Mr. Henry W. Kendall, Ph.D. of Massachusetts.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRAT LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democrat leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 105–186, I hereby appoint the following members to the Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets in the United States: Mr. Maloney of Connecticut, and Mr. Sherman.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

□ 1415

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such roll call votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

TAX CUTS TODAY, BUT AMERICAN WORKERS WILL PAY TOMORROW

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, all across America, parents use the tool of allowance to teach their children the value of money, that they have to pay for what they get. If they do not have the savings, they do not buy the goods.

But over and over, Republicans ignore that basic lesson. They want to get it now and pay later. They want to get tax cuts now and pay for them later.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. Someone is going to pay for it. Who? America's working families who are paying into Social Security for those benefits today and for their retirement tomorrow. They will pay for it by forking over even more in payroll taxes. They will pay for it by having to retire later. They will pay for it in reduced Social Security benefits.

Democrats want to prevent this from happening tomorrow by being responsible today, and we have an opportunity to save Social Security, and we seek to seize it.

Republicans want to get political credits for tax cuts today that America's working families will pay for tomorrow, and that, to me, is the very definition of irresponsible government.

PASSENGER VESSEL ACT

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the domestic deep-sea passenger cruise industry, or better, the lack of it in the United States.

Currently, there is only one ocean-going cruise ship left in the entire U.S. flag fleet. That means that millions of dollars of American tourist money which are spent on cruises each year are going to our foreign competitors.

The reason there are no cruise ships in our domestic fleet is because of an archaic protectionist law known as the Passenger Services Act. The legislation was passed before the turn of the century and requires all cruise ships in the domestic service to be built in the United States.

U.S. shipyards, however, have no interest in building these types of ships and are not competitive on the international market. In fact, the last one built in this country was the U.S.S. *Independence* in 1956.

Things have gotten so bad that when Disney Corp. solicited over $1 billion in contracts to build cruise ships in this country, not a single U.S. shipyard even bid on the project. Now those ships are being built in Italy, but they will be legally barred from servicing the domestic cruise market because of the Passenger Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, this act no longer serves the interests of this country. It stifles maritime job creation and does nothing to promote domestic shipbuilding. Instead, it gives away the cruise market to our foreign competitors, whose customers are mostly Americans.

To fix this problem I am introducing legislation today that will stimulate increased domestic cruise ship opportunities for the American cruising public. My legislation will allow three foreign-built cruise ships to participate in the U.S. domestic cruising market. These cruising vessels must still hire an American crew, pay U.S. taxes, and obey all U.S. environmental, labor, and safety regulations.

Senator MCCAIN has introduced the companion bill, S. 2507, and he expects the Senate Commerce Committee to take action on the bill this session.

This legislation is absolutely necessary to help create a U.S. domestic ocean-going cruise industry and I would call upon my colleagues to support this bill.

TAX RELIEF

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of people forget who is paying the taxes. It is the American citizens. For too long, the Federal Government has increased taxes on our families, our seniors, our farmers and our businesses. The Taxpayer Relief Act returns $80 billion to its rightful owners, the American people, and sets aside $1.4 trillion to protect Social Security. That is 90 percent of the total surplus.

President Clinton calls this, ''a gimmick to please people.'' Mr. Speaker, I urge Americans, do not believe him. The President has already proposed spending billions from the surplus on bigger government. He is the one with the gimmicks. President Clinton keeps forgetting the surplus belongs to the taxpayers of America.

We can protect Social Security and give tax relief. Let us do it.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

GREAT LAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1481) to amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Restoration Study Report, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1481

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study, for which a report was submitted to Congress in 1995, was a comprehensive study of the status, and the assessment, management, and restoration needs, of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes Basin, and was conducted through the joint effort of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, State fish and wildlife resource management agencies, Indian tribes, and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission; and

(2) the study—

(A) found that, although State, Provincial, Native American Tribal, and Federal agencies have made significant progress toward the goal of restoring a healthy fish community to the Great Lakes Basin, additional actions and better coordination are needed to protect and effectively manage the fisheries and related resources in the Great Lakes Basin; and

(B) recommended actions that are not currently funded but are considered essential to meet goals and objectives in managing the resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

SEC. 3. REFERENCE; REPEAL.

(a) REFERENCE.—Each reference in this Act (other than in subsection (b)) to the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 is a reference to the Act enacted by title I of Public Law 101–537 (104 Stat. 2370).

(b) REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE ENACTMENT.—The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990, enacted as title II of Public Law 101–646 (104 Stat. 4773), is repealed.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

Section 1003 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941a) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''this title'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(4) by striking paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

''(1) to develop and implement proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources in the Great Lakes Basin; and''; and

(5) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking ''habitat of'' and inserting ''habitat in''.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1004 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941b) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''this title'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (14), (9), (12), and (13), respectively;

(3) by moving paragraph (14) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) to the end of the section;

(4) in paragraph (9) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''plant or animal'' and inserting ''plant, animal, or other organism'';

(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) the term 'Committee' means the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee established by section 1005(c);'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(8) the term 'non-Federal source' includes a State government, local government, Indian Tribe, other non-Federal governmental entity, private entity, and individual;'';

(7) by inserting after paragraph (9) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(10) the term 'Report' means the United States Fish and Wildlife Service report entitled 'Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study', submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on September 13, 1995;

''(11) the term 'restoration' means rehabilitation and maintenance of the structure, function, diversity, and dynamics of a biological system, including reestablishment of self-sustaining populations of fish and wildlife;'';

(8) in paragraph (12) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(9) in paragraph (13) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''.

SEC. 6. IDENTIFICATION, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.

Section 1005 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941c) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1005. IDENTIFICATION, REVIEW, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Committee, shall encourage the development and, subject to the availability of appropriations, the implementation of proposals based on the results of the Report.

''(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PROPOSALS.—

''(1) REQUEST BY THE DIRECTOR.—The Director shall annually request that State Directors and Indian Tribes, in cooperation or partnership with other interested entities and based on the results of the Report, submit proposals for the restoration of fish and wildlife resources.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSALS.—A proposal under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in the manner and form prescribed by the Director and shall be consistent with the goals of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, as revised in 1987, the 1954 Great Lakes Fisheries Convention, the 1980 Joint Strategic Plan for the Management of Great Lakes fishery resources, the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), and the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and joint ventures established under the plan.

''(3) SEA LAMPREY AUTHORITY.—The Great Lakes Fishery Commission shall retain authority and responsibility for formulation and implementation of a comprehensive program for eradicating or minimizing sea lamprey populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

''(c) REVIEW OF PROPOSALS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—There is established the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee, which shall operate under the guidance of the Council of Lake Committees of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of representatives of all State Directors and Indian Tribes with Great Lakes fish and wildlife management authority in the Great Lakes Basin.

''(B) APPOINTMENTS.—State Directors and Tribal Chairs shall appoint their representatives, who shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

''(C) OBSERVER.—The Great Lakes Coordinator of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall participate as an observer of the Committee.

''(D) RECUSAL.—A member of the Committee shall recuse himself or herself from consideration of proposals that the member, or the entity that the member represents, has submitted.

''(3) FUNCTIONS.—The Committee shall at least annually—

''(A) review proposals developed in accordance with subsection (b) to assess their effectiveness and appropriateness in fulfilling the purposes of this title; and

''(B) recommend to the Director any of those proposals that should be funded and implemented under this section.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSALS.—After considering recommendations of the Committee and the goals specified in section 1006, the Director shall select proposals to be implemented and, subject to the availability of appropriations and subsection (e), fund implementation of the proposals. In selecting and funding proposals, the Director shall take into account the effectiveness and appropriateness of the proposals in fulfilling the purposes of other laws applicable to restoration of the fishery resources and habitat of the Great Lakes Basin

''(e) COST-SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 25 percent of the cost of implementing a proposal selected under subsection (d) (not including the cost of establishing sea lamprey barriers) shall be paid in cash or in-kind contributions by non-Federal sources.

''(2) EXCLUSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The Director may not consider the expenditure, directly or indirectly, of Federal funds received by a State or local government to be a contribution by a non-Federal source for purposes of this subsection.''.

SEC. 7. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 1008 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941f) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1008. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

''On December 31, 2002, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

''(1) actions taken to solicit and review proposals under section 1005;

''(2) the results of proposals implemented under section 1005; and

''(3) progress toward the accomplishment of the goals specified in section 1006.''.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1009 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941g) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1009. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director—

''(1) for the activities of the Great Lakes Coordination Office in East Lansing, Michigan, of the Upper Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office, and of the Lower Great Lakes Fishery Resources Office under section 1007, $3,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2004; and

''(2) for implementation of fish and wildlife restoration proposals selected by the Director under section 1005(d), $4,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2004, of which no funds shall be available for costs incurred in administering the proposals.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

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

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1481, the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his outstanding leadership and tireless commitment to moving this legislation.

This measure arose from the need to coordinate management, protection and restoration of fish and wildlife resources within the Great Lakes Basin. The Great Lakes, which cover approximately 95,000 square miles in surface area, provide unique challenges for resource managers. In many respects, the Great Lakes are more comparable to oceans than lakes and require ocean-type vessels to accomplish management and research tasks.

With respect to our fishery laws, we must remember that fish do not understand or recognize geographical boundaries. It is critical, therefore, that regulatory schemes are developed throughout their ranges. H.R. 1481 establishes necessary cooperative agreements between States and Federal agencies to ensure that fish passing through jurisdictions of many management regions get the proper attention they need to sustain viable populations in the future.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act uses cooperative

agreements between States, Native American tribes, and the Federal Government to manage Great Lakes resources. The act encourages all interested parties to participate in the implementation of recommendations in the comprehensive study. These management and restoration activities were deemed necessary to restore Great Lakes fish and wildlife resources.

Finally, this bill was designed to evaluate and, where appropriate, implement the recommendations of the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study. This 5-year study identified 32 recommendations which should be undertaken to restore the fishery resources of the Great Lakes Basin to sustainable levels.

Mr. Speaker, while I will let my Great Lakes colleagues discuss some or all of the 32 recommendations, I will point out that one of the suggestions was to conduct a cormorant fishery predation study. Since this issue has been of interest to several Members of the House, I would hope that this study would occur.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes the Department of the Interior to spend $8 million per year to carry out fish and wildlife restoration in the Great Lakes Basin. This is a sound investment in a very important region of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on H.R. 1481, and I look forward to early positive action by the other body on this bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) a member of our committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), ranking member, for their hard work on this bill.

The Great Lakes Basin is a vibrant and diverse environment. Ecosystems of the Great Lakes support a wide array of economic and recreational activities. The long-term health of those ecosystems is fundamental to ensuring the quality of life that Americans from the Great Lakes region have come to enjoy. Protecting these precious bodies of water is of the utmost importance, since they are the largest body of fresh surface water in the United States.

While I am pleased that this bill is coming to the floor, I am disappointed to see that the language to institute a new model for a Michigan fisheries Cooperative Unit was not included.

Michigan is home to some of the finest fisheries institutions in this country, and yet it does not have the Cooperative Unit designation given to 37 States. Despite working for more than a decade to redress this issue, it has repeatedly been blocked by some who see the benefits of a Michigan fisheries designation as a threat to their own funding.

I believe the people of the United States want us to work through these fears to ensure that their best interests are of the utmost concern. This is not just about fairness. It is about capitalizing on Michigan's fisheries expertise.

Michigan State University and the University of Michigan have proposed an alternative that will cost the Federal Government next to nothing. In return for providing staff from these universities, the State of Michigan would finally receive this important fisheries research designation. This is a very creative approach that I hope we will explore in the future.

Mr. Speaker, for that purpose, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) has been more than willing to work on addressing the current inequities in the Cooperative Unit program. I would ask the gentleman, would the subcommittee be interested in exploring this model as a new way to deal with this issue? If necessary, this could be done in the next Congress.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), and he agrees there is a legitimate issue of fairness involved. As the gentleman from Michigan may know, his home State of New Jersey is another State that suffers under the present system. He would be interested in working with the gentleman and other members of the committee to find an alternative in the near future.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the interest, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Maryland and with the gentleman from New Jersey to find a sensible solution to this problem.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) to further add to this great piece of legislation.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and also the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), ranking member, for moving H.R. 1481 to the floor so expeditiously, despite the fact that we have so many other things coming to a conclusion at the end of the 105th Congress. The resources Committee, like others, face a daunting list of requests from Members, and for the fact that this bill has moved so quickly I am grateful on behalf of myself and other Great Lakes Members.

I also express my appreciation for the work of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans. He made time in his subcommittee's schedule to hold hearings, and he has been a strong supporter of H.R. 4181 throughout the process.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not thank the staff that made today's presentation possible. Many times, Members make commitments and while these commitments are honored, it is due primarily and in large part to the hard work of our staffs.

I thank the committee staffs of both the majority and the minority, in particular Harry Burroughs and Mike Oetker. Mike has done yeoman's work on H.R. 1481, putting in long hours and making sure that this bill stayed on track.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Rochelle Sturtevant, who is the coordinator for the Great Lakes task force who has been working on this legislation since 1996.

Mr. Speaker, my district borders Lake Erie, a body of water that was once considered to be ''dead.'' I paraphrase Mark Twain when I say that the reports of the Great Lakes' demise have been greatly exaggerated. This would not be possible, of course, without the efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service, working with State and local governments, as well as Great Lakes residents.

Now, Lake Erie fishermen can enjoy catching lake trout, walleye, bass, and perch. In fact, Lake Erie is experiencing rebounds in lake whitefish populations that just 10 years ago was thought to be impossible. Last year, the Fish and Wildlife Service report that lake trout populations in Lake Superior are now self-sustaining and need no further stocking.

Basinwide, water-related recreation and tourism are valued at $15 million annually, almost half of which is derived from fishing. Moreover, the Great Lakes contain over 281 square miles of coastal wetlands which provide habitat for endangered species and breeding grounds for waterfowl, migratory birds and fish.

While this is a great success story, the job of restoring the Great Lakes is a work in progress. Yes, we have come a very long way, but considering we still face degraded habitats, reduced fish and wildlife populations and the threat from nonindigenous species, we must press on.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act reauthorizes legislation passed in 1990, with the same title, to continue this important mission.

The original act established the Great Lakes Coordination Office and Fishery Resources Offices in Michigan, Wisconsin and New York. The 1990 act also led to the formation of a Great Lakes ecosystem team, including partners from the States Native American tribes and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, to coordinate restoration efforts between levels of government and agencies.

Finally, the 1990 act directed that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service undertake a comprehensive study of fishing resources in the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes Fishery Resource Study, which the Fish and Wildlife Service completed and reported to Congress in 1995, contained 32 specific recommendations for projects that would successfully restore the Great Lakes fishery resource.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act will reauthorize the Great Lakes Coordination Office and Fishery Resources Offices of the Fish and Wildlife Service, allowing them to continue coordinating internal Fish and Wildlife Service operations and other Fish and Wildlife Service activities with State, Federal, local and international operations in the Great Lakes Basin.

□ 1430

These coordination efforts are critical to prevent programs from wasting resources and precious funds by working at cross-purposes.

In addition, 1481 sets up a new grant program to enable States and Native American tribal groups to carry out restoration projects that implement the specific recommendations contained in the 1995 study. On the issue of invasive and noninvasive species, the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act will continue to provide the resources to help stop the influx of these creatures. And in regard to the sea lamprey, the legislation ensures that authority for sea lamprey control is retained by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Additionally, the Secretary of the Army, upon request by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, may improve water resources projects related to sea lamprey management. However, non-Federal entities will be responsible for 25 percent of the cost of implementing any proposal other than those involved in construction of sea lamprey barriers. For Members who are unfamiliar with the sea lamprey, in addition to looking like something that comes out of a horror movie, the sea lamprey is a parasite and each lamprey can destroy 10 to 40 pounds of fish during its lifetime.

The Great Lakes are an incredible success story. It is one that no one would have believed just a few years ago. The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act will build upon this success.

This is bipartisan legislation. It has strong support in the other body. In fact, it is my understanding that if H.R. 1481 receives favorable consideration today, the other body will take it up immediately.

Relative to the observations made by our distinguished colleague from Michigan, I am fully aware of the fact that he has championed the cause about which he spoke today on the floor. It is only because of some resistance in the other body that we were not able to address that in this legislation. He would have my pledge that I would do everything in my capacity from Ohio to help him realize his goals and success in that regard.

I would urge all of our colleagues today to support this essential bipartisan measure.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation. This legislation has been adequately described by our colleagues from Michigan and Ohio. It has bipartisan support and the support of the administration. I urge its passage today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

H.R. 1481, which has already been described by the gentleman from New Jersey, would greatly improve the conservation and management of the fisheries and wildlife of the Great Lakes by implementing the recommendations of the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration study.

The Great Lakes provide a vast source of natural resources for the people of the United States. In 1990, Congress authorized the restoration study to assess the status and needs of the fishery and wildlife resources of the Great Lakes and to provide recommendations for better management and conservation of those resources. Now that the study has been completed, it is time to implement those recommendations to ensure the long term sustainability of these valuable resources.

The bill has bipartisan support, as well as the support of the Administration, and I urge its passage today.

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

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

I would like to make a very quick comment to the gentleman from Ohio who said that Mark Twain made a comment that the early demise of the Great Lakes is greatly exaggerated. I think in order to continue to make that statement humorous, those of us in the House must continue to work vigilantly, steadfastly with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and other Members to ensure that we understand the nature of the mechanics of natural processes so that the Great Lakes cannot only continue to be great but we can restore them to what they were 100 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to commend the sponsor and cosponsors of this bill as well as the committee members. It is an excellent bill. It will serve the Great Lakes well.

I particularly commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for continuing in his efforts to be a conservator of the Great Lakes. He has done a tremendous amount of good work here on that score. I hope he continues.

There is one point in the bill I do want to raise because it might create some problems for Michigan. I simply want to get this on the record and perhaps get some assurances from either the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) or the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) regarding the language here. The bill says that there is established the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Proposal Review Committee which shall operate under the guidance of the Council of Lakes Committees. The Review Committee shall consist of representatives of all State directors and Indian tribes with Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife management authority in the Great Lakes Basin.

The language in the report is similar to that in the bill but also adds, ''* * * nothing in this bill shall be construed to enlarge or diminish the authority of any Indian tribe with respect to the management of fish and wildlife in the Great Lakes Basin.''

There is a problem relating to this that just came to my attention during a call I received from the Governor's office in Michigan. As some of my colleagues may be aware, there have been several court cases on the issue of Indian fishing rights in Michigan, resulting in a substantial number of court decisions. And my concern is that this language in the bill might be interpreted to say that those tribes which have been given certain rights in court cases would be regarded as having management authority. If that were true, then we might well have 5 or 6 times more representatives of Indian tribes than from the State of Michigan on this commission. That would make it somewhat unbalanced.

I assume the intent was not to do that and I want to get that on the record. Perhaps both the chairman and the sponsor of the bill can assure me that that is not the intent, and that in fact we will use and interpret the language as it was originally intended.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to look at this very closely. That certainly is not our intent. Our intent with this legislation is to ensure that all participating parties improve the quality of the Great Lakes Basin, not to give one any more advantage over another.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1481, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''To amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1481, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

KICKAPOO TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA FEDERAL INDIAN SERVICES RESTORATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2314) to restore Federal Indian services to members of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma residing in Maverick County, Texas, to clarify United States citizenship status of such members, to provide trust land for the benefit of the Tribe, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2314

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma Federal Indian Services Restoration Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF FEDERAL INDIAN SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the members of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma residing in Maverick County, Texas, shall be eligible for all Federal services and benefits furnished to members of federally-recognized tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma in Maverick County, Texas. In the case of Federal services available to members of federally-recognized tribes residing on or near a reservation, the members of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma residing in Maverick County, Texas, shall be deemed to be residing on or near a reservation.

(b) COOPERATION WITH THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT.—In providing services pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior (referred to hereafter in this Act as the ''Secretary'') and the head of each department and agency shall consult and cooperate with appropriate officials or agencies of the Mexican Government to the greatest extent possible to ensure that such services meet the special tricultural needs of the members of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma residing in Texas. Such consultation and cooperation may include joint funding agreements between such agency or department of the United States and the appropriate agencies and officials of the Mexican Government.

(c) DISCLAIMER ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to—

(A) constitute an independent authorization for the appropriation of funds for benefit of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma, or

(B) result in the diminution of funding to any other federally recognized Indian tribe.

(2) The Secretary shall, upon request of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma and subject to the availability of appropriations, provide technical assistance to prevent duplication of services for members of any federally recognized tribe in Maverick County, Texas.

SEC. 3. LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) 45 ACRES.—Pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 465), the Secretary may accept at least 45 acres of land held in fee by the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma in Maverick County, Texas, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma.

(b) ADDITIONAL LAND.—Pursuant to land acquisition authority under the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), the Secretary may accept in trust for the benefit of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma any additional land in Maverick County, Texas, acquired by the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma.

(c) NO LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Secretary under section 5 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 985).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

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

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

H.R. 2314, the proposed Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma Federal Indian Services Restoration Act of 1998 would restore Federal Indian services to members of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma who reside in Texas.

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 18, 1998.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2314, a bill to provide certain benefits to the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma. I understand that the Committee on the Judiciary, which has Rule X jurisdiction over section 3 of H.R. 2314 providing certain immigration benefits to the tribe, requires more time to address properly the issues raised by that section.

However, I understand that the Committee on the Judiciary will not object if the Committee on Resources proceeds to the Floor with the bill with an amendment to strike section 3. This arrangement is acceptable to the Committee on Resources and the author of the bill and we will act accordingly.

Thank you for your cooperation and that of your staff, especially Daniel Freeman and Jim Wilon, in this effort.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Re H.R. 2314—Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: I understand that the Committee on Resources wishes to proceed expeditiously to the floor with H.R. 2314, a bill to provide certain benefits to the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma. The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over Section 3 of the bill, which would provide certain immigration benefits to the tribe.

A number of important immigration issues are raised by Section 3 of the bill, and the Judiciary Committee has been working toward a global legislative solution of those issues for the Kickapoo Tribe and many other similarly situated Indian tribes. To that end, the Committee requested relevant information from the Justice Department's Office of Tribal Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs on February 11, 1998. Unfortunately, much of the requested information has still not been provided, so the Committee is not yet prepared to craft an optimal legislative solution.

However, the Judiciary Committee would have no objection if the Resources Committee proceeded to the floor, on the suspension calendar, with a manager's amendment to H.R. 2314 with the Section 3 immigration provisions removed. Please let me know if this is acceptable.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support and ask my colleagues on both sides to support this. I believe it has bipartisan bill support and understands the administration supports it.

In fact, H.R. 2314 rectifies disputes that have arisen over housing, medical and other social services for Kickapoos that are residing in Texas down in Maverick County. This will allow the services to be provided in many areas, and it is very much needed. These disputes have been discussed for a number of years.

The proposed legislation has been agreed upon by all parties involved. I know I have worked with several of them. I would just like to encourage the Members to support this bill under suspensions at this time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which points out how differences in cultures make it difficult to legislate on a national level.

The Kickapoo tribe is a noted tribe which inhabited lands in the States of Oklahoma, Texas and Mexico. This free lifestyle has led to questions concerning the citizenship of tribal members and the eligibility of tribal members for Federal and State health, housing and social welfare programs.