.....	2,438,758	1,779,500	2,074,500	-364,258	+295,000
Categorical grants.....	1,136,591	1,181,300	1,153,300	+16,709	-28,000
Rescissions (various EPA accounts).....	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Subtotal, State and tribal assistance grants....	3,575,349	2,960,800	3,127,800	-447,549	+167,000
=====					
Total, title II, Environmental Protection Agency:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	8,026,485	7,520,600	7,708,027	-318,458	+187,427
Appropriations.....	(8,023,485)	(7,520,600)	(7,808,027)	(-215,458)	(+287,427)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,000)	---	---	(-3,000)	---
Rescissions.....	---	---	(-100,000)	(-100,000)	(-100,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-48,704)	(-44,141)	(-44,142)	(+4,562)	(-1)
(By transfer).....	(48,704)	(44,141)	(44,142)	(-4,562)	(+1)
=====					
<b>TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>					
<b>Forest Service</b>					
Forest and rangeland research.....	276,384	285,400	285,000	+8,616	-400
State and private forestry.....	292,506	253,387	254,875	-37,631	+1,488
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	49,100	---	---	-49,100	---
National forest system.....	1,380,806	1,651,357	1,423,920	+43,114	-227,437
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	12,153	---	---	-12,153	---
Wildland fire management:					
Preparedness.....	676,470	676,014	691,014	+14,544	+15,000
Fire suppression operations.....	648,859	700,492	700,492	+51,633	---
Additional appropriations (Title IV).....	394,443	---	---	-394,443	---
Other operations.....	377,687	67,761	399,000	+21,313	+331,239
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	1,028	---	---	-1,028	---
Funded in Defense Bill (P.L. 108-287) (sec. 8098).....	(30,000)	---	---	(-30,000)	---
Subtotal.....	2,098,487	1,444,267	1,790,506	-307,981	+346,239
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	514,701	380,792	468,260	-46,441	+87,468
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	50,815	---	---	-50,815	---
Funded in Defense Bill (P.L. 108-287) (sec. 8098).....	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)	---
Land acquisition.....	61,007	40,000	15,000	-46,007	-25,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,054	1,069	1,069	+15	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	231	234	234	+3	---
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	3,021	2,963	2,963	-58	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	64	64	64	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	5,879	5,467	5,467	-412	---
Total, Forest Service.....	4,746,208	4,065,000	4,247,358	-498,850	+182,358
=====					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services:					
Non-contract services.....	2,098,424	2,207,277	2,207,277	+108,853	---
Contract care.....	480,318	507,021	507,021	+26,703	---
Catastrophic health emergency fund.....	17,750	18,000	18,000	+250	---
Total, Indian health services.....	2,596,492	2,732,298	2,732,298	+135,806	---
Indian health facilities.....	388,574	315,668	370,774	-17,800	+55,106
Total, Indian Health Service.....	2,985,066	3,047,966	3,103,072	+118,006	+55,106
=====					
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	79,842	80,289	80,289	+447	---
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	76,041	76,024	76,024	-17	---
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..	3,140,949	3,204,279	3,259,385	+118,436	+55,106
=====					
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....					
	3,258	2,717	2,717	-541	---
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,027	9,200	9,200	+173	---
Emergency fund.....	397	---	---	-397	---
Total, Chemical Safety and Hazard.....	9,424	9,200	9,200	-224	---
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,930	8,601	8,601	+3,671	---
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute.....	5,916	6,300	6,300	+384	---
=====					
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses.....	489,035	524,135	524,381	+35,346	+246
Facilities capital.....	126,123	90,900	90,900	-35,223	---
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	615,158	615,035	615,281	+123	+246
=====					
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses.....	91,708	97,100	97,100	+5,392	---
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	10,946	16,200	16,200	+5,254	---
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	102,654	113,300	113,300	+10,646	---
=====					

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</b>					
Operations and maintenance.....	16,914	17,800	17,800	+886	---
Construction.....	16,107	15,200	10,000	-6,107	-5,200
<b>Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....</b>	<b>33,021</b>	<b>33,000</b>	<b>27,800</b>	<b>-5,221</b>	<b>-5,200</b>
<b>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,863	9,201	9,085	+222	-116
<b>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</b>					
<b>National Endowment for the Arts</b>					
Grants and administration 1/.....	121,264	121,264	121,264	---	---
<b>National Endowment for the Humanities</b>					
Grants and administration.....	122,156	122,605	122,605	+449	---
Matching grants.....	15,898	15,449	15,449	-449	---
<b>Total, National Endowment for the Humanities....</b>	<b>138,054</b>	<b>138,054</b>	<b>138,054</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....</b>					
<b>259,318</b>	<b>259,318</b>	<b>259,318</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>	
<b>Commission of Fine Arts</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,768	1,893	1,893	+125	---
<b>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</b>					
Grants.....	6,902	7,000	7,000	+98	---
<b>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,536	4,988	4,860	+324	-128
<b>National Capital Planning Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,888	8,344	8,177	+289	-167
<b>United States Holocaust Memorial Museum</b>					
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	40,858	43,233	41,880	+1,022	-1,353
<b>Presidio Trust</b>					
Presidio trust fund.....	19,722	20,000	20,000	+278	---
<b>White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance</b>					
Operations.....	248	250	250	+2	---
<b>Total, title III, related agencies:</b>					
<b>New budget (obligational) authority (net)...</b>	<b>9,011,621</b>	<b>8,411,659</b>	<b>8,642,405</b>	<b>-369,216</b>	<b>+230,746</b>
Appropriations.....	(8,898,525)	(8,411,659)	(8,642,405)	(-256,120)	(+230,746)
Emergency appropriations.....	(113,096)	---	---	(-113,096)	---
<b>Grand total:</b>					
<b>New budget (obligational) authority (net)...</b>	<b>26,982,234</b>	<b>25,724,328</b>	<b>26,159,125</b>	<b>-823,109</b>	<b>+434,797</b>
Appropriations.....	(26,803,784)	(25,754,328)	(26,289,125)	(-514,659)	(+534,797)
Emergency appropriations.....	(208,450)	---	---	(-208,450)	---
Rescissions.....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-130,000)	(-100,000)	(-100,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-48,704)	(-44,141)	(-44,142)	(+4,562)	(-1)
(By transfer).....	(48,704)	(44,141)	(44,142)	(-4,562)	(+1)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
Bureau of Land Management.....	1,816,910	1,759,042	1,755,115	-61,795	-3,927
United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	1,332,591	1,322,894	1,306,168	-26,423	-16,726
National Park Service.....	2,365,683	2,249,275	2,228,963	-136,720	-20,312
United States Geological Survey.....	936,464	933,515	974,586	+38,122	+41,071
Minerals Management Service.....	173,826	167,422	159,682	-14,144	-7,740
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement..	296,573	356,549	298,549	+1,976	-58,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	2,295,702	2,187,469	2,317,976	+22,274	+130,507
Departmental Offices.....	726,379	815,903	767,654	+41,275	-48,249
<b>Total, Title I - Department of the Interior.....</b>	<b>9,944,128</b>	<b>9,792,069</b>	<b>9,808,693</b>	<b>-135,435</b>	<b>+16,624</b>
<b>TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>					
Environmental Protection Agency.....	8,026,485	7,520,600	7,708,027	-318,458	+187,427
<b>TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
Forest Service.....	4,746,208	4,065,000	4,247,358	-498,850	+182,358
Indian Health Service.....	2,985,066	3,047,966	3,103,072	+118,006	+55,106
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	79,842	80,289	80,289	+447	---
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.....	76,041	76,024	76,024	-17	---
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,258	2,717	2,717	-541	---
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.....	9,424	9,200	9,200	-224	---
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.....	4,930	8,601	8,601	+3,671	---
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.....	5,916	6,300	6,300	+384	---
Smithsonian Institution.....	615,158	615,035	615,281	+123	+246
National Gallery of Art.....	102,654	113,300	113,300	+10,646	---
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	33,021	33,000	27,800	-5,221	-5,200
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	8,863	9,201	9,085	+222	-116
National Endowment for the Arts.....	121,264	121,264	121,264	---	---
National Endowment for the Humanities.....	138,054	138,054	138,054	---	---
Commission of Fine Arts.....	1,768	1,893	1,893	+125	---
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs.....	6,902	7,000	7,000	+98	---
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.....	4,536	4,988	4,860	+324	-128
National Capital Planning Commission.....	7,888	8,344	8,177	+289	-167
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	40,858	43,233	41,880	+1,022	-1,353
Presidio Trust.....	19,722	20,000	20,000	+278	---
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance.....	248	250	250	+2	---
<b>Total, Title III - Related Agencies.....</b>	<b>9,011,621</b>	<b>8,411,659</b>	<b>8,642,405</b>	<b>-369,216</b>	<b>+230,746</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>26,982,234</b>	<b>25,724,328</b>	<b>26,159,125</b>	<b>-823,109</b>	<b>+434,797</b>

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY 2006 (H.R. 2361)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Forest Service limitation from Farm Bill programs	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
NPS land acquisition transfer	---	---	---	---	---
Emergencies in this bill	-208,450	---	---	+208,450	---
Total, adjustments	-228,450	---	---	+228,450	---
Total (including adjustments)	26,753,784	25,724,328	26,159,125	-594,659	+434,797
Amounts in this bill	(26,982,234)	(25,724,328)	(26,159,125)	(-823,109)	(+434,797)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(-228,450)	---	---	(+228,450)	---
Prior year outlays (including supplementals)	---	---	---	---	---
=====					
Total mandatory and discretionary	26,753,784	25,724,328	26,159,125	-594,659	+434,797
Mandatory	(52,125)	(52,125)	(52,125)	---	---
Mandatory (prior year)	---	---	---	---	---
Mandatory (total)	(52,125)	(52,125)	(52,125)	---	---
Discretionary	(26,701,659)	(25,672,203)	(26,107,000)	(-594,659)	(+434,797)
Discretionary (prior year)	---	---	---	---	---
Discretionary Domestic (total)	(26,701,659)	(25,672,203)	(26,107,000)	(-594,659)	(+434,797)
=====					
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory	52,125	52,125	52,125	---	---
Prior year outlays	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Mandatory	52,125	52,125	52,125	---	---
General purpose discretionary	26,701,659	25,672,203	26,107,000	-594,659	+434,797
Prior year outlays	---	---	---	---	---
Total, General purpose discretionary	26,701,659	25,672,203	26,107,000	-594,659	+434,797
=====					
Grand total, Mandatory and Discretionary	26,753,784	25,724,328	26,159,125	-594,659	+434,797
=====					
DISCRETIONARY 302B ALLOCATION					
GENERAL PURPOSE	26,701,659	25,672,203	26,107,000	-594,659	+434,797
302B ALLOCATION	---	---	26,107,000	+26,107,000	+26,107,000
OVER/UNDER ALLOCATION	26,701,659	25,672,203	---	-26,701,659	-25,672,203



Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the staff of both the minority and majority staff, and Mr. DICKS, and all of those who have worked with the Committee in producing this. We have had outstanding participation, and I thank all of them for their participation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) for his commendable work for putting together this Interior, Environment and Related Agencies appropriations bill for next year.

This bill is basically good, considering the budget allocation that our subcommittee received. As always, the chairman and his staff have included me in the process of putting together the bill, and for that I am very appreciative. Such cooperation is a hallmark of the Interior Subcommittee, and it is the chairman who sets the tone.

While the bill we are considering today represents hard work all around, I must note that it falls short of properly funding many programs. The reason for this failure is the inadequate budget allocation we have. The shortfall compared to the 2005 Interior bill adds up to more than \$800 million.

As you know, this is the first year that the Interior Subcommittee has funded the EPA, and what a challenge it is proving to be with the President's budget proposing a cut of more than \$500 million from last year. These are very deep holes to fill.

Let me switch to a positive note by praising the decision by the administration and the chairman to fully fund uncontrollable costs such as pay COLAs and rent.

Now, this may sound like just a matter of fact, but it makes all of the difference in the world in our national parks on whether they can operate properly. Over the last few years the administration has been proposing unrealistically low funding levels to pay for these uncontrollable costs. This year the budget did include the funding to meet these costs, and I applaud the chairman for including them in the bill, and I hope that the administration will continue to propose full coverage of uncontrollable costs in future budget submittals.

I also want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) for the continued effort to increase funding for the operation of our national parks. I think we have a great team to make sure that the national parks, certainly the most beloved of our Federal public lands, receive enough money to provide our constituents the visit they expect and deserve.

The \$30 million the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) has added to the \$22 million increase contained in the budget will mean a second consecutive year of very healthy

increases in the Park Service operations budget, and I want to pledge to continue to help my chairman to make sure that the Park Service Partnership Program stays on track towards better management.

The biggest concern that I have in this bill is the reduction in spending for clean water activities. First, I must commend the chairman for his decision 2 weeks ago to agree to add an extra \$100 million to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund from unobligated EPA funds from previous years. But even with this additional funding, the Clean Water Revolving Fund will be \$240 million lower than this year.

If you compare the proposed funding in 2006 to the level in 2004, there is a decrease of nearly \$500 million in just 2 years. I know that many of you are hearing from your State and local officials about the effect this cut will have on plans to construct and improve water treatment facilities.

The Federal Government should not be retreating in this fashion from such an important responsibility. For that reason I am going to support an amendment to increase funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

I must also register my disagreement with the decision to continue to retreat from the commitment made in 2000 to increase funding for the Conservation Trust Fund. If the Lands Legacy conservation agreement was being followed, this bill would have \$1.8 billion for the various conservation activities under our jurisdiction. Instead the bill contains only \$750 million. I wish this bill did not contain the President's proposal to eliminate funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Stateside grants program.

I also disagree with the decision to provide no money for land acquisition within the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but I do sympathize that those decisions were tough due to the situation our allocation has caused. Core programs, such as agency operations, must come before grant programs such as these.

Even though the awful fiscal situation we are faced with is the direct cause of these decisions, I do hope that we can better meet the obligations of the Lands Legacy agreement when we ultimately finish the 2006 Interior and Environment bill.

It is gratifying to note that we seem to have come to a consensus on funding on the NEA and the NEH, in that this bill provides level funding compared to this year. I again will be joining with what I predict will be a majority of my colleagues in support of an amendment to increase both of these endowments.

Last year the Interior Subcommittee made a wise decision to be better prepared for the cost of firefighting. We provided \$500 million for both fiscal year 2004 and 2005 in emergency funding to prevent the painful borrowing from other Interior and Forest Service programs that has occurred in past years when more fires than were ex-

pected depleted the annual firefighting budget.

Although neither the President's budget nor this bill contains such contingency funding for 2006, there is an increase of \$120 million over the non-emergency spending level in fiscal year 2005. I hope this is sufficient to meet the challenge of what could be a busy fire season with estimates of higher than average threats in several areas of the country, including Washington State and the Northwest.

I also agree with the decision to restore some of the cuts in the budget to the Indian school and construction account. Even with this added money, this bill contains a cut of \$75 million to those important programs, and it is important that we are freezing the funding level for the Indian trust accounting program. I believe we should not spend money at the expense of other Indian programs on a historical accounting exercise that cannot produce the desired results.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and his great staff, led by Debbie Weatherly for their hard work on the 2006 Interior and Environment appropriations bill.

I also want to commend Mike Stephens on Mr. OBEY's staff and Pete Modaff of my staff for their part in helping to put together this bill. I hoped we could do better, but this is a difficult situation that we are in, and I appreciate the cooperation, the bipartisan spirit in which this bill was created.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Chairman, the bill before us today is one that required many tough choices. It required fiscal discipline. It also required the committee to meet the environmental, land management, cultural, science, resource and recreation needs of the Nation in a responsible manner; tough choices were required and I believe the right and most reasonable choices were made.

The bill helps meet our fiscal responsibilities by cutting \$800 million in discretionary spending from the fiscal year 2005 level, but it also allows us enough money that our Nation's priorities can be carried out by the diverse departments and agencies funded in the bill.

There are many competing interests in this bill that had to be balanced and addressed in a tight allocation. We may hear some Members lament that greater funding was not provided for a particular program, but I believe that Members would be hard pressed to name another program that should be cut so the one they favor can be increased. One thing is certain, the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) made a special effort to include both parties in the drafting of

the bill and conducted a fair and impartial hearing process.

The bill places priorities in the areas where they need to be. Increases were provided for wildland firefighting, the operations of the National Parks and National Forest Systems, Superfund hazardous waste cleanup program, environmental science and technology, and Indian health and education.

The bill contains necessary initiatives in forest health, in backlog maintenance in the national parks, Everglades restoration, and the national fire plan. This is a bill that makes tough but right choices and puts priorities where they should be.

This bill is as good as it can be given the budget restrictions. It deserves our support and I urge its passage.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the full Appropriations Committee, who has played a very constructive role, along with the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), in trying to help us move this bill forward today.

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

Let me simply say that I think the chairman has produced a fair process. He has treated the minority fairly and I very much appreciate that, but I believe the bill fails this country in many fundamental ways, and that failure is a direct result of the Republican budget resolution which requires this committee to cut \$11.7 billion below the amount needed to maintain current services for domestic discretionary programs.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, said 2 weeks ago, "This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November." I think that is true. This is exactly what it means.

The Republicans in this House voted by a vote of 218 to 212 to adopt that budget resolution. Not one single Democrat voted for that budget resolution, because we recognized the damage that would be done by it. Now, we are told by Members of the majority side we have limited resources. We absolutely agree with that.

That is why this House should never have voted to eliminate all taxes on estates of over \$7 million. It should never have voted to give persons who make more than a million dollars \$140,000 tax cuts next year and do it all with borrowed money because the result of that vote has been a \$400 million cut in EPA programs to improve the quality of our air and our water.

□ 1230

The result has been a 40 percent cut in the clean water revolving fund. We have \$388 billion worth of needs at the community level to fix sewer and water systems; and yet this program is cut by 40 percent in this bill.

The damage done by this bill cannot be fully understood unless we take a look at it in a broader context. This is a great and growing country. When I came to this Congress, there were 203 million people in this country. Today, there are 282 million. That is a 34 percent increase. We are going to have another 26 million increase between now and 2010.

When I came, there were 108 million cars in America. Today, there are 231 million cars. That means more pollution. It means more congestion. It means more pressure on our national parks. It means more pressure on the part of real estate developers. It means more pressure on our sewer and water programs.

In the face of that new pressure, what are we getting out of this bill? We are getting a 34 percent reduction in the funding for the main bill that will help us to clean up our sewer and water problem. I think that is an incredibly myopic decision.

In the teeth of all of that pressure, we are crippling EPA.

We talk about how happy we are to see a slight increase in the national parks budget; but in fact, there are still 720 positions in the National Park Service that continue to remain unfunded. We have 200 of the 544 wildlife refuges that have no staff whatsoever.

In the teeth of all that expanded pressure, what do we get? Despite this bill, we still have a \$5 billion backlog in maintenance for the Park Service, a \$13 billion backlog for our national forests.

I would like to see, for instance, this bill enable us to buy precious land at Pope's Creek on the property where George Washington was born before a real estate developer can grab it and turn it into condos; but we are not going to be able to do that because this bill, for the first time in the 36 years I have been a Member of this House, zero-funds land acquisition programs at both the State and the Federal level. We ought not to do that.

For two generations, we have had a bipartisan consensus behind certain minimal actions in the environmental area, especially in the area of clean water. This bill unravels that consensus because it means we can talk a good game in terms of cleaning up our water and our air, but we are not going to put our dollars where our mouth is.

So I think, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says, "This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican White House last November." If you are satisfied with the results of this bill today, vote for it. I intend to vote against it. I think it is a disaster for the environmental consensus that we have built up with such hard work for so long.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time. I very much appreciate his service on the bill that he has produced, and I support this bill, and I appreciate his efforts and the efforts of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, and the staff on the committee.

However, there is a part of this bill that the country needs to be aware about. All across America we are confronted with skyrocketing energy prices, whether at the gasoline pump or our utilities at home or the manufacturing sector or the feedstock to produce fertilizer (which, therefore, affects agriculture).

What is the connection between that and this bill? This bill has language in it that perpetuates more than 30 years of misguided policy. It has provisions that continue a ban on drilling in most of the outercontinental shelf, offshore drilling that could be occurring in the United States of America. And 60 percent of America's oil reserves are in that outercontinental shelf. Forty percent of our natural gas reserves are in that outercontinental shelf. Yet, for more than 30 years this Congress, each year, has perpetuated a ban on drilling in most of those areas.

What is the consequence of that? It is the high prices. The consequence is the high prices we are experiencing. The result is that each year America is spending \$179 billion to buy foreign oil and bring it to the United States of America. Rounded off, it is \$180 billion, that we could be using to produce energy safely, in an environmentally friendly and clean fashion here in the United States. But because of language that this Congress has put into this bill for over 30 years, we are not doing that.

Right now, almost 60 percent of the oil and gas that we consume in the United States is imported. We need to fix that. We will have several amendments to address this that are offered on this bill.

We will probably hear from people saying, oh, my goodness, we cannot do that; we have got to protect the environment. But we can do it by protecting the environment.

The offshore drilling that does occur right now in the United States produces a fourth of the oil and gas that we have in the U.S. What is their environmental record? The amount of oil that is spilled is  $\frac{1}{4,000}$  of 1 percent. That is all—because we have made so many advances in environmentally friendly methods to handle this drilling. That means we are using methods that are 99.999 percent safe and friendly to the environment.

We need to revisit those provisions that limit offshore drilling, and I hope we will do that today.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a good supporter of this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's

courtesy in permitting me to speak on behalf of this bill.

The congressional consideration of the Interior appropriations bill should be one of the highlights of this congressional session, as it touches on things that are near and dear to people's hearts: clean water, vast open spaces, environmental protection, even opportunities to invest in the arts.

Sadly, what should be a positive expression of our values, our hopes, and our opportunities is instead in this bill a pattern of broken promises to our communities and to ourselves. Unfortunately, the bill represents lost opportunities and is a symbol of the inability of this Congress and this administration to match our priorities with those of our constituents and, most importantly, with the future of this country.

I agree that the dramatic underfunding in terms of the budget allocation put the chairman and the ranking member and the staff in a hole to begin with, and my heart goes out to them; but there is no reason that we, as a Congress, cannot use the billions of dollars that are set aside in a trust fund for the Land and Water Conservation Fund that have not been tapped as these resources are set aside expressly for this purpose of land conservation.

In the year 2000, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), my friend, mentioned, he was integral to fashioning an important compromise that gave flexibility to the Committee on Appropriations. We in Congress made a commitment to the public and an agreement amongst ourselves to fund this responsibility. It was something that then-Governor Bush sounded as one of his pledges when he was running for the White House. The promises of candidate Bush, President Bush and of Congress to our constituents and to ourselves is broken again by this budget.

Now, there are specific proposals to try and make an inadequate bill better. I will support and speak out strongly in support of working to stop the diluting of our commitment to clean water with an amendment to stop the administration's efforts to weaken water quality protections, putting more sewage into our rivers and streams and drinking water.

As a former commissioner of public works, I was responsible for the administration of sewage and water resource programs. I am not insensitive to the needs of many communities to occasionally blend water not completely treated. I recognize the need to do that in extreme weather events, an important tool for communities; but it is not something that we should be doing routinely. We should instead be reducing our use of this tool wherever possible rather than increasing it.

The EPA rule weakening the current policy would actually penalize communities like mine and yours around the country that have worked to upgrade and improve their systems.

In periods of extreme wet weather, blending will still often be necessary. It is legal under the current law, and it is not going to be changed with the amendment that will be offered. The anti-sewage dumping amendment would not change these existing blending standards, but they will prevent the EPA from lowering them to authorize routine sewage dumping.

Now is not the time to move backwards. Water bodies around the country are impaired. We need to make sure that we are not making it harder to ultimately meet these water quality standards.

I urge joining me in supporting the amendment and working with the members of this committee to try to craft this bill in a way that meets the needs of America's communities.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I recognize the next speaker, I want to point out that it is not, as I am hearing, that we are obliterating the clean water State revolving fund or the arts funds. We are funding the arts and humanities \$259 million, the same as the 2005 year. We are funding the State revolving fund \$850 million, the same as we did in 2005.

Unfortunately, with the costs and the deficit we have now, we cannot continue to put more and more in. We are trying to do the best we can by consistently funding our needs in this area.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to have an opportunity to address an issue that is so important to this country, and that issue is the energy that drives this economy.

We all know that everything that we purchase in this country has got an energy cost component in it; and so when we address the energy issues, we know that when we can provide more supply of energy, whether it comes from someplace else on the globe, whether it comes from the northern hemisphere, whether it comes from the United States, whether it is renewable energy or whether it is a consumable energy, that is at least in theory not renewed, all of those things add to the overall size of the energy pie.

It is our responsibility here in this Congress to be able to expand the size of that pie so we have more energy available to the consumers; and we know that due to the law of supply and demand, the more supply there is, of course the less relative demand there will be. The relative costs of energy will either be slowed in their increase or actually diminished in some cases, and we can see reductions in the price of energy.

It is critical to me, in the part of the State I come from. We are very vulnerable to energy. We use gas and diesel fuel for the production of agriculture, for example, and we also produce ethanol and biodiesel. So we are a renew-

able energy export center, as well as a consumer of energy.

I have watched this policy here in the United States, and we tend to take sides a little bit. That taking sides falls into a few categories: energy consumers who want all the energy they can get, as cheap as they can get it; and environmentalist interests that want to be able to preserve the pristine areas of America at whatever cost to the economy.

I would take the stand that natural gas in this country, for example, we have a huge domestic supply of natural gas in the North American Continent underneath nonnational park public lands. We have a tremendous supply of natural gas offshore in the Outer Continental Shelf, Gulf of Mexico, and a lot of that is, as we stand here, off limits to producers. That has driven up the cost of natural gas in my district and all across this country and put an additional price on virtually everything that we sell and purchase.

So, Madam Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address this House and the opportunity also to have some time yielded to me for this important subject matter.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

□ 1245

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, we all recognize that the Committee on Appropriations must work within the constraints of a budget that is completely inadequate to meet the Nation's needs. I acknowledge that. But the fiscal year 2006 Interior and Environment appropriation bill also reflects the kinds of choices made in recent years by this administration and the majority in Congress, which made this clash of growing needs and shrinking budgets unavoidable.

The effect is that the Department of the Interior and our other departments and agencies are being put on a crazy fad diet that is harmful to the health of the Nation. I am troubled, for example, by the continued underfunding of maintenance needs to our national parks. The committee has seen fit to provide \$20 million over the President's request for operations, an increase I support, but our national parks should be safe places, where parents and children can roam and relax, where they can picnic and hike and raft. Instead, our parks are falling apart, and against a huge backlog of maintenance needs, this bill cuts funds for park construction projects, a critical component of our park maintenance efforts.

Forest Service programs that help to promote safety and job creation in

rural America are also underfunded in this bill. Economic action programs, which enable rural communities and businesses to become more economically self-sufficient through the use of forest resources were zeroed out.

The situation here goes well beyond trimming fat. We can talk all we want about the need for a lean government, but this is not belt tightening, as some would suggest. This is more like being shoved into Scarlet O'Hara's corset.

The President eliminated statewide funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund in his budget. Those monies are indispensable to States across the Nation that rely on those matching monies for their parks and recreation budgets. But while the President may have conducted a tummy tuck, this bill calls for something close to an amputation. Even the Federal share is axed.

I am especially troubled by the flat lining of the appropriation from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund. There continues to exist a large inventory of high priority human health and safety threatening sites in our Nation's coalfields. The unspent balance in the fund is approaching \$2 billion, yet this money from a fee assessed on the coal industry is not being adequately deployed to combat these threats to coalfield citizens and their communities.

Madam Chairman, this bill is not a case of an overweight agency being squeezed into a slimmer, trimmer budget. This is a case of a starving agency trying to survive on the crumbs of a fiscal mess. I regret that I cannot support this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Chairman, there are many important parts of this bill, but I want to speak briefly to the House about our love for the national parks. We have about a \$600 million backlog, and it is overwhelming to try to address this in an appropriation bill where money is so tight.

We have a bill called the National Parks Centennial Act that tries to address this. Senators MCCAIN, FEINSTEIN, and ALEXANDER are leading the fight in the Senate and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), myself, as well as key appropriators such as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), and others here in the House. But what is before us today is actually very important, because even in a time of tight budgets the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to raise the President's request on national parks by \$70 million over last year's funding, and \$20 million above the President's approval.

At a time when we are fighting on so many different fronts to figure out how

to balance our budget and move towards a balanced budget, where every trade-off between immunizations and Medicaid and whether we support our troops and veterans benefits and all this, it is important to remember the legacy of America's national parks, America's gifts to the world, and I appreciate it very much in this overall important bill that they have increased the funding for the national parks.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that this bill does not deserve approval, and so I will not vote for it.

This is not a criticism of Chairman TAYLOR, Congressman DICKS, and the other members of the Appropriations Committee who had the unenviable task of developing the bill. The budget authority allocated to the Interior and Environment Subcommittee fell far short of the amount needed to adequately fund the agencies and activities within their jurisdiction. That in turn was the result of the unrealistic and inadequate budget resolution that the Republican leadership pushed through the Congress earlier this year. But while the shortcomings of the bill are understandable, they are nonetheless so serious that I cannot vote for it.

Among the worst are its severe reductions in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency. It cuts EPA's Clean Water State Revolving Fund by \$242 million below the 2005 funding level. This will mean that many communities in Colorado and elsewhere will be adversely affected as projects that have already been approved by State water authorities for future funding probably will be rejected, scaled back, or substantially delayed.

The wrong-headedness of this is clear when we recall that just two years ago EPA Administrator Whitman issued a formal report, entitled the "Water Gap Analysis," which estimated the twenty-year fiscal shortfall between what we are currently spending and what is required at \$388 billion.

Further, the bill includes cuts beyond those required by the budget resolution. Perhaps the most notable is the reduction of \$190 million of Land and Water Conservation Act funding, including funding for all new Federal land acquisitions as well as all assistance to States. This, too, is something that I cannot support.

In Colorado and across the county there is a need for wise reinvestments of the funds coming into the treasury from oil and gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf and elsewhere. The wise principle of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is that these short-term gains should be used to provide long-term assets for the American people. This bill turns its back on that principle.

Of course, there are some good things in this bill. I am particularly glad that because of the adoption of an amendment I sponsored along with Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. CANNON it includes \$242 million for the payments in lieu of taxes—or PILT—program that is so important to local governments in Colorado and across the country. This is only about 80 percent of the amount authorized for PILT, but it is a great improvement over the amount proposed by the administration—which sought a cut of \$26 million below last year's level.

Nonetheless, overall, the bill falls woefully short of what is needed and I do not think it deserves to pass.

Mr. STARK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2361. This legislation is irresponsible. It under-funds programs to preserve open space. It endangers public health. And, it abdicates our responsibility to protect the environment for future generations.

In this time of increased growth and urban sprawl, our green spaces are more precious than ever. Instead, this bill eliminates funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, designed to help local communities preserve open space, protect wildlife and make recreation opportunities available in urban areas.

In addition, this bill cuts funding for the environmental enforcement activities of the EPA by \$12 million. Republicans have consistently sought to weaken environmental standards and this maneuver is the latest in a series of attempts to undermine what have been successful environmental protections and the best of big business. Big business should never be allowed a free pass to destroy the environment while endangering the health of millions of Americans who will be exposed to dirtier air and water.

I won't vote for this indefensible legislation that only serves to harm the environment and put Americans' health at risk. We have a responsibility to protect our citizens and our environment and this legislation blatantly takes us in the opposite direction. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, unfortunately I did not get a chance to offer an amendment with Mr. REYES to provide an additional \$10 million for a critical program in the Interior-EPA Appropriations bill. The funds would have been used for "architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission."

This is the section of the EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants program that funds the Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF). The amendment would have transferred the \$10 million out of the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) \$974.5 million appropriation. The USGS appropriation in this bill is currently \$39 million more than the FY2005 appropriation, and \$41 million more than the president's request. The border program, on the other hand, has been flat-funded at \$50 million for several years.

The record should reflect that we did not intend for the USGS's National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program to be impacted by the reduction in USGS's appropriation. NAWQA carries out very important work collecting and analyzing data and information in more than 50 major river basins and aquifers across the Nation in order to develop long-term information on streams, ground water, and aquatic ecosystems in support of sound management and policy decisions. This critical program would have been shielded from the \$10 million cut in USGS appropriations.

In Imperial County, California, the New River carries raw sewage from Mexico through the town of Calexico, and air pollution from Mexicali contributes to the worst childhood asthma rates in the state. A modest increase in funding for the BEIF would begin to improve the situation. The BEIF, which was established by the North American Development Bank to

administer grant resources provided by the EPA, helps finance the construction of water and wastewater projects in the U.S.-Mexico border region.

The objective of the BEIF is to make environmental infrastructure projects affordable for communities throughout the U.S.-Mexico border region by combining grant funds with loans or other forms of financing. It is designed to reduce project debt to a manageable level in cases where users would otherwise face undue financial hardship.

We have seen what BEIF can accomplish when it has adequate funding. BEIF grants have played an important role in the successful construction of water conservation projects in the Cameron Irrigation District in Texas; a wastewater project in Heber, California; a wastewater collection and treatment project in Patagonia, Arizona; and a sewer system and wastewater treatment plant in the Salem and Ogaz communities in New Mexico.

All projects supported by the BEIF must have a health and/or ecological benefit in communities on the U.S. side of the border. All projects must also be certified in a rigorous vetting process undertaken by the Border Environment Cooperation Commission.

There is strong support for increasing BEIF funding. The bipartisan Border Governors' joint declaration last year called for a "substantial increase" in funding for the program.

While many important programs in the Interior-EPA Appropriations bill have been short-changed, the lack of funding for BEIF is particularly troubling. The border region is in desperate need of assistance. Communities in the border region struggle with some of the highest poverty rates in the Nation as well as air and water pollution—often originating in northern Mexico—that contributes to severe public health problems. The region lacks basic infrastructure, such as water and sewer service, that most of the rest of the country takes for granted.

The neglect of these largely low-income and Hispanic communities, along with the dirty air and water they are forced to endure, represent a grave environmental injustice. According to the U.S.-Mexico Border Health Commission, the border region includes three of the ten poorest counties in the United States and twenty-one counties that have been designated as economically distressed areas.

The Commission also reports that approximately 432,000 people live in 1,200 colonias in Texas and New Mexico, which are unincorporated, semi-rural communities that are characterized by substandard housing and unsafe public drinking water or wastewater systems. If the border region were made the 51st state in the Union, it would rank last in access to health care; second in death rates due to hepatitis; last in per capita income; and first in the numbers of school children living in poverty, according to the Commission.

The Good Neighbor Environmental Board, an independent U.S. Presidential advisory committee that operates under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, recommends restoring BEIF to its mid-1990s funding level of \$100 million dollars.

There are currently 105 certified clean water projects in the pipeline waiting for funding. Examples of the many certified projects that could be carried out in disadvantaged communities if the BEIF had an appropriate funding level include: Water/wastewater systems im-

provements in Brawley, California; a wastewater project in Nogales, Arizona; a solid waste project in Doña Ana County, New Mexico; and a water conservation project in Brownsville, Texas.

Supporters of this amendment include the Border Trade Alliance, the Border Counties Coalition, Clean Water Action, National Council of La Raza and others.

I will continue fighting to increase appropriations for the Border Environment Infrastructure fund and protect communities in the border region.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to both the Peterson Amendment and the Istook Amendment. If passed, these amendments will trample on a long-standing bipartisan moratorium on offshore oil and gas development that was initiated by former President Bush, continued under President Clinton, and endorsed in President Bush's FY 2006 budget. Given this legacy of strong bipartisan support, I am simply amazed that the OCS moratorium is under such assault.

However, this is exactly what we face today with these amendments. Mr. Peterson's amendment strikes liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the moratorium while Mr. ISTOOK's amendment calls for the entire moratorium in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, on both oil and gas, to vanish—poof—when the United States meets an arbitrary percentage of crude oil imports, 66.7 percent.

Every year since 1982, Congress has included language in the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill to prevent the Department of Interior from using funds for leasing, pre-leasing, and related activities in sensitive coastal waters. Mr. Speaker, some might wonder why so many coastal areas stand firmly behind the OCS moratorium. I answer with tourism, tourism, and more tourism. Tourism is not just a major industry for coastal states or a mere staple of their coastal economies. It is, along with recreation, the fastest growing sector of the ocean economy according to the President's own U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy's Final Report. The money spent by tourists pay the bills and put food on the table for the people living in these communities. Offshore oil and gas drilling directly threatens this economic engine and the people of these communities know it.

By removing LNG from the moratorium, Mr. PETERSON's amendment ignores the many concerns being raised about all phases of the LNG process—from exploration all the way to arrival at our ports. These concerns must be considered with more than a few minutes of discussion.

As for Mr. ISTOOK's amendment, we had an opportunity one month ago with H.R. 6 to set a strong and visionary national energy policy to reduce our dependence on imported oil, and yet we did not take advantage of that opportunity. And so today, his amendment attempts to make coastal communities pay for that lack of vision.

Madam Chairman, I cannot accept these amendments because they are short-sighted and fail to uphold decades of bipartisan agreement on protecting our coastlines from oil and gas drilling. At their core, they fail to honor our communities and our environment. In conclusion, Madam Chairman, the Peterson and Istook Amendments should be defeated and I urge a "no" vote on both of them.

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Chairman, I rise to speak on the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies. This measure is part of the first wave of appropriations bills to be considered under the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution, and provides for the resource management needs for our Nation, clearly a national priority. The bill, which is in compliance with H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget, provides appropriations for most of the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, among others.

#### INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

For the first time, the House Appropriations subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies marked up a bill with their new jurisdiction, reflecting additional responsibility for all discretionary programs under the Environmental Protection Agency and losing some Energy Department programs previously under their jurisdiction. H.R. 2361 provides \$26.1 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 2006, which is \$653 million, or 2.2 percent, below the fiscal year 2005 level. The level is \$432 million over the President's request. The bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an Appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

This measure, like government spending on the whole, has been drawn up under a tighter-than-normal budget constraint. However, this does not mean that needed services are cut in a meaningful way. Two examples from the bill are useful in illustrating this point, one in firefighting through the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, and the other in water programs for the EPA.

Regarding firefighting, I would point out that the base we are using for comparison, had higher-than-normal spending due to a one-time appropriation of \$500 million to be used as insurance in case regular fire fighting appropriations become exhausted. Excluding this one-time appropriation means that the measure before us is \$153 million less than the 2005 level rather than \$653 million less than 2005. Moreover, some of this one-time money is still available, and will remain available for obligation next fiscal year too for its intended use if regular funding becomes exhausted.

In the water program area, the committee looked for ways to secure funding for EPA's Clean Water Program, a program mentioned even during our own budget resolution proceedings. I understand that GAO found over \$100 million in expired EPA grants, contracts, and inter-agency agreements, and that the bill rescinds this money in order to fund an increase in the level of Clean Water Program funding to \$850 million from the President's request of \$730 million. While it maybe the case that the \$100 million found in these accounts, some dating back to the 1980s, would never have been actually been spent, the savings constitute legitimate efforts under the Budget Act. I also note that because this account carries hundreds of millions of dollars in unobligated balances from year to year, the impact from budget reductions relative to the current fiscal year are not likely to result in reductions in community investments next fiscal year.

H.R. 2361 does not contain any emergency-designated BA, which is exempt from budget limits. The bill reduces a National Park Service contract authority account by \$30 million—an account not subject to annual appropriations—thereby offsetting discretionary spending through changes in a mandatory spending program. If this provision were stricken (because it constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill) the measure as reported would exceed its allocation under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

As we enter the appropriations season, I wish Chairman LEWIS and our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee the best in maintaining their admirable pace of bringing bills to the floor.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2361.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, today are considering the Interior Appropriations Bill, which provides Federal funding for our national parks, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency. I agree with the assessment of our ranking member, Mr. OBEY, that this subcommittee has done good work with a difficult allocation. I would have preferred more resources devoted to important environmental, land management, and land conservation programs.

As this bill moves forward, I hope to work with the subcommittee to provide EPA funding for a much-needed study on air toxics in east Harris County, which lies in the district I represent. The Houston Chronicle recently completed a five-part series titled "In Harm's Way" that investigated air toxics in these "fence-line" communities near industrial facilities.

In particular, the series noted that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality found that folks residing in some of Houston's East End neighborhoods experience higher levels of potentially carcinogenic compounds than other areas.

For many years, residents have had concerns and questions about the quality of the air in Houston's East End, the potential relationship to local industry, and the potential health effects on families.

While it came to few conclusions about health impacts of air toxics in Houston, the Chronicle series raised an alarm and confirmed that there is a pressing need for a comprehensive Air Toxics Risk Assessment to properly identify any adverse health effects and their possible relationship to local industry.

With support from the EPA, the City of Houston plans to utilize methods from the EPA's National Urban Toxics Program, which has proven successful in other cities with air quality issues.

The City of Houston, partnering with the University of Texas School of Public Health, is already working to characterize the science and weigh the evidence on health effects. Federal funding would broaden the scope of these efforts to ensure that we can include the full range of risk assessment activities in our efforts to improve the air in Houston.

The folks in fence-line communities are often the workers who produce many of the essential energy and petrochemical products we all use everyday, and they deserve accurate information about their environment.

I look forward to working with the EPA on this effort and hope that the Appropriations Committee will see it fit to include this critical

funding during conference negotiations on this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment with the Interior Appropriations bill that we are considering today. I am concerned with the lack of funding for many important programs, and am particularly concerned with the Appropriation Committee's decision to zero out funding for a federal program that is important to my state and the nation—the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been instrumental in assisting local and state government's preserve such vital open spaces in the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). This program was established in 1965 to address rapid overdevelopment by increasing the number of high quality recreation areas and facilities and by increasing the local involvement in land preservation. To achieve this goal, the fund was separated into two components, one portion of the fund serves an account from which the federal government draws from to acquire land and the other portion is distributed to states in a matching grant program.

New Jersey has been active in seeking grants from this program and has received funds from the LWCF that were used to preserve treasures such as the Pinelands National Reserve and the Delaware National Scenic River. In addition, LCWF has provided more than \$111 million in state and local grants to build softball fields, rehabilitate playgrounds and to expand state parks.

Unfortunately, in recent years funding for the state side part of this program has been insufficient. In fact, this program was zeroed out in the mid-1990s. In 1999, I joined Representative MCGOVERN in restoring funding for this program. Since then funding for the program has risen to 91 million in Fiscal Year 2005, I am dismayed that the Interior Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2006 has once again zeroed out funding for the state grant portion of the program. I am fully aware that we are working under a tight budget and that many programs in this bill receive a significant reduction in funding, but I believe that it is unnecessary and unwise to strip this program of all funding.

Urban and highly developed regions will suffer the most from the elimination of the LWCF state grant program. The LCWF matching grant program has proven to be a successful way to overcome the high cost of living that makes land acquisition and renewal projects costly in these regions. Elimination of this program will leave local leaders without the financial capital necessary to enhance the quality of life in their communities.

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The Nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired, in value." Although the citizens of New Jersey and this nation have demonstrated their enthusiasm for this program, this bill fails to meet their commitment to our future.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Chairman, I have some grave concerns about several provisions of this bill. Among the most important concerns to Marylanders is the fact that this bill cuts clean water funding by \$241 million from last year's appropriated level—bringing our financial commitment to clean water down to 1989 funding levels. This money—in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund—pays for sew-

age system upgrades across the country. We in Maryland know how incredibly important this money is to protect the health of our people.

Fifty million gallons of waste will spew from Baltimore's crumbling sewers in May. Nitrogen pollution is the most significant environmental hazard facing the Chesapeake Bay. The so-called "dead zones" in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries (in which there is too little oxygen to support a healthy ecosystem) are a direct result of nutrient pollution, principally nitrogen. In July of 2003, data from the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program shows one of the largest areas of oxygen-depleted water seen since the program began monitoring 20 years ago.

The Clean Water Act requires the Environmental Protection Agency to issue permits for all sewage treatment plants that will protect water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, yet the EPA routinely fails to include restrictions on nitrogen pollution in these permits. The EPA has not updated the standards on nitrogen pollution in almost 20 years.

We need to commit more money—not less—to enforce the Clean Water Act.

No issue united the people of Maryland and our region as well as the effort to "Save the Bay." Rather than fulfill the obligations of the federal government to serve these people and protect the Bay, this bill reduces the federal government's commitment to enforcing the Clean Water Act.

We have an obligation to ensure that our estuaries nationwide are there for future generations, and to do that we must restore funding to enforce the Clean Water Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my deep concerns about the FY06 Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill.

This bill epitomizes the Republican plan; hand out lavish tax breaks to the wealthy while slashing crucial domestic programs.

In this bill, there are painful cuts to a wide range of valuable programs, from EPA enforcement to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Among them all, the cuts in clean water funding stand out as a prime example of what's wrong with the Republican budget.

Nothing is more essential to human health than clean water. If we follow down the path the Republicans are leading us, there will be water, water everywhere, but not a drop of it to drink.

More than three decades ago, Americans rose up in outrage, appalled by our filthy rivers and lakes. Congress responded to the clarion call for clean water with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which evolved into the modern Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act set the goals of zero discharge of pollutants, and achieving water that is clean enough to be "fishable" and "swimmable."

When upstream communities fail to clean up their sewage or prevent polluted runoff, downstream communities pay the price. Beaches must be closed to protect swimmers from harmful bacteria and virus. Fish cannot be eaten, and shellfish cannot be harvested. Water must be treated more thoroughly before it can become drinking water.

We have made enormous progress since the infamous day the Cuyahoga River caught fire in 1969. For three decades, the federal government has been an essential partner, working with the states to pay for clean water infrastructure.

The key federal program today is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which provides funding for wastewater collection and treatment, correction of combined sewer overflows, and control of storm water and non-point source pollution. These funds also create good jobs for engineers, contractors, skilled laborers, and manufacturers.

But our work is not done. About 45 percent of water bodies in the U.S. that have been assessed do not meet our water quality standards.

Our wastewater infrastructure is aging, and our population is growing. The Environmental Protection Agency's estimates funding needs range between \$300 billion and \$400 billion over the next 20 years.

This bill turns back the clock on clean water, slashing the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for the second year in a row. Cuts for this program total \$500 million in this two-year period.

This is the wrong thing to do, and the public agrees. A recent poll showed Americans want clean water to be a national priority—67 percent say they prefer spending for clean and safe water over tax cuts.

Madam Chairman, I also wish to state my support for the Stupak amendment on sewage blending. "Sewage blending" is a euphemism referring to the practice of allowing some sewage to bypass the secondary treatment phase, the phase in which toxic chemicals, viruses, parasites, and other pathogens are removed.

The amendment would not block current practices needed to cope with heavy rains or snowmelt, but it would prevent EPA from expanding the use of sewage blending.

Furthermore, I intend to support the Andrews-Chabot amendment to stop wasteful and destructive logging in the Tongass National Forest, and the Hastings amendment to promote environmental justice. It is unconscionable that minorities and low-income communities are subjected to worse water and air pollution than other Americans.

Madam Chairman, clean water is precious and must be treated as such. For the sake of our children, and our grandchildren, let us take care of this most basic of needs: clean water.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2361

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the

Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$845,783,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,000,000 is for high priority projects, to be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; and of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2006 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

In addition, \$32,696,000 is for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$845,783,000, and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, fire science and research, emergency rehabilitation, hazardous fuels reduction, and rural fire assistance by the Department of the Interior, \$761,564,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$7,849,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided*, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., protection of United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That using the amounts designated under this title of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into procurement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, for hazardous fuels reduction activities, and for training and monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels reduction activities, on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That not-

withstanding requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, the Secretary, for purposes of hazardous fuels reduction activities, may obtain maximum practicable competition among: (1) local private, nonprofit, or cooperative entities; (2) Youth Conservation Corps crews or related partnerships with State, local, or non-profit youth groups; (3) small or micro-businesses; or (4) other entities that will hire or train locally a significant percentage, defined as 50 percent or more, of the project workforce to complete such contracts: *Provided further*, That in implementing this section, the Secretary shall develop written guidance to field units to ensure accountability and consistent application of the authorities provided herein: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this head may be used to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out their responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to consult and conference, as required by section 7 of such Act, in connection with wildland fire management activities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may use wildland fire appropriations to enter into non-competitive sole source leases of real property with local governments, at or below fair market value, to construct capitalized improvements for fire facilities on such leased properties, including but not limited to fire guard stations, retardant stations, and other initial attack and fire support facilities, and to make advance payments for any such lease or for construction activity associated with the lease: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$9,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite jointly funded wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That funds provided for wildfire suppression shall be available for support of Federal emergency response actions.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, \$11,476,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, \$3,817,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein, including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; \$110,070,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEM HEALTH AND RECOVERY  
FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102-381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, implementing and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities, such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq., and Public Law 106-393) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

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

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

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

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as authorized by law, and for scientific and economic studies, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, \$1,005,225,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided*, That \$2,000,000 is for high priority projects, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$18,130,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsection (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)), of which not to exceed \$12,852,000 shall be used for any activity regarding the designation of critical habitat, pursuant to subsection (a)(3), excluding litigation support, for species listed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) prior to October 1, 2005: *Provided further*, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to \$400,000, to remain available until expended, may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on her certificate: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to \$1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; \$41,206,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for

acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, \$14,937,000 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That land and non-water interests acquired from willing sellers incidental to water rights acquired for the transfer and use at Lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges under this heading shall be resold and the revenues therefrom shall be credited to this account and shall be available without further appropriation for the acquisition of water rights, including acquisition of interests in lands incidental to such water rights, for the two refuges: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for specific land acquisition projects can be used to pay for any administrative overhead, planning or other management costs.

LANDOWNER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for private conservation efforts to be carried out on private lands, \$23,700,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided herein is for a Landowner Incentive Program established by the Secretary that provides matching, competitively awarded grants to States, the District of Columbia, federally recognized Indian tribes, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa, to establish or supplement existing landowner incentive programs that provide technical and financial assistance, including habitat protection and restoration, to private landowners for the protection and management of habitat to benefit federally listed, proposed, candidate, or other at-risk species on private lands.

PRIVATE STEWARDSHIP GRANTS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for private conservation efforts to be carried out on private lands, \$7,386,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided herein is for the Private Stewardship Grants Program established by the Secretary to provide grants and other assistance to individuals and groups engaged in private conservation efforts that benefit federally listed, proposed, candidate, or other at-risk species.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES

CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), as amended, \$84,400,000, of which \$20,161,000 is to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund and \$64,239,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), \$14,414,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION  
FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101-233, as amended, \$40,000,000 to remain available until expended.



## NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

For financial assistance for projects to promote the conservation of neotropical migratory birds in accordance with the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act, Public Law 106-247 (16 U.S.C. 6101-6109), \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201-4203, 4211-4213, 4221-4225, 4241-4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-96; 16 U.S.C. 4261-4266), the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301-5306), the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6301), and, the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-266; 16 U.S.C. 6601), \$5,900,000, to remain available until expended.

## STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and federally recognized Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, \$65,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided herein, \$6,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, after deducting said \$6,000,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: *Provided further*, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: *Provided further*, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of such projects: *Provided further*, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: *Provided further*, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant unless it has developed, by October 1, 2005, a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan, consistent with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior, that considers the broad range of the State, territory, or other jurisdiction's wildlife and associated habitats, with appropriate priority placed on those species with the greatest conservation need and taking into consideration the relative level of funding available for the conservation of

those species: *Provided further*, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its comprehensive wildlife conservation plan is disapproved and such funds that would have been distributed to such State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall be distributed equitably to States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans: *Provided further*, That any amount apportioned in 2006 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2007, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2008, in the manner provided herein: *Provided further*, That balances from amounts previously appropriated under the heading "State Wildlife Grants" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of passenger motor vehicles; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management, and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Service may use up to \$2,000,000 from funds provided for contracts for employment-related legal services: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 108-330.

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, \$1,754,199,000, of which \$30,000,000 is provided above the budget request to be distributed to all park areas on a pro-rate basis and to remain in the park base; of which \$9,892,000 is for planning and interagency coordination in support of Everglades restoration and shall remain available until expended; of which \$97,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, is for maintenance, repair or rehabilitation projects for constructed assets, operation of the National Park Service

automated facility management software system, and comprehensive facility condition assessments; of which \$1,937,000 is for the Youth Conservation Corps for high priority projects: *Provided*, That the only funds in this account which may be made available to support United States Park Police are those funds approved for emergency law and order incidents pursuant to established National Park Service procedures, those funds needed to maintain and repair United States Park Police administrative facilities, and those funds necessary to reimburse the United States Park Police account for the unbudgeted overtime and travel costs associated with special events for an amount not to exceed \$10,000 per event subject to the review and concurrence of the Washington headquarters office.

## UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs of the United States Park Police, \$82,411,000.

## NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, \$48,997,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act for the River, Trails and Conservation Assistance program may be used for cash agreements, or for cooperative agreements that are inconsistent with the program's final strategic plan.

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), \$72,705,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2007, of which \$30,000,000 shall be for Save America's Treasures for preservation of nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts: *Provided*, That any individual Save America's Treasures grant shall be matched by non-Federal funds: *Provided further*, That individual projects shall only be eligible for one grant: *Provided further*, That all projects to be funded shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities prior to the commitment of Save America's Treasures grant funds: *Provided further*, That Save America's Treasures funds allocated for Federal projects, following approval, shall be available by transfer to appropriate accounts of individual agencies: *Provided further*, That hereinafter and notwithstanding 20 U.S.C. 951 et seq. the National Endowment for the Arts may award Save America's Treasures grants based upon the recommendations of the Save America's Treasures grant selection panel convened by the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the National Park Service.

## CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, \$308,230,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$17,000,000 for modified water deliveries to Everglades National Park shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the "Land Acquisition and State Assistance" account for Everglades National Park land acquisitions: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the National Park Service may be used to plan, design, or construct any

partnership project with a total value in excess of \$5,000,000, without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service may not accept donations or services associated with the planning, design, or construction of such new facilities without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading for implementation of modified water deliveries to Everglades National Park shall be expended consistent with the requirements of the fifth proviso under this heading in Public Law 108-108: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for planning, design, or construction of any underground security screening or visitor contact facility at the Washington Monument until such facility has been approved in writing by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND  
(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2006 by 16 U.S.C. 4601-10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, \$9,421,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which \$1,587,000 is for the administration of the State assistance program.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 245 passenger motor vehicles, of which 199 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 193 for police-type use, 10 buses, and 8 ambulances: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than 3 calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, appropriations available to the National Park Service may be used to maintain the following areas in Washington, District of Columbia: Jackson Place, Madison Place, and Pennsylvania Avenue between 15th and 17th Streets, Northwest.

None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention.

The National Park Service may distribute to operating units based on the safety record of each unit the costs of programs designed to improve workplace and employee safety, and to encourage employees receiving workers' compensation benefits pursuant to chap-

ter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to return to appropriate positions for which they are medically able.

If the Secretary of the Interior considers the decision of any value determination proceeding conducted under a National Park Service concession contract issued prior to November 13, 1998, to misinterpret or misapply relevant contractual requirements or their underlying legal authority, the Secretary may seek, within 180 days of any such decision, the de novo review of the value determination by the United States Court of Federal Claims, and that court may make an order affirming, vacating, modifying or correcting the determination.

In addition to other uses set forth in section 407(d) of Public Law 105-391, franchise fees credited to a sub-account shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary, without further appropriation, for use at any unit within the National Park System to extinguish or reduce liability for Possessory Interest or leasehold surrender interest. Such funds may only be used for this purpose to the extent that the benefiting unit anticipated franchise fee receipts over the term of the contract at that unit exceed the amount of funds used to extinguish or reduce liability. Franchise fees at the benefiting unit shall be credited to the sub-account of the originating unit over a period not to exceed the term of a single contract at the benefiting unit, in the amount of funds so expended to extinguish or reduce liability.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; and to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law and to publish and disseminate data; \$974,586,000, of which \$63,770,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations; of which \$8,000,000 shall remain available until expended for satellite operations; of which \$23,320,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007, for the operation and maintenance of facilities and deferred maintenance; of which \$1,600,000 shall be available until expended for deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects that exceed \$100,000 in cost; and of which \$174,765,000 shall be available until September 30, 2007, for the biological research activity and the operation of the Cooperative Research Units: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided for the biological research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the United States Geological Survey shall be available for the purchase and replacement of pas-

senger motor vehicles; reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: *Provided*, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in 31 U.S.C. 6302 et seq.: *Provided further*, That the United States Geological Survey may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements directly with individuals or indirectly with institutions or nonprofit organizations, without regard to 41 U.S.C. 5, for the temporary or intermittent services of students or recent graduates, who shall be considered employees for the purpose of chapters 57 and 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for travel and work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, but shall not be considered to be Federal employees for any other purposes.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE  
ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS  
MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$152,676,000, of which \$77,529,000 shall be available for royalty management activities; and an amount not to exceed \$122,730,000, to be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additions to receipts resulting from increases to rates in effect on August 5, 1993, from rate increases to fee collections for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities performed by the Minerals Management Service (MMS) over and above the rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities established after September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That to the extent \$122,730,000 in additions to receipts are not realized from the sources of receipts stated above, the amount needed to reach \$122,730,000 shall be credited to this appropriation from receipts resulting from rental rates for Outer Continental Shelf leases in effect before August 5, 1993: *Provided further*, That \$3,000,000 for computer acquisitions shall remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$15,000 under this heading shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of MMS concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, the MMS may under the royalty-in-kind program, or under its authority to transfer oil to the Strategic

Petroleum Reserve, use a portion of the revenues from royalty-in-kind sales, without regard to fiscal year limitation, to pay for transportation to wholesale market centers or upstream pooling points, to process or otherwise dispose of royalty production taken in kind, and to recover MMS transportation costs, salaries, and other administrative costs directly related to the royalty-in-kind program: *Provided further*, That MMS shall analyze and document the expected return in advance of any royalty-in-kind sales to assure to the maximum extent practicable that royalty income under the program is equal to or greater than royalty income recognized under a comparable royalty-in-value program.

#### OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$7,006,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

#### OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

##### REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; \$110,435,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations, may use directly or through grants to States, moneys collected in fiscal year 2006 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1268), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

##### ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$188,014,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended; of which up to \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Federal Expenses Share of the Fund, shall be for supplemental grants to States for the reclamation of abandoned sites with acid mine rock drainage from coal mines, and for associated activities, through the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative: *Provided*, That grants to minimum program States will be \$1,500,000 per State in fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That pursuant to Public Law 97-365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: *Provided further*, That funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95-87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: *Provided further*, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: *Provided further*, That amounts allocated under section 402(g)(2) of the Surface Mining Control and

Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232(g)(2)) as of September 30, 2005, but not appropriated as of that date, are reallocated to the allocation established in section 402(g)(3) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232(g)(3)): *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this heading may be used for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

With funds available for the Technical Innovation and Professional Services program in this Act, the Secretary may transfer title for computer hardware, software and other technical equipment to State and Tribal regulatory and reclamation programs.

##### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

##### OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), as amended, the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001-2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), as amended, \$1,992,737,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007 except as otherwise provided herein, of which not to exceed \$86,462,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments and notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, not to exceed \$134,609,000 shall be available for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with ongoing contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 2006, as authorized by such Act, of which \$129,609,000 shall be available for indirect contract support costs and \$5,000,000 shall be available for direct contract support costs, except that tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet contract support costs of ongoing contracts, grants, or compacts, or annual funding agreements and for unmet welfare assistance costs; and of which not to exceed \$478,085,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 2006, and shall remain available until September 30, 2007; and of which not to exceed \$61,267,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, the Indian Self-Determination Fund, land records improvement, and the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, and 25 U.S.C. 2008, not to exceed \$44,718,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available to tribes and tribal organizations for administrative cost grants associated with ongoing grants entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 2005 for the operation of Bureau-funded schools, and up to \$500,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available for the transitional costs of initial administrative cost grants to tribes and tribal organizations that enter into grants for the operation on or after July 1, 2005, of Bureau-operated schools: *Provided further*, That any forestry funds allocated to a tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2007, may be transferred during fiscal year 2008 to an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of such tribe within

the tribe's trust fund account: *Provided further*, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2008.

##### CONSTRUCTION

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87-483, \$284,137,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: *Provided further*, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 13 shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, in implementing new construction or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of \$100,000 that are provided to tribally controlled grant schools under Public Law 100-297, as amended, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in 43 CFR part 12 as the regulatory requirements: *Provided further*, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of 43 CFR; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: *Provided further*, That in considering applications, the Secretary shall consider whether the Indian tribe or tribal organization would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by 25 U.S.C. 2005(b), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary declines an application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in 25 U.S.C. 2504(f): *Provided further*, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in 25 U.S.C. 2507(e): *Provided further*, That in order to ensure timely completion of replacement school construction projects, the Secretary may assume control of a project and all funds related to the project, if, within eighteen months of the date of enactment of this Act, any tribe or tribal organization receiving funds appropriated in this Act or in any prior Act, has not completed the planning and design phase of the project and commenced construction of the replacement school: *Provided further*, That this Appropriation may be reimbursed from the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians Appropriation for the appropriate share of construction costs for space expansion needed in agency offices to meet trust reform implementation.

##### INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For miscellaneous payments to Indian tribes and individuals and for necessary administrative expenses, \$34,754,000, to remain available until expended, for implementation of Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 99-264, 100-580, 101-618, 106-554, 107-331, and 108-34, and for implementation of other land and water rights settlements, of which \$10,000,000 shall be

available for payment to the Quinault Indian Nation pursuant to the terms of the North Boundary Settlement Agreement dated July 14, 2000, providing for the acquisition of perpetual conservation easements from the Nation.

#### INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed and insured loans, \$6,348,000, of which \$701,000 is for administrative expenses, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$118,884,000.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Notwithstanding 25 U.S.C. 15, the Bureau of Indian Affairs may contract for services in support of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Power Division of the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans, the Indian loan guarantee and insurance fund, and the Indian Guaranteed Loan Program account) shall be available for expenses of exhibits, and purchase and replacement of passenger motor vehicles.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office operations or pooled overhead general administration (except facilities operations and maintenance) shall be available for tribal contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution to other tribes, this action shall not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

Appropriations made available in this or any other Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996. No funds available to the Bureau shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau school system as of October 1, 1995. Funds made available under this Act may not be used to establish a charter school at a Bureau-funded school (as that term is defined in section 1146 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2026)), except that a charter school that is in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act and that has operated at a Bureau-funded school before September 1, 1999, may continue to operate during that period, but only if the charter school pays to the Bureau a pro rata share of funds to reimburse the Bureau for the use of the real and personal property (including buses and vans),

the funds of the charter school are kept separate and apart from Bureau funds, and the Bureau does not assume any obligation for charter school programs of the State in which the school is located if the charter school loses such funding. Employees of Bureau-funded schools sharing a campus with a charter school and performing functions related to the charter school's operation and employees of a charter school shall not be treated as Federal employees for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 113 of title I of appendix C of Public Law 106-113, if a tribe or tribal organization in fiscal year 2003 or 2004 received indirect and administrative costs pursuant to a distribution formula based on section 5(f) of Public Law 101-301, the Secretary shall continue to distribute indirect and administrative cost funds to such tribe or tribal organization using the section 5(f) distribution formula.

#### DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

##### INSULAR AFFAIRS

##### ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, \$76,563,000, of which: (1) \$69,182,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance, including maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, insular management controls, coral reef initiative activities, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94-241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) \$7,381,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the Government Accountability Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands approved by Public Law 104-134: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for technical assistance, sufficient funds shall be made available for a grant to the Pacific Basin Development Council: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for technical assistance, sufficient funding shall be made available for a grant to the Close Up Foundation: *Provided further*, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the grantee's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets: *Provided further*, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non-Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

#### COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For grants and necessary expenses, \$5,362,000, to remain available until expended, as provided for in sections 221(a)(2), 221(b), and 233 of the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau; and section 221(a)(2) of the Compacts of Free Association for the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Government of the United States and the Federated States of Micronesia, as authorized by Public Law 99-658 and Public Law 108-188.

#### DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, \$118,755,000; of which \$23,555,000 shall remain available until expended for a departmental financial and business management system; of which not to exceed \$8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which up to \$1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this or previous appropriations Acts may be used to establish any additional reserves in the Working Capital Fund account other than the two authorized reserves without prior approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I offer several amendments, and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER: Beginning on page 44, line 25, strike “;” of which \$23,555,000 shall remain available until expended for a departmental financial and business management system;” and insert “(reduced by \$8,000,000);”.

Page 75, line 12, insert “(reduced by \$7,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 106, line 9, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 106, line 13, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

Page 106, line 25, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)” after the dollar amount.

□ 1300

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for 10 minutes.

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

Madam Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will redress a grievous act that was perpetrated, without our knowledge, on a majority of this great body.

Last year, with a resounding vote of 241 Members, the House voted an increase for our Federal arts agency that

we knew would pay us back many times over, both in hard dollars and in ways that are simply incalculable for the people we represent.

The actual amounts were small, an increase of \$10 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and \$3.5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

But the loss was great. After conferees met for the omnibus funding bill, NEA, incredibly, received just several hundred thousand dollars, and NEH received less than \$3 million.

Not only was the will of this great body thwarted, but also the creative activities of our artistic constituents in every congressional district in this country were stifled.

Grants were not made and those grants were not matched. Works were not created. Performances did not happen. Audiences did not gather. Minds were not enlightened, souls were not fed; and the small businesses that depend on the nonprofit arts community did not profit.

Finally, the funds that should have been returned to the Federal Treasury in the form of tax receipts, many times over the original amounts, never arrived. It was a lose-lose situation for everyone involved: the artists, the audiences, our communities, and our small businesses, as well as our local, State, and Federal treasuries.

By all rights, I should be standing here asking my colleagues not just to restore the moneys that we voted for last year, but to double them. If our Federal deficit were not so huge and our budgets so tight, believe me, I would be doing just that.

Instead, I ask you simply to put these Federal art agencies back in business where we funded them last year, with an increase of \$10 million for NEA and \$5 million for NEH.

The President's own budget request for NEA was telling. In it, even as he suggested level funding for the agency, he asked that American Masterpieces, a majestic program that emphasizes the best of American art, should be increased by \$6.5 million.

President Bush was rightfully enthusiastic about that program. It is an increase that I personally applaud. But unless we provide an overall increase for NEA, the money is slated to come from Challenge America, a highly popular program that supported artists in more than 99 percent of our congressional districts last year.

That is not a good idea. Challenge America grants go to the towns and hamlets of this sprawling country, where big touring companies will rarely go, and major actors, actresses, writers and artists may never appear in person. For example, last year Challenge American grants went to Aliceville, Alabama and to Bainbridge Island, Washington; to Red Wing, Minnesota and Lucas, Kansas. They energized audiences in Texarkana, Texas and Locust Grove, Arkansas, and spellbound art-hungry folks in Albany, Georgia and Billings, Montana.

We can and should do both: increase American Masterpieces as the President wishes, and continue to challenge the artists and their audiences in our congressional districts by funding Challenge America.

Madam Chairman, \$10 million will ensure that the program will prosper and grow, with Chairman Gioia using up to 10 percent of the money to ensure effective administration of this fine program. And \$5 million will enhance NEH's We the People, which promotes the teaching and understanding of American history.

But let me remind my colleagues, even with these increases, we are far from providing the agencies with the funds they received in the mid-1990s. As you see from the first chart, NEA is currently funded at \$121 million, but received \$176 million in 1992. And NEH is funded at \$138 million, while it received \$175.5 million in 1994.

Why is it so important to rebuild the funding for these agencies? Well, every year I stand here and remind you what an economic powerhouse the nonprofit arts industry has become in American. As this second chart proves, it produces over \$134 billion annually. I do not know of any other investment we make that does that. Please note it returns \$10.5 billion to the Federal Treasury.

In these difficult financial times for so many of our districts, as our local leaders strive to balance their budgets by cutting services, we would be irresponsible not to invest in the arts. While other industries have suffered, the nonprofit arts world continues to build in strength while it encourages the growth of innumerable small businesses on its periphery, thereby creating more jobs.

This third chart may surprise Members. It demonstrates the financial muscle of the arts industry, which has produced far more jobs than all of America's farmers, programmers, doctors, lawyers, or accountants. This is an amazing chart.

In fact, while the national economy has grown at a rate of 3.8 percent, the arts have far out-distanced that number by expanding at a rate of 5.5 percent.

And all of that said, I also stand before you at this time, every year, to remind us all of the stunning gifts American artists make to our daily lives. Their creative force not only helps our children learn but also makes them smarter. It brightens the life of each one of us, bringing us joy and comfort, enlightenment and understanding, in ways impossible to find otherwise.

The arts and artists of America are our national treasure, which this great Nation needs, deserves, and must support as other nations do.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote for the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment, and thank my colleagues who have joined me today.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the gentlewoman is obviously speaking seriously about the arts and humanities. Certainly we support both and have done so generously in this bill. The American public supports arts now by over \$9 billion. The government's support is a very minimal part of that \$9 billion. In fact, this increase would be an even smaller part of that \$9 billion, and so it would be hardly noticeable inside the total support of the arts.

What we are having to sacrifice, though, is to reduce funding for the administration of the Department of the Interior by \$8 million and administration of the Forest Service by \$7 million. This will cost some 200 staff positions in the Department of the Interior and Forest Service. They are responsible for 634 acres in the United States. This is a primary obligation we have. It is not supported by \$9 billion of public support. It is primarily supported with the funding that this Committee has the duty to appropriate.

That is why we are trying to do our primary job by maintaining the levels that we did and to find a balance to show our support for the arts and do the mandated portion that we must do for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service.

Members can count on us to continue to support the arts, to watch the oversight of our Committees, and this bill strikes a fair balance between the needs of the arts and our responsibility to land management and Indian programs. I ask Members to join me in opposition to this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chairman, I rise to urge support for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and myself to increase the funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities. The amendment would provide an additional \$15 million for the endowments—\$10 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, and \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities. The increase would be offset by reductions in various accounts.

My colleagues may recall that a similar amendment passed the House last year during consideration of the 2005 Department of the Interior bill by a vote of 241 to 185. The amendment provided an additional \$10 million for the NEA and \$3.5 million for the NEH.

Once again the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and I are asking for support for this amendment, and perhaps we can obtain a greater margin than last year.

I have sensed over the last few years that the battle over this amendment has cooled and we can move on knowing that a healthy majority in the

House agrees that these two important programs deserve our strong financial support.

This debate presents a good opportunity to make sure our new colleagues understand the importance of this modest Federal support and how it has such a tremendous impact on every one of our congressional districts. Each of the NEA and NEH grants is modest in size, but it is vitally important to the communities they reach. The Federal money serves as a catalyst to draw in private contributions. In fact, we now know that higher levels of Federal money will leverage even greater private support.

Unfortunately, since 1996, the endowments have been underfunded. The endowments are still being funded below their level of 10 years ago. In 1996, Congress reduced the NEA by 39 percent and NEH by 36 percent. Our amendment does not restore those funding levels of a decade ago, but it does provide an opportunity for the Members of the House to show their strong support for the endowments by approving this modest amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment for increased funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts.

As co-chair of the newly established Congressional Humanities Caucus, I am pleased to support this amendment which will in particular increase funding for NEH's We the People program by \$5 million.

We the People is an agency-wide program focused on examining and understanding significant events and themes in our Nation's history. An additional \$5 million will enable We the People to support teacher seminars and institutes with new content focusing on American history and civics, media projects focusing on key people and events in American history, and preservation projects that preserve and provide access to important historical documents and artifacts that are central to America's historical and cultural heritage.

We ought to do more, but this modest funding increase will help. It will aid NEH's efforts to conserve and nurture America's heritage, bring humanities to communities across this country, and educate the next generation of Americans. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous

consent request to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Slaughter-Shays-Dicks-Leach-Price Amendment to provide much needed funds for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

This is a long overdue and a modest funding increase to build programs that use the strength of the arts and our Nation's cultural life to enhance communities in every State and every county around America. The additional funds provided through this amendment would keep intact the very successful Challenge America program, which brings the arts to rural communities and inner-city neighborhoods whose limited resources don't always allow for community arts programs.

In 2004, the Challenge America program provided grants to towns and cities in 99% of congressional districts for jazz and blues festivals, showcases for regional musicians and artists, and public-private partnerships that bring the arts into local schools. Dozens of studies have demonstrated the significant positive effect of arts education on students' academic performance, self esteem, and behavior, and the Challenge America grants are an excellent mechanism to bring the arts to students who can greatly benefit from that exposure.

Similarly, the NEH serves to advance the Nation's scholarly and cultural life. The additional funding contained in this amendment would enable NEH to improve the quality of humanities education to America's school children and college students, offer lifelong learning opportunities through a range of public programs, and support new projects that encourage Americans to discover their storied and inspiring national heritage.

It is clear that increasing funding for the arts and humanities is among the best investments that we, as a society, can make. They help our children learn. They give the elderly sustenance. They power economic development in regions that are down and out. They tie our diverse society and country together.

Will the projects that would be sponsored by this increase in funding help defend our country? Probably not, but they will make our country more worth defending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH.

The arts are crucial for the flourishing and development of societies. As our economy

continues to grow it is important that the arts remain a priority in our communities. As former President Kennedy stated, "I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for our victories or defeats in battles or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit."

Though some would consider our economy hard pressed for such funding as this, I implore my colleagues to consider the profound influence of arts-centric businesses.

While some of the country's concerns only affect a minority of people, the involvement in the arts spans all walks of life. Indeed, it weaves together all communities and crosses racial, gender, and religious boundaries.

In my district, the arts create a sense of nationalism for the State and the rest of the country. For, what would Chicago be without the architecture of the Sears Tower, the flourishing talent in Second City, or the abundant museums? Indeed, the beating pulse of America lives and thrives through the arts.

Not only do the arts enrich societies, but the arts is also an industry. In my district there are 2,989 art related businesses and 44,709 people that make their daily living working in the arts. It is obvious that support of arts, also is support of the economy. Arts-Centric businesses supply 578,000 businesses in the United States and employ 2.97 million people. Even more, it is a growing institution, exceeding the total United States business growth rate by 1.7 percent. Not only do the arts help sustain the economy by supplying jobs and generating revenue, it helps to fuel future creative industries and workers.

These future creative workers come in the form of our children. The arts help in a child's brain development and their creative skills. A country without a full expression of the arts would truly create a void in a child's development. They too deserve the right to blossom and flourish their imagination from the various artistic resources.

We cannot disregard the contributions and growing trends of the arts. The arts and humanities support our culture, it supports our economy, and most importantly it supports our future. In my district there is a wealth of diversity. This diversity is preserved through the arts. The arts promote respect for diversity, and appreciation of other cultures. It seems to me, that these elements are necessary for building stable healthy communities.

Madam Chairman, if we minimize these possibilities in the arts, we will be limiting the liberty of our imagination. I request my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I also would stand in support of the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Slaughter Shays-Dicks-Price-Leach Amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

In my district in New Mexico, arts and humanities are a significant part of daily life—the

name "Sante Fe" conjures up images of Georgia O'Keefe's beautiful flowers and Ansel Adams' breathtaking photographs. But arts and humanities programs are also a major employer. New Mexico's third congressional district has over 1,700 arts-related businesses that employ over 5,300 people. This includes the famed Santa Fe Opera, the budding film industry, numerous respected museums, hundreds of art galleries, mariachi bands, arts schools, and more.

Many of these artists make use of grants through the NEA and NEH. Unfortunately, NEA and NEH programs remain seriously underfunded due to past budget cuts. This modest amendment seeks to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities' "We the People," initiative by \$5 million, and the National Endowment for the Arts' "Challenge America" program by \$10 million. In congressional terms, these amounts are a blip on the budget screen. But in terms of what they mean to these programs and the constituents who benefit from them, such increases are incredibly helpful, and can mean the survival of numerous arts and humanities programs around the country.

I often hear from New Mexicans who attest to the effectiveness of the We the People initiative in strengthening youth understanding and appreciation of American history and culture. We the People helps all of us become more aware of our past, our values, and our institutions. I believe this effort is crucial for the progress of our country.

In addition to economic benefits of the arts, recent studies have shown the significant impact that arts education can have on at-risk youth. The YouthARTS Development Project recently conducted a study showing that students who are exposed to arts education show an increased ability to express emotions appropriately, communicate effectively with adults and peers, and to work cooperatively with others. They also show decreased frequency of delinquent behavior, improvement in attitudes toward school, higher self-esteem, and much lower dropout rates. These programs are working, and we must make sure we continue to fund them.

I thank my colleagues for offering this amendment and I urge a "yes" vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. WU. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Slaughter/Shays/Dicks/Leach/Price amendment.

□ 1315

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to increase funding for the NEA and the NEH. Without this amendment, the continued flat funding the President requested this year will really amount to another cut. I wish we could return to the days of the first President Bush when the arts were funded at \$175 million. The amount we are asking for today amounts to little

more than a comma in the budget, a rounding error when compared to Federal spending in other areas such as defense.

Whether it is the educational value, the cultural enrichment, or the substantial economic windfall the arts and humanities create, the NEA and the NEH are two of the best investments this Nation makes. When we short-change the NEA, we ignore the \$134 billion in business that the arts generate, the 4.8 million jobs, the \$89.4 billion in household income, and the \$25 billion in tax revenues. A recent RAND study noted the importance of the intrinsic benefit of the arts for individuals and communities.

This modest amount asks only to restore the funding level the House supported last year, but that was stripped during conference. It is the very least we should do today. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to vote against any attempts to slash funding from the arts and humanities that may be offered in other amendments.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Certainly if we do not do a better job of educating our children in the arts, we will be a Nation of poor spirit and little understanding. It is really through the arts that we understand how destructive is greed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I commend Congresswoman SLAUGHTER and Congressman SHAYS for all of their hard work supporting the arts and humanities through the Congressional Arts Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, this a very modest amendment. Indeed, I would support significantly greater increases for both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The reason is quite simple—these agencies are good for the Third District of Massachusetts and for every community across the country.

Nationwide, nonprofit arts industries generate \$134 billion annually in economic activity, support 4.85 million fulltime equivalent jobs, and return \$10.5 billion to the Federal Government in taxes. Measured against \$1.4 billion in direct Federal cultural spending that is a return of nearly eight to one. Frankly, there aren't many industries that I can think of with those kinds of returns.

The mid-90s brought drastic funding cuts to Federal arts and humanities programs, and it is now more important than ever to keep funding stable. By adding \$10 million for NEA and \$5 million for NEH, arts businesses will be able to reinvest into their creative enterprises and back into the community. Between 2004 and 2005, growth in the number of arts businesses outpaced total business growth by 5.5 percent vs. 3.8 percent. During this time, when the total number of U.S. jobs shrank 1.9 per-

cent, the drop off of arts employment was less than half that rate.

In my district, there are 1,234 arts-related businesses that employ over 7,000 people. These businesses range from non-profit museums and symphonies to for-profit films and advertising companies. The arts business community serves as a cornerstone for cultural enrichment and the tourist economy. Studies show tourists spend 7 percent more than their local counterparts on arts events. How can we deny that is good for the community's economic, social, and creative well-being.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Slaughter Amendment for minor increases in NEA and NEH funding.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor today in strong support of Slaughter amendment to the FY06 Interior Appropriations Act that will increase funding for the National Endowment of the Arts by \$10 million and for the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million. Even with these increases, the funding level for the NEA will still be \$40 million below the FY 1994 level, and the funding level for the NEH will be \$30 million below the FY 1994 level.

This amendment is needed to continue the critical work of the NEA and the NEH in providing Americans with access to the arts, and an understanding of American culture, legacy, history, and civics. By funding the arts and humanities in every congressional district and giving priority to rural and underserved communities, the NEA and the NEH ensure that Americans across the country can discover and share these treasures while instilling a sense of historical and cultural heritage in their children. These funding increases will help ensure that future generations continue to have the opportunity to explore the creative worlds of arts and humanities.

In addition to providing important cultural experiences nationwide, the NEA and the NEH also support economic growth and tourism nationwide. The non-profit arts industry generates \$134 billion in economic activity, supporting \$4.85 million full time equivalent positions. In my district there are 1,801 arts related businesses which employ 5,370 employees. Many of these businesses receive grants from the NEA and play crucial roles in increasing tourism in my district. Events like the Monterey Jazz festival and the Cabrillo Music Festival bring tourists to my district to enjoy these cultural experiences, and our local businesses directly benefit from this influx.

I urge all of my colleagues to support increases in funding for the NEA and the NEH and to oppose any proposal to cut these valuable programs.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, let me share with you two recent experiences that confirm why we should support the Slaughter-Shays-Dicks-Leach-Price amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of joining NEA chairman Dana Gioia at the Folger Theater to help judge young high school students in a poetry recitation contest. As one of the judges, I had to pick a winner, but I can tell you there were no losers. It was plainly evident all were winners. Each student provided a masterful performance, had presence and demonstrated a clear and impassioned understanding of the work he or she presented from some of the English language's best poets.

It was a memorable evening. But as much as I enjoyed it, I know it left an even stronger impression on the student and the families and friends who joined them. That evening at the Folger Theater brought us all to a common point of a shared experience where barriers and pretenses were cast aside and humanity and understanding prevailed.

Last week I had a conversation with a retired school teacher who volunteers as a docent providing school tours at the National Gallery of Art. She was upset because of a decision by the gallery to suspend the volunteer-led tours for a year while a new program is developed. It didn't make sense to me and I agreed to help.

During our talk, she mentioned how art at the gallery had touched a young student she had led. He was a recent immigrant who had come from a very troubled land. His English was limited and broken but he was able to say to her that the tour had helped calm his inner turmoil and as he put it, "helped make some of the hurt go away."

Art touches people in ways words cannot describe. The dividend this Nation receives from the Endowment for the Arts far exceeds the investment we make with the limited Federal funds.

In Virginia, the Wolf Trap Performing Arts Center has received NEA grants for their nationally recognized artistic and education programs. In addition to year-round performances, Wolf Trap offers a variety of education programs both locally and nationwide. Its primary education program, the Wolf Trap Institute for Early Learning Through the Arts, places professional performing artists in preschool classrooms nationwide. In classroom residencies, these artists use drama, music and movement to teach basic skills and encourage active participation and self-esteem in the earliest stages of learning. Wolf Trap Institute Artists also conducts workshops and presentations throughout the country to demonstrate to teachers and parents how the arts can bring new life to learning and literature.

As we fight for education funding and standards, how can we look past the significant contribution that performing arts organizations like Wolf Trap are making across the country? This is a time when we must embrace this type of unique programming.

A modest increase in funding for the arts and humanities can make a difference creating new opportunities for hundreds of arts and humanities organizations and bringing the organizations out into the communities.

When the NEA budget has been cut, we have seen its dramatic effect on the national arts community and specifically on arts education programs developing at community centers and in our schools. Now is the time when we must invest in the cultural lives of our citizens and in our children's futures.

I cannot fathom how a Nation as rich and prosperous as ours could not find it in its heart to provide a \$15 million increase, \$10 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and \$5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities. We could eliminate all funding for the endowments tomorrow, and the arts and humanities would survive.

That's not the issue.

The grants NEA provides don't make or break most theater productions, studio exhibitions or symphonic performances. What NEA does with its grants is to ensure that these

performances, exhibits and productions are introduced to a greater share of America.

Support the arts, support the NEA and the NEH, support the Slaughter-Shays-Dicks-Leach-Price amendment.

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Chairman, I am pleased that the amendment offered by my esteemed colleagues Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. PRICE, passed today by a voice vote. The amendment offered on behalf of the Arts Caucus, will increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$10 million and \$5 million respectively. I am a strong supporter of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, and I enjoy a strong working relationship with South Dakota's arts community. As a member of the Arts Caucus, I am proud to support our amendment, which represents an important step towards providing these agencies with the funding they need to continue providing critical support for literary, design, performing arts, and cultural projects in South Dakota and across the country.

Another agency that receives funding under this bill is the U.S. Forest Service, which has the vital responsibility to fight fires on our public lands. I recognize the need for wildland fire protection and I strongly believe that Congress must provide Federal land management agencies with the resources they need to protect our public resources from fire, as well as the lives and property of those who live in and near national forests. It was for this reason that I voted in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. BEAUPREZ of Colorado, to increase funding for wildland fire protection.

Unfortunately, I strongly disagree with the source of funding that Mr. BEAUPREZ chose to utilize, the National Endowment for the Arts, in order to fund this wildland fire prevention increase. This amendment was soundly defeated on the House floor. I believe this was a function of the offset that the amendment sought to use, and not a lack of support in the House for forest fire prevention. It also is an indication that we must look for other ways to increase funding for wildland fire prevention. I offer to work with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in the coming years to identify ways to fund increased wildland fire funding without raiding the important funds of the NEA to accomplish that goal.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Slaughter-Shays-Dicks-Leach-Price Amendment, which would provide a much needed increase in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

This additional \$10 million for the NEA and \$5 million for the NEH would help expose our children to American art, history and culture. In addition to the enjoyment and life-enrichment that each participant in the arts experiences, the involvement of children in the arts has been shown to improve reading and language development, mathematics skills, fundamental cognitive skills, motivation to learn, and social behavior.

The Arts and Humanities not only enhance the lives of our children—they also keep our economy strong. Each year, the nonprofit arts industry creates \$134 billion dollars in economic activity, generating \$24.4 billion dollars in tax revenue for our local, state and federal governments, and supporting nearly 5 million full-time jobs all across our country.

In my district alone, nearly 120,000 people are employed by the museums, theaters, art galleries and other arts organizations that I am proud to represent. In fact, with over 8,000 arts-related organizations, including the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, and the American Ballet theater, my district has the third highest number of arts-related business in the country. For my constituents, and for all Americans, the arts mean business.

Because such a modest increase in funding would bring the arts and jobs to so many people, I strongly support the Slaughter-Shays-Dicks-Leach amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I do not want to rain on anybody's parade, but in a sense I do. What we have just witnessed here is our annual Kabuki dance on the question of the arts.

In the first years that the Republicans were in control, they wound up making a very large cut in the arts program. I offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to restore a portion of that cut and that amendment was adopted. But the majority exercised its power in the Rules Committee and when this bill went to the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee arbitrarily, unilaterally eliminated my amendment which had been adopted by the full committee. But then they proceeded to make the exact same amendment in order with one difference: that amendment was to be offered by a Republican, because the majority party wanted to have the issue both ways. They wanted to be able to tell their right-wing supporters that they had cut the devil out of the arts, yet they wanted to tell what few remaining moderates were left in their caucus that they could go home with a rollcall in their pocket bragging about the fact that a Republican had partially restored some of that funding. That maneuver was enough to give insincerity and hypocrisy a bad name.

And now what we have seen here today is, I hope, not a repetition of what we saw last year. Because last year, as was pointed out, we had an arts funding level which was \$49 million below where it was at its high water mark, \$100 million in real terms after adjusting for inflation below where it had been just a few years earlier.

An amendment was offered, \$10 million. Liberals and progressives argued for it. Conservatives argued against it. The amendment was passed, added \$10 million, everybody got to put out their press releases; and, guess what, when we wound up in conference with the



Senate, 80 percent of the money was stripped out of the bill. So the bill was left with a token \$2 million increase.

I just have one observation. I would hope that if the House wants to demonstrate the slightest bit of sincerity on this issue, that having adopted this amendment, it will stick to it in conference so that something other than a phony Kabuki dance has taken place on the floor this year. I know that is quite a bit to expect given the hypocrisy that often accompanies conferences and given the penchant for so many Members of either body to try to pose for political holy pictures on some of these issues; but nonetheless I would like to express the vain hope that on occasion some sincerity will be displayed on this issue and that if the House adopts an amendment, it really means it.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I had planned to offer an amendment on this subject, but I will settle for a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Before I start, let me just note for the record, I am glad to state to my constituents, I would have voted to cut the National Endowment for the Arts funding and, believe me, want that part of the record.

Madam Chairman, the problem we have in the West is in terms of Federal land. Looking at my own State of Arizona, 48.1 percent Federal ownership. The State of Nevada, 84.5 percent. Utah, 57.4 percent. It is going up. The problem is, it is going up. You try to run a school system in a county where the Federal Government owns 80, sometimes 90 percent, of the land in that county, it is tough to have enough taxable land to do so.

The Federal Government has tried to make up for that by what is called PILT, or payment in lieu of taxes, where they compensate counties with a high incidence of Federal land, but there is less of that than there is Federal land certainly. I would argue here and have argued throughout this appropriation process that we need to cut Federal land acquisition funding. We have successfully done that. The chairman of the subcommittee has been cooperative. We have seen a cut there. The problem is as soon as we get to the Senate, it is negotiated upward once again, so that PILT funding is not nearly what was authorized, and Federal land acquisition, we always get more than what we ask for.

I would just respectfully ask the chairman if he will work within the conference to keep the number for Federal land acquisition as low as possible. I understand that the \$43.1 million, I believe, in the bill now is for land sales that are already in the works. That is understandable. But if we could please insist that that not go up any higher. As we go up and acquire more Federal land, we simply make the problem worse. We exacerbate the problem of PILT funding that is too low and Fed-

eral land acquisition, which is too high.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

I certainly agree that PILT is a necessary funding item. We have added \$30 million to it. I agree with the gentleman that we will make every effort to do so as we move to conference with the Senate. As the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned a moment ago, when you go to the Senate, you cannot always control what happens. We will certainly stand by our statements to decrease the spending on land if we can manage that, and we will count on the House to support us in that area.

But I do thank the gentleman for calling this to our attention, and we certainly support what he is thinking about.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. There will be an amendment coming up, the Cubin amendment, which will seek to restore a better balance to Federal land acquisition as opposed to PILT funding.

Let me just point on this map again, people point to the red State/blue State issue. The red in this case indicates the percentage of Federal land ownership, or the incidence of Federal land ownership. As my colleagues can see, there is a lot of red out there. We do not need as much red. The more red you have, the more red ink that local governments have. We need to restore this imbalance.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Interior subcommittee in a colloquy dealing with some language in the committee report requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to fund a national Academy of Sciences study concerning the Hudson River. The language was added to the report unfortunately without the knowledge of those of us who represent the Hudson River area in New York State.

More than a decade has already been spent studying cleanup alternatives for the Hudson River. Therefore, the request for this new study raises concerns. Those of us who live in the region would like clarification as to what the impact of this new study would be. From what I understand, the report language in no way is intended to delay, stop, or otherwise disrupt either phase I or phase II of the PCB cleanup planned for the Hudson River which is slated to begin in the summer of 2006.

Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman is correct. In no way should this study delay or disrupt either phase I or II of the planned cleanup of the Hudson River or any other ongoing Superfund project. I will work with the gentleman to consider modifications to clarify this in the conference agreement.

Mr. HINCHEY. I very much thank the gentleman for his leadership in the committee, and I thank him for his response. There is widespread support for the Hudson River cleanup project, and I know the people I represent will be relieved to hear the chairman clarify that this report will in no way delay phase I or phase II of the Hudson River PCB cleanup. I would suggest that if the study does proceed, it should be focused on new developments and should address the National Academy of Sciences' recommendations.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from New York for his good work on the Hudson River program and for bringing the need for clarification of the intent of the study to my attention.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, as someone who enjoys recreational activities like fishing, boating and hunting and represents thousands of Minnesotans who do as well, I share a special responsibility to make sure that these opportunities are available for generations to come. Today, many of those activities are threatened by the spread of aquatic invasive species. We have seen a rapid growth of invasive species in recent years, from the Great Lakes, to our coastal waters, to local lakes and streams throughout the country.

In my home State of Minnesota, we have increasingly been challenged to find ways to prevent and control disruptive species like European and Asian carp. In many areas, invasive European carp have found their way into Minnesota's wetlands and lakes, while Asian carp has found its way into the Mississippi River as far north as Iowa. If not properly addressed, both of these species threaten to disrupt the ecosystem that many Minnesotans enjoy for fishing and boating.

One of the few ways in which Federal, State and local governments collectively combat the threat of aquatic invasive species is through the State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management plans. These plans identify activities to eliminate or reduce the environmental, public health and safety risks associated with aquatic invasive species. These activities are implemented by States through feasible, cost-effective management policies undertaken in an environmentally sound manner. These plans are available to both individual States and affected multi-State regions. In fact, currently 14 States have approved plans, and at least 11 other States have plans under development.

Unfortunately, the resources available to effectively implement these

plans fall well short of the mark. This is the third year in a row plans to attack invasive species are funded at slightly over \$1 million. I very much appreciate the work of the chairman and the committee to try to address this very important issue but would suggest that these limited funds are not enough to counteract the billions of dollars in costs associated with invasive species habitat destruction and lost recreational opportunities.

□ 1330

Simply put, we must invest more in these plans if we hope to control the spread of these aquatic pests.

I appreciate the chairman's offering to work with me.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I agree with the gentleman that invasive species pose a threat to the marine environment, and we do provide funds in the bill reported by the Committee to address the Invasive Species Act. We have also provided other invasive species funds to stop that in areas of timber and things coming in from imports. For instance, the hemlock woolly adelgid is one of the invasive species that are threatening one of our species and may wipe it out in plant area.

But the gentleman is right, and I will work with him to see if we can increase funding in this area in the conference report. I note there are some small increases included in the bill for invasive species efforts by the Fish and Wildlife Service also. So we will try to work with him to increase his request.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the chairman for his commitment and look forward to working with him to have more resources for this vitally important need in the conference report.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the arts amendment, however, in strong opposition to this bill's environmental shortcomings.

First, I want to applaud the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who are the co-chairs of our Arts Caucus, and their staffs for their leadership on this issue.

Providing for adequate resources to the National Endowment for the Humanities, which is the largest single funder of humanities programs in our country, and to the National Endowment for the Arts, the infrastructure for private nonprofit and federal arts initiatives, this should really be a very high priority for this body.

Mr. Chairman, my district, the Ninth Congressional District of California,

ranks 24th in the country in the number of arts businesses and 46th in the country in the number of arts employees. Since we debated this amendment last year, there are 113 more arts-related businesses in my district, and that translates into more jobs for my constituents. Across the country there are more than 578,000 arts-centered businesses. This is really not a marginal group. The arts and humanities do constitute the pulse of our Nation.

Supporting this amendment is critical and should be noncontroversial. We already know that the economic downturn and our budget crisis are crippling arts initiatives all over this country. Many who are eager to restrict funding for the NEA and NEH forget that organizations which receive grants for these institutions include the museums, performing and visual arts, film, radio, television, design, publishing, and educational facilities in all of our districts.

In Oakland, one of the cities in my district, most arts education programs continue to face extinction, and the students in these communities are the ones who stand to benefit the most from arts education initiatives.

Performance and visual arts offer people of all ages, ethnic and social and economic backgrounds opportunities for new experiences and constructive retreats. For example, the Berkeley-based California Shakespeare Theater, an arts education grants recipient, will offer student matinees and Arts Integration programs this year, which support student achievement and creativity and teacher professional development for some of the most underserved communities in my district.

Clearly, a vote against this amendment, which is endorsed by our bipartisan Arts Caucus, is really a vote against the vital thread which sustains the pulse of our country. The long-term economic and social impact of a minute \$10 million increase for the NEA and a \$5 million increase for the NEH will be felt for generations. It is the very least we can do to promote and preserve American culture and heritage. It should not be controversial. The facts speak for themselves. If we cut arts funding, we cut jobs and opportunities for all. We all need to support the Arts Caucus bipartisan amendment.

I am appalled, however, by what this bill proposes to do to America's environment. Once more we are forced to vote on an Interior appropriations bill that is nothing less than an environmental disaster. This bill cuts funding for the EPA by \$318 million. This bill cuts \$241 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which is a 37 percent reduction for California. This bill eliminates \$190 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. And this bill fails to make critical infrastructure investments in our National Parks System.

Overall, this bill represents a 3 percent cut in funding for our environ-

mental programs and once again points to the misplaced priorities of this administration.

We need a bill that makes a strong commitment to protect the environment, our children's health, and our future. Unfortunately, this bill does not make that commitment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CUBIN

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CUBIN:

Page 44, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$13,000,000)".

Page 45, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$12,000,000)".

Mrs. CUBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, as the Members know, the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, or PILT as it is called, compensates units of general government for property taxes that they otherwise lose due to Federal ownership of the land within that locality. Our local counties then use these dollars to help fund essential services such as law enforcement, health care, education, firefighting, and search and rescue.

Unfortunately, despite the local benefits to this program in all 50 States, a large majority of the congressional districts' full funding of PILT, as is authorized by law, is simply not a commitment that this Congress has been willing to meet in the past years. My home State of Wyoming has been denied over \$75 million in PILT funding over the past 10 years that would have been used to make our communities safer, healthier, and cleaner.

I truly appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), ranking member, to restore the PILT funding that the administration tried to cut. They even went a step further to show their support of PILT and added an additional \$3 million over last year's level. However, this level funding still falls far short of the authorized level and it simply is not enough for these communities.

The Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall amendment would add \$12 million to PILT by redirecting funds from the Department of Interior's management, salaries, and expenses at the higher levels. Our amendment still does not bring PILT to full funding, but it would reflect a renewed commitment of Congress to do so by providing approximately 80 percent of the authorized level for this year's funding.

It is also important to emphasize that this amendment still allows the

Department of Interior to spend \$10 million more for administrative costs than they did in 2005. We are not cutting salaries. We are simply reducing the \$23 million increase that they would receive under this bill and instead directing a portion of those funds back to local counties where every dollar will make a real difference on the ground where people live and where they work.

So I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for co-sponsoring this amendment, as well as the National Association of Counties, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and other members of the Western Caucus for the leadership that they have shown on this issue. It is very important to every single State in the country. Short-changing local communities by underfunding PILT is simply bad policy, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly sympathize with the gentlewoman and other Members who have already spoken. I support PILT. In fact, we increased it some \$30 million in our bill. And as we indicated with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) a few minutes ago, we will certainly do more and we appreciate their bringing it to our attention.

But the Department of Interior is responsible for one-fifth of the land in the United States and manages programs that affect over 4 million Native Americans. This amendment would eliminate 110 staff positions and drastically impact the management of numerous important programs, including the management of PILT, the very program that this amendment is intended to help. The PILT program is managed using staff from the Department Management account.

The Interior bill is a balanced bill. In developing this bill, The Committee made a number of difficult choices. If we had additional resources, I believe PILT would be a deserving program and I certainly would try to increase it. But I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise with my colleague from Wy-

oming and a number of other colleagues from the West and from the East in support of this bipartisan amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

The amendment would increase funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes, or PILT program, by \$12 million. The result would be to bring the bill total for PILT to about 80 percent of the authorized amount. That would not be enough, in my opinion, but it would be a definite improvement.

PILT payments go to every State except Rhode Island, as well as to the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as we see on the map here. So PILT is a nationwide program, this amendment is important for local governments across the country. But it is particularly important for Western States because we have the largest amounts of public lands, again as we can see on the map. PILT payments help local governments pay for vital services like firefighting and police protection, construction of public schools and roads, and search and rescue operations. So it should be something local governments can count on without becoming hostage to debates over the management of Federal lands.

But as things stand now, PILT is neither stable nor dependable because the amount of each year's payments is decided by annual appropriations. We were reminded about that when the President's budget proposed a \$26 million cut in PILT. This would have been devastating for Colorado. So I am glad the Committee on Appropriations rejected this idea, and I applaud them for including \$230 million in the bill for PILT. However, that is still less than the full authorized amount.

That is why I support this amendment and that is why I urge the House to adopt it to bring us closer to full funding.

If I can conclude, the gentlewoman of Wyoming mentioned that it is unnecessary to continue debating PILT every year as a part of the appropriations process. She has a bill that would phase in full funding for PILT over 3 years. I have also introduced a bill with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) that would provide permanent automatic funding, and I hope the Committee on Resources will take this up in the near future.

But in the meantime we should pass this very bipartisan amendment, which will help counties all over our great country.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me this time.

I would also like to begin by thanking the people who have worked so hard on this bill, especially the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who has been very thoughtful about the Payments in Lieu of Taxes

issue and has worked well with us in the past. We are committed to getting full funding for PILT because the counties in rural America and areas where they are dominated by the Federal Government need that kind of support.

I have a map beside me here which is similar to the map the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) had just a moment ago, although we did it in red because we want to represent the statement, so we can see the meaning of a statement that was made by President Ronald Reagan in 1988. He said: "I have a map. I wish everyone could see it. It's a map of the United States. And land owned by the government is in red, and the rest of the map is white. West of the Mississippi River, your first glance at the map, you would think the whole thing is red the government owns so much property."

□ 1345

The government owns so much property. I do not know any place other than the Soviet Union where the government owns more land than ours does.

We have a problem. The Federal Government owns the bulk of the West. Half of California is owned by the Federal Government. Two-thirds of most of the other States in the West are owned by the Federal Government. That means we do not tax those lands, and that means that in the western United States, we pay less per child per education, but we tax our people more per family, because we are supporting the Federal Government in this environment. It is only fair that we pay a reasonable amount in lieu of taxes to cover that shortfall.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to add a modest sum to the PILT, but a sum that is very, very important to the American people, those who live in these public land areas, and those who enjoy them from the rest of the country.

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

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

While I agree that our counties would wisely use increased PILT payments, I think that this bill provides the proper funding for PILT, considering the very tight allocation the subcommittee was given. Like many of my colleagues who represent districts with large amounts of Federal lands not part of the tax base, I understand the difficulties our communities face. That is why I have always strongly supported PILT. But I believe that the \$3 million increase that PILT receives in this bill compared to 2005 should be defended, considering the many other programs facing cuts.

In a healthier budget climate, I would gladly support funding PILT at an amount higher than the \$230 million

contained in this bill. Unfortunately, we are facing a much bleaker budget reality.

Again, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

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

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment, and I commend the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her leadership on this issue, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON). It is always a pleasure for me to team up with these distinguished colleagues, and especially my friend from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), on natural resource issues of importance to both of our States. It is true that we are sometimes at odds with each other, that is never a pleasant experience, but when we do see eye to eye, we can make some inroads.

Today I find myself the token easterner on the bipartisan Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall amendment to restore a portion of authorized funding for the PILT program. I chose to sponsor this amendment to make a point. PILT is as important in the east as it is to the west.

West Virginia, for instance, is heavily forested and 919,000 acres are federally owned with the Monongahela National Forest. PILT payments are extremely important to the forest counties, helping them to provide essential services to the public.

This amendment is about keeping faith with our units of local government who are already being strained to the limit.

Under the PILT program, the deal is that the Federal Government will compensate these localities for the loss of local tax revenues from Federal lands.

I urge support for the amendment.

Mrs. CUBIN. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me just read this statement. It seems the Washington Post has some sympathy for this: “The Federal Government is the largest landowner in Washington. Since the land cannot be taxed, the Federal Government is the principal contributor to the district’s chronic fiscal imbalance.”

Now, if the Federal Government owns a lot of land in the District of Columbia, believe me, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California, Colorado, we ought to really be hurting, because the incidence of Federal land is so much higher there.

The President had initially more than \$200 million for Federal land ac-

quisition. It has been cut by the chairman down to \$43 million. It is still too much, and particularly when PILT is underfunded.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of the Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall Amendment. In 1976, Congress passed the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act in an effort to compensate counties for the loss of property tax revenue that comes with having large tracts of Federal lands within their jurisdiction. These important funds help local governments meet the needs for schools, road construction and other infrastructure projects for their residents.

In my district alone, there are over 17 million acres of land eligible for PILT payments; accounting for \$11 million in Fiscal Year 2004. In the recent past, Congress has failed to fund PILT to its authorized level, leaving local governments with the burden of answering painful budget decisions. We have seen a great discrepancy between authorized funding levels and the appropriated amounts. In FY 2004, PILT was funded to only 67 percent of its authorized level; falling over \$100 million dollars short of what the Bureau of Land Management found to be the authorized level.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will get us closer to reaching the goal of 100 percent PILT appropriation. If adopted, this Congress will fund PILT to its highest level in a decade. The bipartisan PILT Amendment would add \$12 billion to PILT by redirecting funds from Interior Department overhead. This will help local governments by providing approximately 80 percent of the authorized level for PILT while still allowing the Interior Department to spend \$10 million more for administrative costs than in fiscal year 2005. We will provide small rural counties with the resources necessary to provide basic services to their residents.

This Congress owes it to Rural America to fully fund PILT. I ask my colleagues to support the Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall Amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill.

SUMMARY BY COUNTY OF PILT PAYMENTS—COLORADO’S 3RD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (Fiscal Year 2004)

County	Payment (dollars)	Total Acres
Alamosa County	\$103,015.00	77,592
Archuleta County	522,307.00	440,797
Conejos County	556,046.00	498,778
Costilla County	1,219.00	887
Custer County	224,555.00	174,173
Delta County	166,250.00	405,624
Dolores County	80,946.00	422,281
Garfield County	1,170,205.00	1,188,113
Gunnison County	311,753.00	1,636,328
Hinsdale County	72,758.00	676,515
Huerfano County	180,690.00	214,966
Jackson County	97,816.00	515,761
La Plata County	536,066.00	434,015
Las Animas County	409,384.00	316,559
Mesa County	1,606,962.00	1,563,639
Mineral County	80,427.00	524,299
Moffat County	317,051.00	1,671,738
Montezuma County	413,306.00	471,828
Montrose County	1,248,681.00	974,793
Otero County	240,480.00	181,265
Ourray County	206,790.00	157,387
Pitkin County	581,980.00	562,074
Pueblo County	86,047.00	63,174
Rio Blanco County	284,122.00	1,498,114
Rio Grande County	410,184.00	334,630
Routt County	462,772.00	665,854
Saguache County	362,613.00	1,292,699
San Juan County	40,653.00	214,353
San Miguel County	297,888.00	485,909
District Total	11,072,966.00	17,664,145

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bipartisan amendment, which would benefit counties and local governments in 49 States.

The Federal Government makes PILT payments to counties that have Federal lands to make up for the revenue local governments lose because they cannot collect property taxes on the Federal lands within their borders. Congress has chosen to underfund these PILT payments—leaving local governments in nearly every State with less funding for education, law enforcement, firefighting, search-and-rescue, and other services. In my congressional district alone, localities have lost over 48 million dollars in PILT funding because of inadequate appropriations by Congress over the last ten years.

The bipartisan amendment we are discussing today would bring the Federal Government’s payments for PILT a bit closer to the authorized funding level, helping local governments in 49 States.

I encourage you to vote for this bipartisan amendment, which is a key step toward meeting Congress’ commitment to our local governments.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the required word.

One of the greatest responsibilities of representing Idaho in Congress is convincing Members who represent other States—particularly those east of the Mississippi River—why some issues matter to us so much.

High among those issues is our unique relationship with our biggest landlord. Almost two-thirds of Idaho is federally owned, and therefore exempt from local property taxes that pay for everything from our children’s schools to police and fire protection.

Picking up our Uncle Sam’s slack means in the West we each pay higher property taxes and our counties are forced to make tough choices about essential public services. Counties in Idaho were shorted \$75.5 million from 1995 through 2004 alone. That burden is heaviest where it can least be borne, in more rural counties with relatively small tax bases.

Since almost all the land in the East is private, States there have no such concerns. Many Members of Congress from the East, care little about how tax-exempt Federal land hurts folks in Idaho. They just don’t get it.

I am extremely disappointed at the Administration’s FY 06 PILT request of \$200 million—a \$26.8 million reduction from the FY 05 payment. PILT was funded at \$200 million back in 2001 and is clearly a step backward in a commitment to compensate counties for financial burdens imposed on them through an overwhelming Federal presence.

There’s no getting around the need for some of the basic services that property taxes provide on the local level, but there’s no excuse for having to pay extra for the ‘honor’ of having so much nontaxable Federal land in our counties. The Federal Government has been a deadbeat landlord long enough.

I am very concerned that over the past ten years, the PILT program has been funded at an annual average of \$155 million, while over the same time period, Federal land acquisition funding has averaged more than \$347 million. Why are we buying more land when we can’t make good on the commitments for the land we already have?

I applaud Chairman TAYLOR for trying to address this problem and recognize the constraints he has to work within. Mr. TAYLOR I commend you for recognizing the importance of this program and for increasing PILT up to \$230 million while at the same time reducing land acquisitions to roughly \$40 million.

However, I think we need to go further and zero out all land acquisitions until PILT is fully funded and the Federal Government can actually manage the land under its ownership. I would encourage everyone to vote for the Cubin, Rahall, Udall, Cannon amendment and give what is due to our rural communities.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Cubin-Rahall-Udall amendment that seeks to increase funding to the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program by \$12 million. This would increase PILT payments to local government by redirecting funds from Interior Department administrative and overhead accounts. This amendment would bring the Federal Government's payments for PILT closer to the authorized funding level, helping local governments in 49 States, while still allowing the Interior Department to spend \$10 million more for administrative costs than in fiscal year 2005. Had the House of Representatives held a recorded vote on this amendment, I would have voted to support it. As it is, the propriety of this amendment was so clear to my colleagues and me that no Member of the House of Representatives sought a recorded vote on this issue and it passed by voice vote.

Along with Interior Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman TAYLOR of North Carolina, I oppose the amendment by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado that pertains to PILT funding. As I mentioned above, I strongly support increased PILT funding, but I am opposed to the offset that Mr. HEFLEY would use to pay for his amendment. He would pay for those increased PILT funds by reducing the allocation for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million. The Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall uses a much preferable offset and that is why I voted to oppose the Hefley Amendment and why I voice my strong support for the Cubin-Rahall-Cannon-Udall Amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) still has 4 minutes remaining.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907), \$230,000,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than \$100.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

Page 45, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$4,800,000)".

Page 106, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to

10 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

This amendment cuts \$15 million from the account of the National Endowment for the Arts and applies \$4.8 million to the payments in lieu of taxes account. What I wanted to do is make that equal; but it was subject to a point of order, so this is what we came up with. It would reduce the NEA account to about the level at which it had been funded for about a decade, while bringing PILT just a little bit closer to its \$340 million authorization level.

Now, I want my colleagues to know that this is not an NEA-bashing amendment. The NEA I think has considerably cleaned up its act since the days of Mappelthorpe and Serrano, and the Challenge America grants program has helped return the NEA to educational outreach, the thing that it did with some success at its founding.

No, this amendment is an acknowledgment, and we have been hearing a lot about it this afternoon, but this is an acknowledgment of the need for the PILT program.

People have often said to me, you are so lucky to live in the West with all of the open space and all the public land, and I do consider myself lucky because of that. But people who do not live in the public land States do not realize sometimes that these public lands and all that open space comes at a cost. My colleagues saw the gentleman from Utah's (Mr. CANNON) map up here with the red and so forth showing the public lands. East of the Mississippi, there are a few red spots scattered around. West of the Mississippi, it is almost solid red. The West is essentially owned by the government.

For every acre under public ownership, western counties and municipalities lose part of their tax base. In Colorado, this amounts to almost 30 percent of the State's acreage. Of course, we heard earlier, this pales to the about 85 percent of the States' acreage in Nevada that is under Federal control. We have one county in Colorado, Hinsdale County, that is close to 98 percent public land. You have Lake City, the county seat, you have a mountain, and then you have the rest of Hinsdale County; and almost all of it is owned by the government. So services, as you can imagine, are limited.

Services mean fire and police and schools and health care and all kinds of things.

There are other more direct costs too. Due to Federal underfunding of its own land, local municipalities are often asked to bear the cost of road maintenance and police coverage for those areas. All of this, while operating under the diminished tax base that I mentioned earlier.

So I have always supported full funding of PILT, and I know we cannot get there this year. I do appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for what they have done for PILT in this bill. They have moved it forward somewhat. But since we have all this land, I think we should give us the funds we need to help take care of it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, recognizing the very serious problems that its proponent seeks to address. But it would be very unwise to cut the budget of the NEA, especially after we succeeded in adding a little money back to it, because the NEA is simply doing a fantastic job now of strengthening public arts education, of strengthening arts institutions, and of helping arts institutions to market themselves and strengthen the economies of not only our inner cities, but small, rural communities. So in Connecticut, the NEA, in conjunction with the Connecticut Commission on the Arts, has really helped us develop the itineraries that we needed to attract tourism to the small towns with arts institutions or performing groups where the agricultural economy is failing.

In our schools, the HOT schools, (the Higher Order of Thinking schools), have been supported by the NEA, and have helped children understand that not only thinking is a powerful process, but original thinking is an extraordinary process children can possess and use to grow in mind and spirit, as well as technical capability.

In 139 of Connecticut's schools, they are using the NEA's Shakespeare in American Communities, a free educational kit that really helps kids grasp the power of Shakespeare. Who better can teach children about the horrendous power of greed to do evil and the tremendous opportunity of love to do good.

So the arts are extremely important to the spiritual strength of this Nation, the strength of its economy, and the health and well-being of our children, for the arts provide the power to aspire to new heights of greatness in each of us.

So I must oppose this amendment, because it drains resources from the National Endowment for the Arts.

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

I think it is interesting that the gentlewoman is from Connecticut. If my colleagues remember that map, public lands are insignificant in Connecticut by comparison with States in the west where we have up to 85 or 90 percent of the land owned by the government.

I said at the outset that this is not an NEA-bashing amendment. The NEA does many good things; but we only have so much money, and the committee knows that is the case. They are the ones that had to struggle with the allocation they got and they had to make tough, tough choices. When you have to make choices, I think you need to ask yourself the question, NEA, as good as it is in some areas, is it better than having the funds to educate your children in many of those western States? Is it better than having the funds to provide fire protection, to provide police protection, to take care of those public lands that are out there? Which is better? We have to weigh it and balance it.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) said a while ago that he thought they had a pretty good balance. I think that if you are making these choices, the balance needs to lean a little bit more to the PILT.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment increases payments in lieu of taxes \$4.8 million and reduces the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million. This Interior bill is a balanced bill. In developing this bill, the committee made a number of difficult choices. If we had additional resources, I believe PILT would be a deserving program, as we have said over and over again here today. But to unbalance this bill at this time, I must rise in opposition. I encourage my colleagues to do the same thing.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just encourage an "aye" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

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

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

□ 1400

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee in a colloquy dealing with

some language in the committee report requiring the EPA to fund a National Academy of Science study.

Mr. Chairman, we have already heard that there is language requiring such a study to determine the effectiveness and cost of a large dredging operation of hazardous waste sites, many of which are contaminated with PCBs.

I would point out that our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who engaged in a colloquy a little earlier, stated that there was strong support for this project. Well, this is a project that has been debated for 20 years. In some ways that is an overstatement of that support.

I represent the affected area, and in fact it has been an extremely difficult process for my constituents. However, we all agree that further delay of the project is in no one's best interest. As you have already clarified, the report language, Mr. Chairman, in no way is intended to delay, stop or otherwise disrupt the cleanup planned for the Hudson River slated to begin in the summer of 2006.

Further, the EPA has reviewed the language and found no provision that would require them to disrupt the Hudson River project in any way. Is that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman is correct. In no way should this study delay or disrupt either phase 1 or 2 of the planned cleanup of the Hudson River, any other ongoing Superfund site, and I know of no party involved that wishes that delay.

I will work with the gentleman to consider whether modifications to the language are needed to further clarify this point.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that kind offer and clarification. Let me just say that it has long been my position that we should not debate past decisions on the Hudson River but look to the future in the region and focus on protecting those communities most directly affected by the cleanup project.

What has been consistently overlooked is the fact that dredging will have a heavy impact on people's everyday lives. This is especially true for the residents of Fort Edward, New York, who will be hosting the dewatering site in their community.

As the representative of that area, I want to continue to strive to uphold their interests and remind others that we are talking about real people and real neighborhoods, and not just political points for some special interest groups.

For that reason, I want to thank you for a separate report language provision which was inserted at my request to address the burden the Hudson River cleanup project is placing on the people of Fort Edwards and reiterate my concern that the EPA do all it can to provide assistance to the town.

It is my hope that we can jointly work towards that end and meet that important goal as the appropriation process continues.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his good work on the Hudson River cleanup and for bringing the need for clarification of the intent of the study to my attention. I like forward to working with the gentleman and learning more about Port Edwards' needs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy, if you will, on the subject of the proposed USGS laboratory in Santa Cruz, California.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to discuss this matter with the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman is aware, I have raised concerns about the plans to build a new USGS laboratory in Santa Cruz. Actually I am thrilled to have USGS moving into my district, but the USGS will benefit greatly from the synergy of other local marine science facilities in the area, including the University of California's Long Marine Lab and the United States Government's National Marine Fisheries Service Lab.

With USGS collocated near these other facilities, I believe the United States will have the best marine science information anywhere. But in the development of the plans for the lab, we run into contradictory budget numbers and laboratory configurations that have dogged final approval for getting this project off the ground, and it has really been a problem. And I appreciate your consideration of being willing to work with me to facilitate the meeting of the principals involved in this project and resolve some of these questions once and for all.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I understand the gentleman's concern over this issue, and appreciate his desire to see the facility built. I would be pleased to assist in a meeting with the gentleman and agency officials on this matter.

I thank the gentleman for his commitment to this issue.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) regarding urgent construction and maintenance needs for the War in the Pacific National Historically Park in Guam.

Mr. Chairman, my district, Guam, is home to a unique national park. The War in the Pacific National Historical Park was established by an act of Congress in 1978. It is the only site in the National Park System that honors the bravery and sacrifices of all of those who participated in the Pacific theater of World War II.

Among the seven units of park and its features is a memorial wall at the

Asan Bay Overlook as that preserves and honors for perpetuity the 1,642 names of Chamorro and American casualties who suffered or died during the war in Guam.

The memorial wall was authorized by an act of Congress in 1993 and today is in dire need of repair and restoration. Mr. Chairman, my home island of Guam, as many of my colleagues know, is vulnerable to tropical intense weather conditions.

In December of 2003, one of the most powerful typhoons to ever strike hit Guam with over 200-mile per hour wind gusts. Many elements of the park were casualties of this storm. In the aftermath of Super Typhoon Pongsona, the service was forced to close the Park Visitors Center, which had been leased for several years and which has not yet been reopened or replaced. The memorial wall, in particular, has suffered since it was originally constructed and has deteriorated to unacceptable conditions.

We are now commemorating the 60th anniversary of the War in the Pacific, and the need to repair and restore this memorial wall deserves the support of the service and this Congress. Of a more long term but just as deserving a need is the construction of an appropriate contact facility for the park to provide for the visitor experience and the interpretation of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely disappointed that the service's budget request failed again this year to adequately take into account these needs. It is my hope that these projects, particularly the memorial wall, will receive greater attention and higher priority from the service as they allocate discretionary funds in fiscal year 2006 as they prepare the fiscal year 2007 and future budget requests.

I would appreciate the help of the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) in ensuring that the service budgets appropriately for the needs of the War in the Pacific National Historic Park.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for raising the budget issues. The committee recognizes the uniqueness and development needs of the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Guam.

We will work with the National Park Service to remedy this situation. I thank the gentlelady for her efforts and look forward to continuing to work with her on this matter in the future.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to the National Park Service and for his comments and concerns regarding the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Guam. I look forward to continuing to work with the

gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) to address this serious situation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), \$9,855,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account, to be available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$55,340,000.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, \$39,566,000.

#### OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

##### FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For the operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, \$191,593,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$58,000,000 from this or any other Act, shall be available for historical accounting: *Provided*, That funds for trust management improvements and litigation support may, as needed, be transferred to or merged with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Operation of Indian Programs" account; the Office of the Solicitor, "Salaries and Expenses" account; and the Departmental Management, "Salaries and Expenses" account: *Provided further*, That funds made available to Tribes and Tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2006, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the statute of limitations shall not commence to run on any claim, including any claim in litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with an accounting of such funds from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quarterly statement of performance for any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 18 months and has a balance of \$1.00 or less: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in

each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 is available for the Secretary to make payments to correct administrative errors of either disbursements from or deposits to Individual Indian Money or Tribal accounts after September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That erroneous payments that are recovered shall be credited to and remain available in this account for this purpose.

#### INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

For consolidation of fractional interests in Indian lands and expenses associated with re-determining and redistributing escheated interests in allotted lands, and for necessary expenses to carry out the Indian Land Consolidation Act of 1983, as amended, by direct expenditure or cooperative agreement, \$34,514,000, to remain available until expended, and which may be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Departmental Management accounts: *Provided*, That funds provided under this heading may be expended pursuant to the authorities contained in the provisos under the heading "Office of Special Trustee for American Indians, Indian Land Consolidation" of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-291).

#### NATURAL RESOURCES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

##### NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment and restoration activities by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-380) (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), and Public Law 101-337, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1911 et seq.), \$6,106,000, to remain available until expended.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, 15 aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement and which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: *Provided*, That existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft: *Provided further*, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the "Departmental Management", "Office of the Solicitor", and "Office of Inspector General" may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That the annual budget justification for Departmental Management shall describe estimated Working Capital Fund charges to bureaus and offices, including the methodology on which charges are based: *Provided further*, That departures from the Working Capital Fund estimates contained in the Departmental Management budget justification shall be presented to the Committees on Appropriations for approval: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide a semi-annual report to the Committees on Appropriations on reimbursable support agreements between the Office of the Secretary and the National Business Center and the bureaus and offices of the Department, including the amounts billed pursuant to such agreements.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency

reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of wildland fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oil spills; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 1773(b) of Public Law 99-198 (99 Stat. 1658); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for wildland fire operations shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for wildland fire operations, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: *Provided further*, That for wildland fire operations, no funds shall be made available under this authority until the Secretary determines that funds appropriated for "wildland fire operations" shall be exhausted within 30 days, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible: *Provided further*, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed \$500,000; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 104. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore preleasing, leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium statement of June 12, 1998, in the areas of northern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico

south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

Page 53, line 12, insert "oil" after "offshore".

Page 53, line 20, strike "and natural gas".

Page 54, line 3, strike "and natural gas".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to the proponent and 10 minutes to an opponent, myself.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will remove the words "natural gas" from the moratorium that has been in every Interior bill, I am told, for 20 some years, unbeknownst to many Members of this Congress, that prohibits the Department of Interior from leasing or subleasing lands on the Outer Continental Shelf, our greatest reserve for natural gas.

The number one economic challenge facing America was not addressed in our energy bill, in my view and the view of many, because we did not adequately deal with the clean fuel, the fuel that has no NO<sub>x</sub>, no SO<sub>x</sub>, the least CO<sub>2</sub>, the clean-burning fuel, natural gas, that can be our bridge to the future.

It is threatening home ownership, folks. 76 percent increase in oil prices, 176 percent increase in natural gas prices. Here is what one of our leading employer group says: America has a new energy crisis. This time it is the runaway price of natural gas.

Congress must act now to ease the natural gas crisis of this Nation's fragile economic recovery, or it will return to recession. Every recession since World War II has been preceded by a run-up in energy prices and none of the run-up in prices have equaled the run-up in natural gas prices.

It is threatening small business. It is the fastest increase in the cost of education. It is the fastest increase in the cost of our hospital health care. It is the greatest threat to our farm community with exploding fertilizer costs. And because fertilizer factories use so much natural gas, 21 of them have quit

making fertilizer in America, and all of them are looking offshore to produce fertilizer. Ninety thousand chemical jobs, some of the best paying jobs in the industrial sector we have left. Polymers and plastics are all looking to move offshore.

The production of natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf is not looked at as an environmental threat by Canada, they sell us gas that they produce, the UK, Norway, Australia, New Zealand, all countries with environmental records. Eighty-five percent of our gas reserves are locked up by moratorium.

□ 1415

Why? It is the clean fuel. As I said before, no docks, CO<sub>2</sub> one-fourth as much. It is the bridge to hydrogen. It could be bridging us in the transportation field like school buses, transportation systems, taxicabs, delivery trucks, easily changeable to natural gas if it was affordable and we had adequate supply.

Natural gas is 25 percent of our energy use today. If we had an adequate supply, it could be the friendly bridge, the environmentally friendly bridge, to lead us to hydrogen, give us time for stronger conservation measures, growing use of renewables and less dependence on oil today.

A gas well is not an environmental threat. It is a 6-inch hole that is cemented at the top and cemented at the bottom with a steel casing, and it lets gas out. Canada produces in our Great Lakes and sells the gas to us with no environmental impact.

When we look at this map, and this is my concluding comment, the natural gas and oil, when we buy \$50 oil, the whole world buys \$50 oil; but in natural gas we are at \$7. Europe is at \$5-something. Japan and China are 4-something, and then we look at a dollar, 90 cents in Russia. Where are industries going to grow? They are not going to grow here.

This is the most important amendment we will consider, in my view, in this part of Congress. Natural gas is a tragedy happening, and we can stop it by lifting the moratorium.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield my 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and ask unanimous consent that he control the 10 minutes of time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some time on this side, if we could have 5 minutes of the 10 minutes, if we could work that out.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman in opposition to this amendment?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I am in opposition.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate that. We have only



a total of 10 minutes to state our opposition. So how about 4 minutes?

Mr. DICKS. Four minutes would be fine.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for the purposes of control.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) will control 4 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes, and despite the eloquence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), my friend, who makes this amendment sound really attractive, I must rise and express the objection of the Committee on Appropriations to this amendment.

This amendment is no better than the amendment offered in full committee which would have taken \$50 million from very important environmental protection issues and transfer it to this fund to create an inventory of gas and oil. The fact of the matter is, we cannot afford to remove the environmental protection in this bill, and we do not need the inventory that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) talks about. This amendment opens all coasts to new drilling.

The oil companies, the energy companies, the gas companies themselves already have this inventory, as does the Minerals Management Service at the Department of the Interior. We already know about this.

The truth of the matter is, this would just be a raid on the environmental issues to fund something that does not need to be done.

The committee is opposed to this. The Committee on Energy and Commerce have debated this in the past, have rejected similar amendments; and I hope that we will do the same thing today, that we will reject this particular amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

(Mrs. CAPPs asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Peterson amendment. This amendment guts the long-standing bipartisan moratorium that currently protects the Nation's most sensitive coastal and marine areas, areas including California, Florida, the eastern Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific Northwest, New England, and the entire Atlantic coast. It is completely unnecessary.

Proponents say that we need to drill offshore to put an end to the high energy prices. The only problem with this argument is that the moratoria are not where the resources are.

MMS released its latest OCS resources survey just last year. Eighty-

one percent of the undiscovered, economically recoverable natural gas in the OCS is located in the central and western Gulf of Mexico where drilling is currently allowed and under way.

This amendment means drilling in the coastal areas of the United States where there is not a whole lot of gas and oil, where tens of millions of our citizens have made it clear they do not want any more gas drilling, and it means gutting the Presidential-congressional moratoria that had been in for decades, reaffirmed by Presidents George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George Bush, every Congress since 1982. State officials have also endorsed the moratoria, including Governor Bush, Governor Schwarzenegger.

This House has voted three times in recent years to stop the oil drilling in waters off Florida, California, and the entire OCS. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Peterson amendment. This amendment would gut the longstanding, bipartisan moratorium that currently protects some of the Nation's most sensitive coastal and marine areas. These moratoria areas include California, Florida and the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, Oregon, Washington, New England, and the entire Atlantic Coast. This amendment is an attack on the moratorium, and an attack on the rights of coastal States and local governments to raise legitimate objections to offshore development that affects their coastlines.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a bad idea for a number of reasons, not least because it is completely unnecessary. Proponents of the amendment say that we need to drill offshore to put an end to high energy prices. The only problem with this argument is the moratoria areas aren't where the resources are. The Minerals Management Service conducts a resources survey every five years. The latest comprehensive analysis assessment was finished in 2003. This assessment includes estimates of undiscovered oil and natural gas that is conventionally and economically recoverable.

We already know, for instance, that 81 percent of the Nation's undiscovered, economically recoverable natural gas on the OCS is located in the Central and Western Gulf of Mexico—where drilling is currently allowed and underway.

The amendment would mean drilling in coastal areas of the United States where there isn't a whole lot of oil and gas and where tens of millions of our citizens have made it clear that they don't want any more drilling.

Mr. Chairman, a little history might be in order here. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush announced an executive moratorium ending new drilling off California, Oregon, Washington, Florida and the entire East Coast. President Clinton extended it to 2012. Both actions were met with widespread acclaim by a public that knows how valuable—environmentally and economically—our coastlines are. And, of course, Congress has supported these actions for the last 20 years by restricting MMS from spending funds to support any new drilling or pre-drilling activities in these areas.

In addition, President George W. Bush endorsed both moratoria in his FY 06 budget.

State officials—including Florida Governor Jeb Bush and California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger—have endorsed the moratoria. And, the House of Representatives has voted three times in recent years to stop new drilling in the waters off Florida, California and the entire Outer Continental Shelf. This amendment is bad policy and reflects the misguided attempt to try and drill our way out of energy problems.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has 3 percent of the known resources but we account for 25 percent of demand. Despoiling all of our coastal areas in the fruitless search for “energy independence” isn't going to work. Coastal communities continue to speak—in strong bipartisan voices—to protect their State's sensitive coastal resources and productive coastal economies. They are too economically valuable to risk with more drilling. It takes only one accident or spill to devastate the local marine environment and economy.

Mr. PETERSON suggests that his amendment would be limited to exploration for natural gas only, and that this approach would somehow avoid the risks of offshore oil drilling. There are serious flaws with this theory. There is virtually no way to explore only for natural gas without exploring for oil.

Moreover, natural gas development also has substantial and long-lasting impacts, including noise, water and air pollution. And it impacts the tourism and fishing industries.

Mr. Chairman, last Congress, 56 Republicans and 172 Democrats voted to protect the OCS Moratorium. In that vote, the House demonstrated its commitment to protecting our vital coastal communities. A vote against this amendment is the same thing—a vote to protect coastal areas from new drilling. We need to reject these attempts to weaken existing protections for our coastal waters.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

#### ASSESSMENT OF UNDISCOVERED TECHNICALLY RECOVERABLE OIL AND GAS RESOURCES OF THE NATION'S OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF, 2003 UPDATE

Using a play-based assessment methodology, the Minerals Management Service estimated a mean of 76.0 billion barrels of undiscovered recoverable oil and a mean of 406.1 trillion cubic feet of undiscovered recoverable natural gas in the Federal Outer Continental Shelf of the United States.

#### INTRODUCTION

This assessment represents an update of selected basins of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Assessments of the entire OCS were made by the Minerals Management Service (MMS) in 1995 and 2000 (MMS, 1996 and MMS, 2001). The next MMS assessment of the entire OCS is scheduled for completion in mid 2005. Areas selected for this update included those where significant new discoveries were made, such as parts of the Gulf of Mexico, and areas where new geological concepts have been developed, such as the Atlantic OCS margin and the North Aleutian Basin of Alaska. Results from this selective update were combined with the year 2000 assessment results from other areas to yield the regional totals presented here.

The MMS utilizes a probabilistic play-based approach to estimate the undiscovered technically recoverable resources (UTRR) of oil and gas for individual plays. This methodology is suitable for both conceptual plays where there is little or no specific information available, and for developed plays where

there are discovered oil and gas fields and considerable information is available. After estimation, individual play results are aggregated to larger areas such as basins and regions.

This assessment is limited to technically recoverable undiscovered resources of oil and gas. Unlike MMS's 1995 and 2000 assessments, it does not contain economic analyses of what portion of these technically recoverable resources are commercially viable.

## RESOURCE SUMMARY

The MMS estimated that 76.0 billion barrels of oil and 406.1 trillion of cubic feet of gas are technically recoverable from the U.S. Federal OCS. These results are presented by area in table 1, which lists mean values as wells as the 95th and 5th percentile values representing high and low probability cases, respectively. Greater range between the high and low values indicated higher uncertainty in the estimates.

These values represent a 1 percent increase in oil resources and a 12.1 percent increase in gas resources when compared with MMS's 2000 assessment. The increases are due to changes in the assessments of the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico OCS areas. Both the Alaska and Pacific OCS area resource estimates are essentially unchanged from 2000. The increases also account for the approximately 2 Bbbl oil and 8 Tcfg that were discovered and moved to the reserves category during this time period.

TABLE 1.—UNDISCOVERED TECHNICALLY RECOVERABLE RESOURCES OF THE OCS

	Undiscovered technically recoverable resources								
	UTRR oil (Bbbl)			UTRR gas (Tcf)			UTRR BOE (Bbbl)		
	F95	Mean	F5	F95	Mean	F5	F95	Mean	F5
Alaska OCS .....	16.6	25.1	35.9	54.6	122.1	226.2	28.0	46.9	72.1
Atlantic OCS .....	1.9	3.5	5.3	19.8	33.3	50.6	5.4	9.4	14.3
Gulf of Mexico OCS .....	31.5	36.9	44.0	208.9	232.5	267.6	68.7	78.3	91.6
Pacific OCS .....	4.4	10.5	21.8	7.4	18.2	38.2	5.7	13.7	28.6
Total OCS .....	62.1	76.0	93.0	326.2	406.1	520.0	122.0	148.3	180.4

(Bbbl, billion barrels of oil, Tcf, trillion cubic of gas. F95 indicates a 95 percent chance of at least the amount listed, F5 indicates a 5 percent chance of at least the amount listed. Only mean values are additive.)

In the Atlantic OCS area significant new knowledge and information was gained as a result of recent drilling in the Scotian basin offshore Canada. Applying this new information led to adjustments to risks applied to previous defined plays, and to the definition of new plays resulting in increased estimates for oil and gas UTRR of 52 percent and 19 percent respectively over MMS's 2000 study. Gulf of Mexico OCS oil resources have remained flat while gas resources have increased by over 20 percent relative to MMS's 2000 study. This increase is attributed primarily to plays in the deep shelf areas of the Central and Western Gulf of Mexico, and to the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. Results of new drilling and discoveries led to revisions of plays and their associated risks that significantly increased gas resources. This is especially true for conceptual plays where valuable insights into the presence of source rock, maturation, migration, trapping, and reservoir facies were gained.

## REFERENCES

Minerals Management Service (MMS), 1996: An Assessment of the Undiscovered Hydrocarbon Potential of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, OCS Report MMS 96-0034.

—, 2001: Outer Continental Shelf Petroleum Assessment, 2000, OCS Report MMS 2001-036, 12 p.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate my comments with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The proponents of this say that it is oil and gas. We are not talking oil. If you want to poke a hole in the ground in Oklahoma or you want to do it in land or even in ANWR, where they have the technology not to cause the spills, that is fine. I will support you, or clean coal, I will support you.

I understand the plight the farmers have with the cost of natural gas and the fertilizer problem that they have. I will work with the gentleman on that as well.

They say, well, let us do it in the Gulf of Mexico, so we are going to do to Mexicans what we want to do for us? If you poke a hole in the Earth, you are going to get oil up. I do not know if

you have ever come to Long Beach, you better bring kerosene with you if you go on our beaches. Because you take your dog or you walk along those beaches, the bottom of your feet are solid oil. You go poking holes in that, the economy of California is critical to tourism.

We have the best beaches, better than Washington State. We have the best weather, and we invite you to come spend your money in California, but you are not going to come if we start poking holes in the bottom of the Pacific along the coast as the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) says.

I know the heart and the effort of the gentleman that is offering this amendment, and I know why he is doing it and I empathize with him, but it would destroy the California economy and environment as well as our beaches.

We have got beautiful lagoons. We have got the most beautiful lagoons in the world, and wetlands. I am not an extreme environmentalist, but those are, no kidding, true wetlands; and the National Academy of Science says whether you are drilling for oil or gas off the California coast, you are going to, not maybe, you are going to hurt the wildlife, you are going to destroy those lagoons, and then we are going to end up like Long Beach with oil all over our beaches and hurt our economy.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) who also cares deeply about this issue.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, actually, it sounds like the author of this amendment does not quite understand the need to preserve our beautiful coastline.

The coast of Marin and Sonoma counties, my district, is one of the most biologically productive regions in the world. While it comprises only 1 percent of the ocean, it is home to 20 percent of the world's fish.

The coastal estuaries are important passages for endangered salmon, steelhead, essential haulouts for seals and sea lions, and prolific nurseries for hundreds of aquatic species.

The coastal communities in my district rely on tourism and the fishing industry that could be severely hurt if offshore oil drilling and gas drilling were permitted off our coasts.

The people who live in my district do not and will not support offshore drilling. They realize that we need an energy policy that focuses on investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy sources, not oil rigs, not an endless depletion of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. For some reason, the Majority Party feels that if we just keep drilling for more gas then our emergency crisis will be over. Unfortunately, they aren't looking for a solution to our energy crisis and rising gas prices, instead, they are looking to line the pockets of big oil companies by supporting offshore oil drillings.

Let's not forget the irrevocable damage to our environment that offshore drilling causes. This devastation can be seen in the Gulf of Mexico where OCS pipelines crossing coastal wetlands are estimated to have destroyed more coastal salt marsh than can be found in the stretch of coastal land running from New Jersey through Maine.

It sounds like the author of this amendment doesn't understand the need to preserve our beautiful coastlines.

But, the people that I am so fortunate to represent in Marin and Sonoma counties do understand. They get it.

The coast of Marin and Sonoma County in my district is one of the most biologically productive regions in the world.

While it compromises only one percent of the ocean, it is home to 20 percent of the world's fish. The coastal estuaries are important passages for endangered salmon and steelhead, essential haulouts for seals and sea lions, and prolific nurseries for hundreds of aquatic species.

The coastal communities in my District rely on tourism and fishing—industries that could be severely hurt if offshore drilling was permitted off of our coast. If you were to visit this

beautiful stretch of coast, you would understand why the people who live in my district don't and won't support offshore drilling. They realize that we need an energy policy that focuses on investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy source, not oilrigs and the endless depletion of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Peterson amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I am here to support the long overdue Peterson amendment.

I come from Florida. We will not hear a lot of folks talk about this. It is a hot political issue. All of us are equally concerned about preserving the environment.

Since my days in the legislature, I have always supported the safe and environmentally sound development and exploration of natural gas off the coast of Florida. I helped participate in the development of the section 181 prohibitions. I oppose oil drilling. We can safely extract natural gas.

For all of the 1990s, and many of my colleagues were here, our policy was to convert coal and oil-generating plants to natural gas, and we have done that in over 30 of our plants in Florida, and we have got more coming online.

My colleagues saw that we pay just about double the price. This not-in-my-backyard does not cut it. We can keep it offshore, but we can still do it soundly and safely.

I support the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair give us a breakdown of the time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington State (Mr. DICKS) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) has 5 minutes remaining before yielding, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 3 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in favor of this.

I have spent 15 years here trying to develop alternative sources of energy so we are not victimized by oil. We have a safe extractive method here with natural gas. We have encouraged it. We want to get to alternative energies. This is one of the alternative energies, and it has a direct effect on the working people of this country.

I will tell my colleagues, I think this is a jobs issue. This is a blue collar issue. This is a family issue in terms of bringing down prices and getting a safe supply of fuel for this country. If we do not get into this kind of alternative, we are going to be struck forever in rhetoric and not being able to produce for our people, not just fuel but produce it in a way that is truly alter-

native and within the bounds of people's budgets.

That is why we need to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I stand in vigorous opposition to this amendment or any amendment similar to this.

The point has been made that you can drill for gas safely. When you start drilling, you do not know what you are going to get. You do not know whether you are going to get gas or oil, and the environmental problems here are immense.

Thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), we have had this moratorium in place since 1983. We need to leave it in place. The environmental studies and testimony that would be required in order to negate any chance of pollution must be gone through before this House ever considers such a bill.

So I would urge all the Members to vote against lifting this moratorium. It is reckless. It is reckless to the environment of Florida. It is a bad environmental vote, and I recommend its defeat.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

It seems like there is quite a bit of discrepancy here in our information. Many of us believe that natural gas can be extracted without endangering the environment. I happen to be on that side of the issue.

We have continually increased our emphasis and our dependence on natural gas, and yet our supply has remained stagnant. We have tried to put in the pipeline from Alaska. That has been stalled.

Currently, we are paying 600 percent more for natural gas than many other nations in the world. Those living on fixed incomes are being eaten up by these costs.

In the area of agriculture, we find that pumping fuel is 20 percent higher this year. We are going to need 10 to 12 cents more per bushel of grain in order to offset the increasing cost of gas and fertilizer. This is the margin that most farmers rely on. That puts them into an unprofitable situation.

So I rise in support of this amendment. I believe it can be done in an environmentally safe and sensitive way, and it does make sense.

□ 1430

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, hard-working American families are paying a high price at the gas pump today because of our Nation's dependence upon

foreign energy. Every day high gasoline prices are hurting good, decent hard-working families who are having to cut back on their purchases of food, medicine, and clothes. High natural gas prices are hurting our Nation's businesses, who are laying off families and breadwinners.

This is simply about supporting an amendment that will provide environmentally safe and sound production of natural gas off the eastern Gulf Coast, something we are already doing off the Texas and the Louisiana coast. And to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), I have walked on Texas beaches since I was 2 years old and have yet to end up with black-bottom feet because of oil on our beaches.

Mr. Chairman, this can be done in a positive way. But most importantly we need to send a message to the OPEC nations that we are tired of a handful of OPEC oil ministers putting their hands around the necks of family budgets and businesses here in America.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We hear a lot of conversation today here on the floor about national security and not depending upon foreign sources of oil and gas. Let me just say that this particular issue is in fact a national security issue.

Most of the focus we hear, obviously, is on the potential environmental impacts and impacts on tourism and all of the environmental things we enjoy along our coasts in Florida and in California. But let me just say that the biggest impact that could happen with oil and natural gas, drilling or exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico is a potential to harm our ability to test and evaluate all of the Air Force weaponry that is used around the globe.

In fact, let me read a quote to you. "Wilbert Patterson, Brigadier General, United States Air Force, June of 2000. We are deeply concerned over the construction of any oil or gas structures that could impact on our critical test programs performed by the Air Armament Center at Eglin Air Force Base."

This is an issue of national security. We have to be able to test in the Gulf ranges and this drilling will harm that testing.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), who is deeply concerned about this issue, as well as his colleagues from California.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The argument that has been made in support of the amendment is that the price of natural gas is increased to the consumer. And we should address this as a Congress. But one of the points that has been overlooked here today is that this Congress passed an energy bill that provided initial financial incentives to drill in the central and

western gulf, and that is a valid attempt by this Congress to address this issue.

But to open up the eastern Gulf of Mexico would be a terrible mistake. There is a very small proportion available, and what is available is right off the coast of Florida. It has been suggested Florida should follow the standards of Texas with respect to our beaches. The beaches in Florida are a pristine treasure not to be experimented with.

The truth of the matter is nobody here on the floor of the House knows what the risk is if you drill. This amendment may say gas, but it is about gas and oil. Because once you start drilling, you get what you get when you drill. So we should not sacrifice or risk the Florida beaches or the California beaches to get a small proportion of gas that can be more easily achieved, and which this Congress is promoting through deepwater drilling in the central and western coast.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, opening up the Offshore Continental Shelf will save \$300 billion in natural gas costs over 20 years for our consumers and manufacturers. It is not just for businesses, but to heat and cool our homes we use natural gas. If we do not explore and produce off our potential, whether it be California, the eastern Gulf of Mexico, or anywhere else, we are going to continue to be held up by the world price. Our consumers will pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I like the beaches in Texas, I like them in Florida and California, but I also know we need to use our natural resources.

Supply and demand for energy is out of whack and our Nation needs more energy. The Federal Government tried to mandate demand reduction in the last energy crisis and it contributed to a nationwide recession we do not want to repeat.

A recent Gallup poll found that half of family budgets have been seriously affected by the recent rise in energy prices.

Opening the OCS could save \$300 billion in natural gas costs over 20 years, for consumers and manufacturers. High natural gas costs are sending manufacturing jobs overseas, following the cheap gas.

Environmentally conscious nations like Norway, Denmark, Canada, Japan and the UK are safely and successfully producing natural gas from their coastal waters.

No nation can produce energy more responsibly than ours. I have been on oil and gas rigs and they have such few discharges into the ocean, a medium sized fishing boat will leak more in a year.

This amendment is a major opportunity for us to respond to today's energy crisis with a national solution. I feel justified in supporting this amendment because I am from a coastal district. My constituents feel the same way as I do on this issue.

Chemical production and oil and gas exploration, processing, and refining are Texas top coastal industries. My colleagues from Florida and California think only they have beaches, but coastal tourism is Texas's second largest coastal industry.

That fact alone shows the argument that oil and gas production and coastal tourism are mutually exclusive is just plain wrong. They are acting like Chicken Little, and cannot point to one beach in Texas that has been ruined by oil or natural gas production.

There will be less need for LNG facilities and LNG tankers when we tap our own offshore resources so we can use the safest mode of transportation in the world—pipelines.

To address the needs of American families, we need a 3 pronged strategy. First, we need more production and infrastructure to meet our needs of today and tomorrow.

Second, we need more conservation to keep our economy going as resources become more competitive globally.

Third, we need more research to transition our economy to future sources of energy, for a time when petrochemicals are only used for materials, and not as an everyday fuel.

Supporting only long-term solutions and conservation is just not enough. It might be easier if it was, but we need to do more for today's energy problems. We will need continued American energy production for some time.

My point is not that we can drill our way to cheap oil or drill our way to energy independence. If we allow domestic production to die out, conservation and research will not save us, and we will have to pay a terrible economic price.

I urge my colleagues to support oil and gas production in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), but I have always supported the oil and gas exploration. Our economy demands it, and I believe this can be done safely. It is a jobs issue, it is about lowering the price of energy, and I strongly urge support for the Peterson amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would point out that Iowa and the Corn Belt are held hostage to the price of natural gas in two ways. It is our input cost for nitrogen fertilizer. Ninety percent of the cost is the cost of natural gas. The other side is that we use it to dry grain.

We have to have a full energy picture. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this amendment, fully support it, and I urge adoption of it.

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

First of all, we had no hearings in the committee about this. I believe that on a subject of this importance, if we are going to take back this protection that we have had on the books almost for the last 25 years, we have to have hearings. We have to bring in the parties and give people good information about what this is all about. That was not done. This amendment came up for the first time in the full committee.

So I believe just on process this amendment should be defeated, and I would tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we should take a look at this. The committee should have some oversight hearings. But to come here now without having those hearings, the benefit of those hearings, and to present this and reverse 25 years of Presidential and Congressional cooperation would be a serious mistake. So I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to ask the gentleman if we had hearings before it was put in this bill 20 years ago and every year in a row? No.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. I made my living in the oil and gas business. And to correct an earlier statement, you can determine what you are going to drill for. You can determine that you are going to put oil at the surface or you are going to put gas at the surface. That is to correct the record.

We are in a world economy, and we are losing our jobs. These jobs are 100,000 a year-plus jobs when we lose them out of the chemical industry and the fertilizer industry. I was in the industry when the price went from \$2 to \$50. We will drill this gas. We will simply do it before or after we lose our jobs. We will do it before or after people have to give up their homes to heat them.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, what is the status of the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) holds the remaining time of 1 minute.

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

Again, I represent the strong position of the committee in opposition to this amendment. The committee has considered this many, many times before and determined that this moratorium should stay in place. It started in 1983. There have been attempts to change it since then unsuccessfully.

We cannot solve the energy problems of America and the world in an appropriation bill. Those issues should be

settled in an energy bill, and the energy bill that was before us did not include this amendment because it just does not work.

So, representing the committee, and the minority has indicated, as indicated by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), we are opposed strongly to this amendment and hope that the Members will reject it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Peterson Amendment to end the 20 year moratoria on natural gas production from the outer continental shelf and Gulf of Mexico.

High natural gas prices have not only affected the 61 percent of U.S. households that use natural gas for heating and cooking, but America's small businesses, including agriculture. The agricultural industry depends on natural gas for crop drying, irrigation, heating, farm buildings, food processing and nitrogen fertilizer production.

Undoubtedly, the most demanding use of natural gas by the farm sector is in the production of nitrogen fertilizer. It accounts for 90 percent of total costs of producing fertilizer. The surge in natural gas prices over the last four years has been a key reason why nitrogen fertilizer costs have jumped by nearly 50 percent at the farm level. This problem is not going away on its own, a recent report by Iowa State University estimates that farmers can expect to pay 20 percent more for fertilizer this year than they did last year.

Nitrogen fertilizer is an essential component in today's high-yielding agriculture and accounts for more than 40 percent of the total energy input per acre of corn harvested. The importance of nitrogen to crop production can be illustrated by the fact that it is applied to 96 percent of all corn acres, 86 percent of all wheat acres and 80 percent of all cotton acres. According to data from the University of Illinois, without nitrogen fertilizers, corn yields would reduce by one-third to one-half.

This 20 year moratorium has created a supply squeeze for natural gas. On one hand, electric utilities and other industries have been influenced to move away from using our plentiful supplies of coal and towards the use of natural gas. Natural gas has been the fuel of choice for more than 90 percent of the new electric generation to come online in the last decade. At the same time, access to natural gas is limited due to environmental policies. Clearly we can't have it both ways.

Our family farmers are already efficient. Since 1980, they have increased efficiency by 35 percent while still boosting corn yields by 40 percent. But they need Congress to produce the kind of policies that enable them to access the resources they need at a reasonable price.

American agriculture is being held hostage to high natural gas prices, yet we have a plentiful supply right here in the United States. A vote in favor of the Peterson Amendment will be a vote for agriculture.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WU

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WU: Immediately after Sec. 104 insert the following:

None of the funds in this or any other Act shall be used to permit class III gaming activities under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act on non-reservation Indian land.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member, but I am deeply concerned about a possible Indian gambling casino in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have had these concerns for at least 7 years, and I am extremely disappointed in recent developments. The Governor of Oregon signed a compact with this tribe on April 6 and it was presented to the Department of the Interior on April 8.

I have been consistent in my position and I have privately informed the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation and Governor Kulongoski and his predecessor Governor Kitzhaber throughout my congressional career that I specifically do not support a casino in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and that generally I oppose off-reservation gaming casinos.

I have persisted in suggesting to the Warm Springs Tribe that they consider a new location on reservation land along a highly traveled route, namely Highway 26, between Portland, Oregon, and Bend, Oregon. This particular proposal came to the Federal Government on April 8, and it is necessary that I weigh in now. I am asking Secretary Norton to disapprove the Tribal-State compact, because this casino will hurt the Columbia River Gorge, other tribes and all Oregonians.

I understand the Secretary intends to approve this compact, but that only starts the process. I am here to tell the Secretary and the Tribe that Congress will not be silent while the crown jewel of Oregon's natural heritage gets trashed. I have been a supporter of preserving the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area and I will continue to do so.

A casino of this magnitude will bring over 3 million non-Gorge-related visitors per year, a million cars per year to the area, and exacerbate traffic, pollution, and risks to endangered species in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I am pro-Gorge, and I am troubled that there is a possibility of disturbing this crown jewel of Oregon's natural heritage. I will actively oppose this proposal and do everything I can to protect the Gorge.

State and Federal agencies have already determined that air quality in the Columbia River Gorge is significantly degraded and that visibility is impaired 95 percent of the time within this national scenic area. Also, according to the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station, this area suffers acid rain and fog as severe as what falls in industrial cities such as Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and New York.

Mr. Chairman, States such as Oregon, Nevada, Louisiana, Rhode Island, and South Dakota derive State taxes from casinos, slot machines, and lotteries for more than 10 percent of their overall State revenues. Oregon must not become further dependent on gambling. In all the States I listed, budgetary problems persist and gambling does not solve their problems. We should not sacrifice our national treasures, our communities, or our souls upon the altar of Indian casino gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

□ 1445

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to having an opportunity to work with my colleagues from Oregon and California in the near future in order to address the expansion of casino gambling to off-reservation sites.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to address this issue of concern to my district. In my Pennsylvania district, the Delaware tribes of Oklahoma have filed suit in order to acquire the right to establish a casino. Their claim is based on a conveyance that allegedly occurred in 1737 before our Nation's independence. The land that they claim is home to at least 25 local families, and also contains the Binney and Smith manufacturing plant, the maker of Crayola crayons. These tribes, who are based out of State, are only interested in seeing working and senior Pennsylvanians gamble away their hard-earned dollars. They are not concerned about the valuable manufacturing jobs jeopardized as a result of the displacement caused by this casino, or the fact that Binney and Smith/Crayola makes a useful product loved by children all over the world.

I am concerned about this kind of reservation shopping, and I look forward to working with my colleagues from California and Oregon and Michigan and elsewhere in order to limit these tribes' ability to build new casinos on properties not contiguous to existing reservations or on those lands where ownership is based solely on a conveyance that predates the existence of our Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this discussion about casinos. I want to relate a similar problem that we have in my area in Michigan, not directly in my district, but it impinges on my district.

I believe it is high time that the Congress address this particular problem. The difficulty my area is a case of a tribe which does not live in the area in which it is seeking to have land placed in trust for it in a community that welcomes it because they think that there will be economic development. But, in fact, it is going to have serious impact on areas in my district and on surrounding communities.

Obviously, it is going to be a high-traffic area, with a need for new roads, and of course the casinos do not pay any tax. There will be no tax on the land, and this results in a good deal of problems that the local communities and state will not have the funds to take care of.

I believe it is very important to put a limitation on off-reservation gambling and on cases where a tribe moves into an area which is nowhere near its home and claims that to be an area where they can have land placed in trust, and they then build casinos and other facilities.

It creates particular problems, for example, for merchants who may be running a supermarket or a gas station, and suddenly there is somebody new in town who is offering the same services, but does not have to pay taxes. This is a totally unfair proposition for the local businesses that are there. In that sense, I support the effort to put some regulation on this.

I am not rising in support of the amendment. I have been involved in discussions with the previous speakers, and they have much the same problems we do, but I have also discussed it with the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) who chairs the Committee on Resources, and he has assured me and the rest of us that he has a bill that will deal with this problem and that will provide free and open debate on the House floor.

Rather than deal with it in an appropriations bill, it is my preference that we not consider these amendments at this point, but defer to the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO) and await the chairman's bill which he has said that he will attempt to get out of committee and onto the floor before the August recess.

We have to recognize this is a serious problem for many communities across the country. I have only addressed one aspect of it, but there are many other aspects that have to be addressed and understood. When the Pombo bill comes up, we will have time for a full debate and discussion of all of the other tangential issues as well, including what ability the States have to regulate the location of these facilities, and what ability the States have to negotiate compacts so that the actual costs to the State and local communities are met by these facilities that are moved into an area where the sponsoring individuals have never lived.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment proposed by my colleague from Oregon. I only wish I had known in advance the gentleman was going to offer this amendment because it is specifically targeted toward my district, a tribe in my district, that is seeking to gain approval of a compact and take land into trust.

Warm Springs Tribe is not a family of five that has gone out shopping somewhere in some other State for land. There are 4,400 tribal members who are suffering on the reservation. They have worked diligently with the communities involved. They have land in the Scenic Columbia River Gorge that is in trust and was in trust prior to the passage of IGRA, and it is on a hillside where they have plans where they could build, and they could do that today.

But that land would scar the beauty of the Scenic Columbia River Gorge, which is my home and has been my home all of my life. This tribe, instead, looked to another area, and my colleague from Oregon suggests that the area they looked at is the crown jewel of the gorge.

Mr. Chairman, this is port property zoned for industrial use, leveled out with dredge tailings from the construction of the second lock at Bonneville Dam, all right, as opposed to an area up on a side hill that is timbered and beautiful where they already have land. So they worked with the local community which supports them locating there. They reached a compact with the Democratic Governor in a long and protracted discussion. That compact is now before the Secretary.

My colleague has on more than one occasion mentioned an acid rain study. We have looked at that, and he should know because we know it was done over a 4-month period one with readings at a little town in Wishram, Washington, during the winter when it is foggy in the gorge. So there is much more to that story that I will not get into today, but I suggest the gentleman take another look at that study.

I grew up in the gorge. We are the wind-surfing, kite-boarding capital of the world. And in the summer, if you want to come and find where the wind blows, come to the gorge and enjoy the great recreational opportunities, and it blows from the west. The west is where the great urban center of our wonderful State is, where there are traffic problems and industrial problems; and I tell Members that because if there is a problem with pollution in the gorge, it is not coming from the east, it is coming from the west.

So I urge Members to oppose this amendment. I think the chairman of our Committee on Resources has a much more prudent approach, to look at this issue on a broader scale, to see what is the best policy for this Nation to follow when it comes to dealing with these issues of tribal casinos on or off reservation.

But to move an amendment like this with very little notice, if any, on an appropriations bill, I would dare say, is not appropriate.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the chairman as to whether the chairman would permit the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and me to engage in a discussion of the merits of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. At this point debate is on the point of order. The gentleman from Oregon may not yield to another for discussion on the point of order. The Chair will hear each Member on his own time in debate on the point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WU. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WU. What is the scope of discussion permitted in this segment of the debate?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Argument relevant to the point of order raised against the amendment.

Mr. WU. I concede the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2361, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2361 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution