As additional conferences from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 702 and 704 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. MOLINARI, and M. LEVIN.

As additional conferences from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 713-14, 717, 879, 1302, 1304-5, and 1311 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Goodling, Fawell, and Payne.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 181 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 181

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of a motion to recommit the bill, the chairman of the committee may pursue to clause (b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of such bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with ""Provided"" on page 46, line 25, through "part 121" on page 47, line 6, and page 48, line 13, the words of the paragraph of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against the provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the paragraph in the report of the Committee on Rules, and not limited by any other rule of the House except as noted in this rule. Points of order against the bill are waived. Points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 3 of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognizing the Member of the Whole for that purpose in clause 1 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may, up to the time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(c) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered and amendments to such amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 46, line 25, after "Provided" insert "beginning with "Provided" on page 46, line 22 through "Reserve" on page 62, line 4;''
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 181 is an open rule. It provides for consideration of H.R. 2107, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. The rule provides an open amendment process, allowing any Member of this House to offer cutting amendments or offsetting amendments, including limitation amendments normally allowed under an open rule. No additional restrictions are written into this rule. This is the open amendment process. It also offers an acceptable compromise in which many Members on the contentious issue of funding the National Endowment for the Arts.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule also provides necessary waivers to allow the bill to be considered on the House floor today. The rule waives section 306 of the Budget Act, which provides for consideration of appropriations measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget in a measure not reported by that committee, against consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Rules understands this waiver to be technical in nature and that it does not constitute a substantive violation of the Budget Act. Otherwise we would not be giving the waiver here today.

The rule also provides certain waivers of points of order against the bill itself with certain exceptions as specified in the text of the rule. Members have copies on the desks in front of them.

Specifically, the rule waives clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized and legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and also clause 6, prohibiting reappropriations, of House rule XXI against the bill, except as noted.

The first items in the bill left exposed to points of order for lack of authorization or legislating on an appropriations bill are two provisions relating to Forest Service credit issued for purchasers of timber for the construction of roads, and a limitation on the availability of timber purchaser road construction credits to small businesses. These provisions were objected to by the chairmen of the authorizing committees, the Chairmen of Agriculture, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Resources.

The second item in the bill left exposed to a point of order for lack of authorization is a $30 million appropriation for necessary expenses of the National Endowment for the Arts. Mr. Speaker, the exposure of this agency to a point of order in this rule bears further explanation. As I mentioned earlier, the rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriations bill. Those are the rules of the House.

General appropriations bills are privileged on this House floor. However, the Committee on Appropriations in modern practice has sought special rules from the Committee on Rules which provide for consideration of bills when there is a request from either chamber. In the 104th Congress the Republican leadership established a protocol relating to waivers of unauthorized programs or legislative language in general appropriations bills. Under this protocol, the Committee on Rules would provide the necessary waivers to enable the bill to come to the floor if the authorizing committee chairmen did not object to them. If the authorizing chairmen objected to the waivers, they reversed the leadership's protocol, the Committee on Rules would leave the specific language in question exposed to a point of order on the floor. In the attempt to do that a few minutes ago before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member, objected, because it was inadvertently protected for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which if we had reversed the protocol, the Committee on Rules that had jurisdiction in the Commerce Department we would have certainly left that measure exposed, as we have others like the NEA.
Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, the House has grappled for many years now, and this year is no exception, with the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA, as we know it, is likely to be stricken from the bill by a point of order. As a matter of fact, it will be, we are told.

After that occurrence, the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ehlers] which represents a different approach to Federal arts funding. This amendment contains a block grant art proposal which provides a total of $60 million, 40 percent of which is dedicated to state arts commissions in the individual States and 60 percent to local school boards for school-based art activities. In other words, we give 40 percent of this to the local school districts in Members’ congressional districts so that they can develop the art programs as they see fit and not as some bureaucrat here in Washington sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, the House should explore various alternatives to address the Federal commitment to the arts. I have long believed that rather than take the money from the taxpayers, perhaps we should just pass the hat around among Members and ask the Members to fund their particular district’s arts programs, but that is not a reality now.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules believes this compromise of exposing NEA to a point of order to respect the committee system while allowing a vote on the approach of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ehlers] to Federal arts assistance is a fair and workable accommodation for all parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue to describe the rule, it also makes in order two additional amendments, one by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Weldon] relating to the Canaveral National Seashore and the deficit reduction locked money offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Crapo]. These amendments are debatable for 10 and 20 minutes respectively, are equally divided between a proponent and an opponent and are not subject to further amendment. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendments.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI, which prohibits nonemergency amendments to be offered to a bill containing an emergency designation under the Budget Act against amendments to the bill. The rule also includes one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, for the minority.

Having finished describing this important amendment, I might emphasize the importance of supporting the lockbox amendment made in order by this rule. There are many Members on the other side of the aisle, I think they call themselves the Blue Dogs, and they all have a commitment to make a budget amendment to be made in order, along with the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Crapo] and Republicans on this side. This amendment is made in order for them.

The Crapo amendment will make the budget process more user friendly for Members who wish to offer spending cut amendments on the floor of the House and the Senate. When a spending cut amendment is adopted, savings from that amendment will be credited to deficit reduction and not left hanging there to be used for other spending purposes.

This amendment is identical to the bill that was reported by the Committee on Rules during the last Congress and passed as an open rule on September 13, 1995, by a bipartisan vote of 364 to 59. We would expect that same vote today; as a matter of fact, an even stronger vote since a new Congress has been seated since that time and most of those are fiscally conservative Members. Similar lockbox language was also adopted by the House on two other occasions attached to bill like this, appropriations bills. Mr. Speaker, with such vast support for the amendment during the last Congress, it follows that it should once again be included with these funding bills.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the customary one-half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to be perfectly clear that the rules we are considering today will kill for all times the National Endowment for the Arts. My Republican colleagues might say that they are creating a smaller substitute program, which is like throwing an 11-foot rope down a 12-foot well to rescue someone. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, with this rule, they are killing Federal support for the arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts is a point of order in the entire country that has not benefited from the NEA. Even the district of my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon] got eight National Endowment for the Arts grants in fiscal year 1994, including the Crandall Center for the Performing Arts in Passaic Falls, which put on folk and traditional art programs; the UNIMA-USA Theater in Hyde Park; arts awareness in Lexington, NY, which put on visual arts programs, and the Mettawee Theater Company in Salem; and Music for Salem.

I recognize that in the past, there have been some bad decisions on the part of the NEA but their number was small, and today it is zero. According to a recent Atlanta Journal Constitution, less than four ten-thousandths of NEA funds have been misdirected. Again, Mr. Speaker, less than four ten-thousandths of NEA funds have been misdirected. But even since then, Jane Alexander and her NEA staff have taken extraordinary steps to ensure that offensive programs are not funded.

Mr. Speaker, artists supported by the National Endowment for the Arts have gone on to win Pulitzer Prizes, National Book Awards, Emmys, and Tonys. In fact, the men who wrote the play “Driving Miss Daisy,” Alfred Uhry, says that his play, and I quote, “never would have gotten out of the garage if not for the support of the National Endowment for the Arts.”

Yet the Republican leadership wants to add this program to the increasing pile of popular Federal programs that they have already eliminated.

Now I might add, Mr. Speaker, the National Endowment for the Arts is already operating under enormous cuts. Two years ago my Republican colleagues cut it by 39 percent. Today, the total NEA budget amounts, and I wish the Members would listen, the total NEA budget today amounts to one-thousandth of 1 percent, one one-thousandth of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is not much.

So, Mr. Speaker, this debate really is not about money, it is about philosophy. It is about ending arts experience for millions of Americans, all for the sake of taking a political stand.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Art in all of its forms touches our souls in ways that just cannot be measured in political points, and despite the huge cuts the arts endowment still manages to bring Shakespeare to the inner cities, classical music to the Midwest and ballet to the suburbs. It improves children’s basic skills, it improves their math ability, raises their SAT scores and enriches their lives, and the
Republican leadership has no business taking that away.

President John Adams once said: “I must study politics and war so that my sons may have the liberty to study mathematics and philosophy in order that their children may study painting, poetry and music.”

Mr. Speaker, John Adams was right. To my colleagues who by their support of this rule decide that we do not need the NEA, let me say that since the National Endowment for the Arts was created in 1966 there has been an explosion of community arts across the entire country. Thanks to the NEA, Mr. Speaker, we have eight times more nonprofit theaters, thanks to the NEA we have seven times more dance companies, and thanks to the NEA we have four times more orchestras and opera companies. Without the National Endowment for the Arts only people in big cities like Boston, Los Angeles, New York, and Houston would be able to enjoy the arts, but thanks to the NEA people all over the country of all ages now experience the joys of art.

And these art experiences, Mr. Speaker, do more than just bring people joy or educate our children. American playwrights raise thousands upon thousands of dollars a year. Every dollar that the National Endowment for the Arts provides attracts an average of $12 from other sources. The nonprofit arts industry represents 6 percent of our gross national product. According to the Ohio Hamilton Journal News, it is as big an industry as construction.

Mr. Speaker, the arts are most definitively in our national interest. The excuse that this represents a singular unauthorized appropriation is not entirely true. There are 13 unauthorized appropriations in this bill, all of which got waivers, all except the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a State in this country that does not benefit from the National Endowment for the Arts. These are wonderful programs, and it would be a shame to see them suffer. Anyone who has gone to a children’s festival, anyone who has experienced a small dance troop, anyone who has enjoyed folk art or seen the benefits of art-based literacy programs should join me in keeping this program alive. Although we cannot measure the dollar benefits of arts programs, school lunch programs, health care for poor children or home heating assistance, there is no reason to eliminate them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting the National Endowment by opposing this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moakley] quoted John Adams. As my colleagues know, over the Fourth of July I had the opportunity to respond to the President’s Fourth of July message, and in my message to the American people I said: “The Founding Fathers designed a government with limited defined powers, but that idea has been turned on its head,” I said, “because instead of being under the Constitution, they have said that the Constitution allows it to do, it does whatever the Constitution does not forbid it to do.”

And let me tell my colleagues something: What our Founding Fathers did not foresee was the idea of paying more in taxes than they do for food and shelter. Do my colleagues know that? They could not even begin to comprehend the idea of the American people working 6 months out of the year just to pay for the cost of government. Our Founding Fathers would have rolled over in their graves if they saw what has been happening here.

And, yes, we have over the last 3 years, we have eliminated 270 programs and bureaus and agencies and bureaucrats in just the last 3 years. That is what this is all about today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Dreier], a very valuable Member of this body, a member of the Committee on Rules, vice-chairman of the Committee on Rules, to expound on that thought a little bit.

Mr. Dreier. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glens Falls, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding this time to me. This has obviously been an extraordinarily contentious debate, and I have to say first that to see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moakley] stand here and make his very eloquent arguments on the second anniversary of his liver transplant is a very important statement to this House, and I appreciate the fact that he has stepped forward.

But now having said that, I have got to say that I completely disagree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts said. The fact is John Adams did envisage the time when we would see that third generation from politics and war to mathematics and philosophy to music and poetry. He envisaged the idea of young people in future generations being able to participate in the arts.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about that. My father passed away this spring, and he had been chairman and president of Massachusetts company in Kansas City, MO, and he was very involved, and he and I had many arguments about that. My dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] and I have discussed this before: My dad wanted me to be a contributor of the National Endowment for the Arts, but I told him that as we looked at establishing priorities it is very important for us to realize that there is Government subsidization of the arts because we provide a tax deduction for people to contribute to the arts.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon] mentioned the fact that many of my constituents could in fact participate by contributing to the arts. Many large corporations have called for continued support for the National Endowment for the Arts. But I think we should do everything we can to encourage them to participate through even greater philanthropy.

I have to say that having supported the Crane amendment myself in the past, this compromise is going to allow those local communities to enjoy Shakespeare, poetry, other very, very important arts because 40 percent of the money is going to go to the arts commissions and 60 percent to local school districts as we look at this compromise. And during that period of time, if this can in fact become law, and obviously there is a big question about that based on what might happen in the other body and down on the other end on Pennsylvania Avenue, but if we were to put this package into place, it seems to me that we could continue down this road of encouraging more and more people to contribute.

The arts are very, very important, and I am very proud that my family has spent many years as supporters of the arts. But it seems to me that, as we look at our priorities here, to claim that the two things are going to fall if the National Endowment for the Arts is not maintained exactly as it is today is a ludicrous argument because they are going to continue, the Government will continue to support them through providing opportunities for tax deductions to be out there, and I hope that much that we can move ahead with this balanced compromise approach.

Support this rule, and let us move ahead with the bill.
power play to prevent Members of both parties who went up in the Committee on Rules yesterday asking for the simple right to vote to continue the NEA as is. And it ought to be turned down because it is a smokescreen.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sham substitute. It protects Federal Government funds and Federal grants, but the agencies who are supposed to receive that money have themselves said they do not want this arrangement. They have said:

State art agencies rely upon Federal leadership in funding and identifying and addressing issues that are national. We need a partner agency at the Federal level to play a leadership role in working with our organizations and agencies.

It also provides a tiny bit of funding to each school district in the country, probably about $500 per school. That is an amount so small that we have been urged by our Republican friends on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education to eliminate a number of programs because such small grants that are not worth having.

Let us not kid ourselves. If we want to save the NEA, there is only one way to do it. It is not to buy into this phony smokescreen of a substitute amendment. It is purely and simply to vote ‘no’ on this rule, take this back to the Committee on Rules, put the Yates amendment in order. That is the least destructive thing to do; it is the most fair-minded thing to do. If we were going to have the Eilers amendment before us, at the very least we ought to have the Yates amendment before us also so that people can choose between conflicting substitutes.

I urge people not to be taken in by this sham power play. Vote ‘no’ on the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], one of the hard-working members of the Committee on Appropriations. He is the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will vote for the rule. This will allow us to debate a bill of great significance. I think sometimes it ought to be called the enhanced quality of life bill rather than the Interior bill, because everything that we do in this bill literally enhances the quality of life for our people. It is the future.

For example, the greatest single source of recreation in this Nation, and it cuts across all spectrums of society, is the national forests, the parks, the fish and wildlife refuges, the BLM lands. These resources are not only a source of recreation, but also a source of education, because many schools take their young people to fish and wildlife facilities, to the national forests, as part of an education process.

So that enhances the quality of life for all 260 million Americans. Likewise, this bill deals with our energy future.

Just this past week I talked to a young lady in my family, who is 14%. She is looking forward to getting out into the workaday world sometime and owning an automobile. We need to be concerned about energy, because energy means jobs, energy means growth, energy means a quality of life that people can get in their automobile and travel at a reasonable cost. We are blessed in this Nation with relatively cheap energy.

We heard a lot about the tax bill in the recent debate. Of course, energy is very much a part of that, because the key to a balanced budget is growth, growth in the economy. To have growth you have to have energy at a modest cost. It is vital. We spent not only literally but a lot of money Desert Storm to protect energy sources. This bill supports a lot of research to provide the technologies to assist with meeting our goals of an improved environment and a growing economy as we look forward into the next century. It truly is a bridge to a better quality of life in the century ahead.

It also deals with other things. One of the subjects that we consider here is the National Endowment for the Arts. Mr. Speaker, I would not begin to denigrate the NEA. I think they have done some excellent work. We had a symphony group that went out to the schools in my district. If Members watched the concert on the Mall on July 4 when they ran the tag lines, we noticed there was support by the NEA. I think it was a great thing. PBS said it is the most watched program they have. I could go on with others.

But likewise I would point out that perhaps the most graphic piece of artwork in this city is at the Holocaust Museum, what is called Remember the Children. There are the little plates, ceramics, that have incorporated the artwork of children from all across this Nation as to what the Holocaust means to them. That was done without an NEA grant. Let me mention also, if we take the passageway from here to the Cannon Building, we see the artwork from schools across the country. Many of us participate in that arts program. There is no NEA grant, they did it without an NEA grant.

What do we do in this bill? We provide that $80 million, that is $100 million that we have provided over each of the last 2 years minus the administrative costs, because we are going to send it back to the communities. We are going to send it back to the State arts agencies. The arts agencies in my State get a budget from the legislature that they use for their administration or activities. Why? Because they have had a very successful administration. They actually get three times as much from the Ohio Arts Agency than they do from here. We want to give them some additional help, because they are out there on the ground.

Last, it provides for sending money back to the schools, back to the children, who are really the future of the arts education, when we try to teach an appreciation of the cultural heritage of this Nation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the minority whip of the Democratic Party.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the artists, the writers, the actors, the musicians, the schoolchildren, and the thousands upon thousands of people in Georgia and around the Nation who benefit from the National Endowment for the Arts. I rise on behalf of all of these people to plead with all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to defeat this rule, this rule which abolished the National Endowment for the Arts without so much as a vote.

It was President Lyndon Johnson who said:

Art is a Nation’s most precious heritage, for it is in our works of art that we reveal to one another and to others the inner vision which guides us as a Nation. And where there is no vision, the people will perish.

We cannot and we should not and we must not abandon the role of the Federal Government in supporting the arts. Bombs, not books; planes, not poems; missiles, but not music: Is this the legacy we will leave for our children? I say no, and the American people say no. There is a role for our government to play in supporting the arts, and that role is through the National Endowment for the Arts.

This rule abolishes the NEA. It does not even permit a vote. This rule is a travesty. It is an insult to our democracy. Mr. Speaker, let us defeat this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the poet Shelley once wrote that the greatest force for moral good was imagination. God knows, our children and the people of America, but especially our children, need all of the imagination they can get to face the challenges of the future. Yet, this rule before us today serves to stifle imagination and stifle debate by eliminating the National Endowment for the Arts without even the formality of a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the music and the arts are their own excuse for being, but they also help our children learn to gain confidence, to reduce barriers to communication, and to enrich the lives of the American people.

Despite a 32-year history of the NEA of bringing the arts to communities all across this country, over $1 million each year to every congressional district, funding over 100,000 grants, and despite the overwhelming support of the American people, and
despite the economic benefits pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moakley], the rule today eliminates the NEA without even the formality of a vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this uncivil rule and uncivilizing rule. [Mr. MAOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].]

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

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I certainly want to commend the gentleman, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for the fine work he has done on this Interior appropriations bill. I regret that his subcommittee has been put in this untenable position. I understand that the emotions are running very high on both sides of this issue.

But although the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and I and many others of us went before the committee yesterday and asked for democracy, that is all we asked for, we sought protection for our peers, and we seek it for this very important issue, and what did we get? We got a rule that is rigged for a legislative procedure that deprives the body of an up-or-down vote on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell the Members that therefore, I must, regretfully, oppose this rule. We should allow a vote on the Yates amendment with the waiver. This would give us adequate funding for the coming year, and this is very important. Mr. Speaker, not a rule that permits an unexamined block grant, so-called block grant, to substitute for the authorization process of the authorization committee. I am a member of that committee, and we should have a deliberate, proper, intelligent procedure in the committee which is consistent with a world-class democracy. That is the American way.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule—fully understanding that it is difficult to opposes a so-called open rule.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for his fine work on this Interior appropriations bill. And I regret that his subcommittee has been put in this untenable position. However, I believe we must rise this afternoon and in opposition to this rule and in support of the National Endowment for the Arts.

I understand that emotions run high on this very sensitive issue. Some people, probably a majority in this House, feel that support for the arts is a cause worth fighting for and that the NEA is a worthwhile endeavor. I also understand that there are those in this House that want to eliminate all Federal support for the arts.

I disagree with them but recognize their right to disagree. So Mr. YATES and I, and many of our colleagues, went to the Rules Committee yesterday and asked for democracy. We sought protection for a simple up-or-down vote on the Yates amendment to restore funding to the NEA.

And what did we get in this rule? A rigged legislative procedure that deprives this body of a vote—up or down—on this issue.

I understand that the NEA has not been authorized, so, therefore, it is not the fault of the supporters of the NEA. As a member of the authorizing committee, I would be happy to vote for a properly structured bill that restructures, restructures, and preserves the NEA.

So we asked for the routine waivers for Mr. YATES’ amendment, something that is done all the time around here, and incidentally, the same protections granted to Mr. EHlers’ block grant amendment. We were simply asking the Rules Committee to allow the democratic process—that’s democratic with a lower-case “d”—to work.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, if the NEA amendment is offered and defeated, I can live with that. Because the process has been allowed to work. The principle of majority rule should have been recognized.

That’s the American way. But the House should have the right to work its will on this issue after a complete and open debate. While I am here, allow me to address the EHlers-Hunter block grant approach.

I applaud these well-intentioned efforts. However, the committee not only did not add the NEA’s appropriations bill and the Interior appropriations bill is not the place to undertake a complete overhaul of our arts funding process.

We simply do not have the time to fully analyze these new proposals. Indeed, this is a job for the authorizing committee—the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, you know my position on the NEA. I have worked for years to reform, strengthen, and protect the NEA.

Since its formation over 30 years ago, the National Endowment of the Arts has provided the public side of a very valuable public-private partnership to foster the arts. The people in this room represent the private side of that partnership.

Since the NEA’s birth, the number of community orchestras has grown from 22 to 422. The number of professional dance companies has risen from 37 to 300. Community orchestras have jumped from 58 to over 1,000. The NEA has provided the critical support which allowed production of such American classics as the original “Driving Miss Daisy,” “The Great White Hope,” and “Chorus Line.” The NEA has brought us the television programs “Live from the Lincoln Center” and “American Playhouse.”

All told, over 11,000 artists have received fellowships from the endowment. They’ve won dozens upon dozens of Pulitzer Prizes, MacArthur Awards, and National Book Club Awards.

The arts have been found to be an important part of a child’s development. Exposure to the arts nourishes imagination and creativity. It develops collaborative and teamwork skills, in addition to flexible thinking and an appreciation for diversity.

A University of California study has shown that after 6 months of piano lessons, preschoolers demonstrated significant improvement in the types of reasoning required to excel in math and science.

It has been the NEA’s role to leverage—not replace—the private funding that is so necessary to allow this type of growth and achievement to occur.

Aside from the creative benefits of the arts industry to the community are the financial benefits to the community. The nonprofit arts industry generates $36.8 billion annually in economic activity, supports 1.3 million jobs, and produces $790 million in local government revenue and $1.2 billion in State revenue.

So why then is the NEA under fire?

I think everyone in this room would agree: A balanced budget is a laudable goal. The NEA, like every other agency of the Federal Government including the Pentagon and NASA, should contribute to that effort. However, the reduction should be proportionate and fair and even-handed.

But there has been nothing even-handed and fair about the proposals to eliminate the NEA. And that’s what I have been fighting for several years now to both reform and renew the NEA.

Funding for the NEA stood at $165 million 2 years ago. This year it stands at $99 million. If the NEA’s opponents win this round this year, funding will be down to the $10 million range for the sole purpose of shutting it down. So I must oppose this rule. We should allow a vote on the Yates amendment—with the waiver. This would give us adequate funding for the coming year—thereby giving the authorization committee time to reform and renew the NEA in a proper, deliberate, and intelligent manner that is consistent with a world-class democracy.

That, my colleagues, is the American way. Oppose the rule. Support the amendment. [Mr. MAOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].]

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I rarely speak from the well of the House, and I even more rarely speak about a procedural issue, but in this case I feel I must. This is a bad rule and it should be defeated. If we stand for anything, we stand for openness.

Frankly, that is why I am here, to be able to use this voting card, to be able to express my opinion. We are going to be prevented from doing that. It is the heart of this Congress, it is the heart of the forum, where we express our feelings as Republicans and Democrats. This rule suppresses that discussion. If the NEA cannot stand on its own and stand the test of debate, it should go down, but let us have a vote on it.

I am a Republican, I am a proud Republican, and we Republicans, when we assumed leadership in the House, promised we would not shut off debate on critical issues. We preach this. Now let us practice it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAOAKLEY].

Mr. MAOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object in the strongest possible terms to this rule. The action of the House leadership to deny a vote on the floor of the House on whether to retain or to
abolish the National Endowment for the Arts is unconscionable and is an act of cowardice. It is an insult to democracy and a great disservice to the American public. The rule specifically targets the NEA for extinction. It waives points of order on the NEA and allows the majority of the House to vote on any other amendment but one. Why? Because they are not confident they have the votes to defeat the NEA in a fair and open vote.

The rule is a cynical attempt to prevent the elected representatives of the American people from even voting for or against abolishing a major Government agency. Instead, the rule permits the Ehlers amendment, which is nothing but a snare and a delusion. That amendment would abolish the NEA and instead distribute $600, on average, to every school district for the arts, $600 to all school districts. To what use could they put that?

What is really at stake is the availability of art to the American people across the country. Before the NEA there were 58 orchestras in the country. Today there are more than 1,000. Before the NEA there were 37 professional dance companies. Now there are 130. Before the NEA, there were 1 million people who attended the theater each year. Today more than 55 million attend.

Do we want to go back to that era, when art was available only in large cities, and only to those who could afford large sums of money? That is what is at stake. Vote against this rule. Do not be deluded.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those artistic surgeon's hands that saved the gentleman's liver are the ones that got some training from the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The Committee on Rules has failed to allow this House to vote for the continued funding of the National Endowment for the Arts. Instead, it gives us the Ehlers amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to read that amendment, because it first abolishes the National Endowment for the Arts. This is a bad idea. Members might ask why, why is it bad for America?

It is bad for the schools, it is bad for our communities, and most of all, it is bad for business, so bad that the presidents and CEOs of America's largest corporations have written the Speaker asking him to sustain the funding for the arts. Companies like Pepsi-Cola, Dean Witter, Procter & Gamble, B.F. Goodrich, Chase Manhattan Bank have joined 70 other Fortune 500 companies in requesting the support of the NEA. Why? Because the structure of the NEA serves as a clearinghouse for giving grants to community groups. Most importantly, creativity is America's greatest gift. Preserve creativity, preserve the NEA.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad time for me as a Republican Member of this House, because for 40 years when the Republicans were in the minority we made it clear that we would not do things without a majority. We always have the sunshine and daylight allow us to bring an issue up on the floor and have an up-or-down vote. That is what should happen for the National Endowment for the Arts. This critical program has done so much good. It is the Republican Congress, the 104th Congress, that clamped down on the atrocities that had come to symbolize unfairly this agency.

We need to move forward. There have been 121 instances in the last Congress where we appropriated unauthorized programs, and there is no reason why this program and the Yates amendment could not have a vote. I would suggest to my colleagues that we need to stop pretending the NEA doesn't exist. Absent that, I regret that we are going to have to vote against the rule. That is something I truly regret having to do.

On the so-called compromise, if Members love the Department of Education and they love the Department of the Interior, they are just sending $90 million more through that bureaucracy, which is not sensitive to the arts in America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules abuses the rights of Members by not allowing an amendment supported by Republicans and Democrats alike to keep the National Endowment for the Arts alive. That is undemocratic, and the President will veto it if it comes to him in that way.

I know the value of the arts to my communities in New Jersey, in Jersey City, Hoboken, Newark. They have revitalized downtown businesses, attracting conferences, conventions, increased tourism, new businesses, boosting the value of commercial and residential real estate.

They are a powerful, positive economic force in our communities. To eliminate that funding hurts our communities. They are important for the education of our children. They move beyond math and science to something equally important, imagination and creativity, allowing students to think about the world and the world around them. And the arts are a bridge to cross-cultural understanding, bringing us together as a nation.

The NEA brings the richness of our people to the poorest in our communities. So vote no on the rule. Vote to save the arts and vote to preserve our rights as Members in this House.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is not about the merits of the NEA. We already know that a majority of the House supports the NEA and if we had a vote it would pass. It is about the process. It is a continuing pattern in this Congress and in the last Congress. In the last Congress we saw when a majority of the Congress wanted to keep the Government open, the majority would not allow the vote. We saw in this Congress when a majority of the Congress wanted to end the debacle with the flood disaster in the Midwest, the majority in the Congress would not allow a vote.

We saw in the B-2, that the majority in this Congress and the Senate wanted to end the rule, and it caused us to wait 10 hours to consider that bill. We are going to do the same thing today because no matter what happens with this rule, the NEA will get funded because that is the will of the majority, the majority of the House and not the ruling majority.

Just this week in Mexico, last Sunday, we saw the ruling party allowed free and fair elections and respected the will of the people, but the majority party of this House does not respect the majority will of the House itself. What a shame that is. Defeat the rule. Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the children. I rise against the attack on the NEA because it is summarily unacceptable.

SOS: The Fourth of July will have to be canceled in Washington, DC, for the NEA sponsored last week, the NEA sponsored last week the Fourth of July celebration. It is unfortunate that the Yates amendment and other amendments to restore NEA funding in the Committee on Rules were not allowed.

Quality of life issues: Less than 0.6 percent of the Federal budget is spent on our children and the arts. Representing most of the arts community in Houston, let me say to you that this is a ridiculous travesty on the arts, the culture and the history of this Nation. What a tragedy that this Nation recognizes the real quality of life is all about. We are going to win this. We are not going to see the clocks turned back. We are going to
stand up for the children so they know what art is about, they know their culture and they know their history. We are going to stand up and make sure this rule is defeated.

I ask my colleagues to join me. Bring up the quality of life and let us know the Fourth of July celebrated in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in order to express my vehement intent to oppose this rule for H.R. 2107—the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill of 1968. The related agency that this rule seeks to eliminate is the National Endowment for the Arts. The current funding level of $10 million appropriated in H.R. 2107 for the NEA is summarily unacceptable and needed to be changed. My amendment restored funding for the NEA to $99.5 million.

The difference between my amendment and the amendment of my colleague, Representative YATES, was that my restoration was offset by a reduction in the Forest Service—forest and range research appropriation; while his restoration was offset by using the strategic petroleum reserve.

I am outraged that the Rules Committee has decided to stop the democratic process by not allowing the Congress to do its job. The Rules Committee had decided to use Gestapo methods in the House of Representatives to vote on such an important issue as preserving an important part of American culture through the arts.

How is it that the chairman of the Rules Committee can completely stop the democratic process. Under the dictator type leadership of the Republicans, the democratic process is not taking place.

If the House of Representatives to hold its title as the people's House, then Democrats and Republicans should work together in openness and fairness. But that is simply not the case. The Republican majority of the House has the power to decide which legislation will be brought to the floor and what will be voted on. Under the Republican dictatorship of the Rules Committee, the full House is completely stopped from voting on important legislation of the American people.

I am outraged at where this debate on funding for the NEA is heading. The opponents of funding for the NEA are quick to trot out the occasional bad choices made by the NEA. However, it is important to highlight and inform the American public of the vast majority of activities funded by the NEA.

In Houston, TX, the Alley Theater is an excellent example of the value of the NEA and the arts in Texas. The Alley Theater is family oriented with over 200,000 persons attending productions annually. To quote Paul Tetreault, the managing director of the Alley Theater in Houston, "the NEA has given meaning support to the Alley and its audiences for many years." However, this year, the Alley was denied funding for a production as a result of reduced budgets. He states that, "it was a great surprise and disappointment to see that support interrupted at a time when the Alley is realizing its greatest artistic achievements." Mr. Tetreault goes on to say, "many other deserving theaters, museums, dance and opera companies have been even more deeply affected by having their grant requests denied. Their losses, like that of the Alley's, will have a collateral effect on the quality of life in the communities they serve, to the detriment of arts education, commerce, and tourism."

Mr. Speaker, that is what this is all about. The quality of life for Americans and their families and children throughout this country. This is not about the few bad choices made by the NEA in the past. This is about the ability of children and families to view productions of plays and musicals; the ability of children to experience dance and art education; the ability of a child to travel across town to an outdoor play with his father and mother and share in a meaningful family outing where the love of a family can be shared; where a community can come together in place; where the quality of life for residents in a city can be improved by an arts event that both educates and entertains.

What is the need to summarily eliminate an area of the Federal Government that is working. Funding for the NEA represents less than six-hundred-thousandths—0.0006 percent—of the entire Federal budget. It is still the largest single source of funding for the nonprofit arts in the United States. This investment of the U.S. Government is an investment in the quality of life for families and children. It is the only Federal budget that promotes arts by the American people, private and corporate donors. However, increased demands on all sectors of private giving have recently presented corporate and individual donors with tough choices. How can we expect private donations to increase when we do not keep our commitment to the NEA. This is the time that the Federal Government should be making an investment in the NEA; not closing it.

Who are we really hurting if we do not fund and support the arts. We are hurting middle class and poor America. Seven point five—7.5 percent—of funding for the NEA goes directly to projects in under-served communities. Through access and outreach related grants, the NEA has helped to make the arts accessible to all Americans who could not otherwise afford them. What does that mean? It means that children in poor communities will not have access to plays, musicals, stage productions, and arts education that serve to increase the quality of life and overall educational value of American children. We are hurting the very people that we are here to help. We are hurting families who are trying to raise their children to respect the community. Mr. Speaker, we are hurting America.

Most grants of the NEA help support community cultural centers and tour concerts, and educational initiatives that make our major institutions accessible to all Americans. How many children will not hear the sweet and magnificent sounds of the symphony and orchestra because of this bill. How many families that cannot afford to buy tickets to the symphony will be left out of valuable and quality appreciation of the performing arts. Cutting funding for the NEA will not only negatively affect cities, but it will also negatively affect rural, small town communities. NEA grants serve communities in both urban and rural areas. In most small towns across the country, traveling tours, exhibits, and concerts are the major exposure to the live performing arts that children receive. The small town and rural communities cannot afford to support a full symphony, orchestra, or museum.

Funding for the NEA is not a Republicans versus Democrats issue. There are even Republicans that support level funding for the NEA. It is not a conservative versus liberal issue, it is for the funding for this cultural issue. Important cultural, educational, and artistic programs are funded by the NEA. Business leaders, educators, cities, States, and even law enforcement officials support funding for the NEA. After schools arts programs keep kids off the streets. We have all heard the phrase "an idle mind is the devil's workshop." If we are able to reach kids and take them off of the streets via an after school arts program, then why don't we. Funding for the NEA exposes inner city minority children to Hamlet and the Othello.

The Cultural Arts Council of Houston/Harris County receives funding from the NEA. They have over 115 members that receive funding from them. These organizations would be dramatically hurt by the destabilization of funding due to cuts in the NEA.

The NEA stimulates local and national economies and helps to create jobs. It is estimated that nationally, the NEA generates $37 billion in economic activity and returns $3.4 billion in Federal income taxes to the U.S. Treasury each year. The estimated impact to the Houston community because of funding cuts to the NEA was a negative $1.5 million across all manners of organizations both great and small. Houston's diversity of institutions makes it a great city. We do not believe in elitism. Cultural diversity is keen. If funding for the NEA is drastically cut, then the negative impact in Houston will be devastating, estimating that it will cost the city over $3 million in economic gains.

The Houston Ballet is internationally known. C.C. Conner, the managing director of the Houston Ballet expressed that, "private support cannot replace the role of the Government in cultural funding." He states that, "Funding from the NEA has played a significant role in Houston Ballet's growth from a small regional company to what is today, according to many dance critics, one of the premier dance companies in the United States. The effect of any cuts to the NEA will be devastating to Houston's diversity of institutions." The Houston Ballet is internationally known. C.C. Conner, the managing director of the Houston Ballet expressed that, "private support cannot replace the role of the Government in cultural funding." He states that, "Funding from the NEA has played a significant role in Houston Ballet's growth from a small regional company to what is today, according to many dance critics, one of the premier dance companies in the United States. The effect of any cuts to the NEA will be devastating to Houston's diversity of institutions."
natural resources for future generations, including our children. The underlying bill is an excellent example of doing more with less.

We are going to save money by focusing our limited resources in priority areas. This bill spends $100 million less than last year’s appropriation, it still provides important funding increases for our national parks, the National Forest System, and the National Wilderness Refuges, which many Americans and American children use.

Especially important for my home State of Florida, this is a vehicle for the crucial Everglades restoration funds. These funds permit us to meet the Federal commitment in our ongoing effort to restore and preserve for future generations, especially our children, the unique river of grass.

Another important provision is the extension of the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas exploration moratorium, which protects Florida’s fragile coastline from oil slicks and pollution. Each year for the last 13 years Congress has passed this moratorium, and I am proud to co-sponsor this to once again see fit to include this commonsense measure. So many people enjoy our beaches and shores, including, of course, all Americans, many visitors, and especially our children.

As always, there are some issues in this bill that remain controversial and probably always will be. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has done an outstanding job balancing the very diverse views of this body.

This rule likewise reflects a genuine workable compromise. I think it is a good process. I think the rule is a good rule, and I think it is a good bill.

If the NEA is the only way to culture in America, then we have got a problem. This rule provides for us to look at other ways to get public money, tax dollars, to the public for the purpose of the arts. Those who suggest the sky is falling if the arts are cut back or curtailed do not understand that there are many ways and many aspects to the arts. I believe that the block grant opportunity is one we should examine, and will under this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the rule and to support one of America’s greatest treasures, the National Endowment for the Arts.

My colleagues, who want to slash the NEA budget, say it is elitist and controversial. I claim that eliminating the NEA will help cut the deficit. But their numbers do not add up. The NEA budget represents only 0.15 percent of the Federal budget. That translates into 35 cents a person, little more than a postage stamp. In fact the NEA actually brings in money. The arts generate $36 billion in revenue and pay $3.4 billion in Federal income taxes.

But their numbers do not add up. The NEA funding is equal to 13 cents a person, little more than a postage stamp. In fact the NEA actually brings in money. The arts generate $36 billion in revenue and pay $3.4 billion in Federal income taxes.

In New York State, the NEA is a boon to the economy. The arts employ approximately 174,000 New Yorkers and attract millions of tourists annually, producing an estimated $13 billion in revenue. Without the NEA, local theater and educational groups that introduce children to the arts will be forced to trim their programs, and that would be a serious loss to this country.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this rule needs to be defeated because if it passes, the National Endowment for the Arts and all the great work that it does will be defeated.

During our hearing on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, we heard from a young lady by the name of Denyce Graves. She grew up just a very few miles from here, right next to the Kennedy Center, but the Kennedy Center could have been a world away. She never had the money to go to the Kennedy Center.

But because of an NEA grant, there was a community opera production that was at a school when she was a teenager. She was inspired by it. She went on to devote her career to being an opera singer. She now plays Carmen at the Met. That may not seem important to the Members of this body, but I know it is important to millions of young families and children around the country who would like that similar opportunity and will not have that opportunity if it is only the elitist organizations that are funded. NEA works on behalf of the real people of America. Give their talent an opportunity to express itself. We are all richer because of it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. Pryce], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me the time. I rise in strong support of this rule. This is a small part of this legislation. This appropriations bill is also about preserving our nation’s rich heritage, our natural resources like our national forests and parks; our human resources, like improving native American education and the many museums and cultural centers all around the country.

This bill is about keeping our history and heritage alive for people of all ages and all walks of life to see and to enjoy. What we do today in this bill will not just preserve our past for the record books, it will also enable us to educate our children and grandchildren about who we are and where we came from and the events that shaped our nation. In recognition of these precious resources, we honor the legacy of our land and the struggles and the accomplishments of those who came before us.

Mr. Speaker, summer is a time when many of our constituents pack up the family and head off to vacation, maybe to the Nation’s Capital to take advantage of the diverse cultural institutions that Washington has to offer. I am pleased to note that the bill provides priority funding for the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, the John F. Kennedy Center and the National Holocaust Museum.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules worked very hard to find a way to resolve the controversies surrounding the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. This has been a difficult emotional issue for Members on both sides of the debate, and many thoughtful arguments have been made for why the NEA should or should not continue as it is today. I believe this rule offers a very fair approach to debating the question of whether the Federal Government should be engaged in promoting the arts in America and to what degree.

This rule permits the House to debate an amendment which will transform the current NEA Endowment grant program funded at $80 million, to be administered by the States. This may not be the preferred option for those who strongly support the NEA, but in my view it is an honest, good faith attempt to resolve this contentious issue and to maintain an appropriate Federal commitment to promoting the arts and the culture in America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me say that I deeply appreciate the hard work of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

We all recognize the tight constraints of the Federal budget and the contentiousness of many of these issues. He has crafted a bill that balances good government choices with a paramount need to restore, preserve, and protect our Nation’s natural and cultural resources. This is a responsible bill. And under this rule we will have a chance for an open debate. I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to vote for this fair and open rule and to support the Interior appropriations bill that it supports.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, we look back over history and we see that the great civilizations are not remembered for the wars that they fought. They are not remembered for the people that they killed in those wars.

The great civilizations of history are remembered for the arts that they provided for their people: music, art, sculpture, and literature. But throughout those ages, it was not always easy for people who created and fostered these arts. There were always those in government who wanted to prevent the arts from progressing.

When Rodin developed the great sculpture of the Burghers of Calais,
Small amounts of public arts support leverage immense amounts of outside funding, which have the net result of creating more jobs, greater profits, and more taxes. The work of NEA can be justified simply on the basis of what it does to advance the arts, but it also contributes to the overall economy as well as to that of the communities. It is a positive, positive national force. Let us defeat the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Unfortunately, we only have 1 minute we can allocate to him, but he deserves it.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I will try to compress a lot in 1 minute.

One of the things that struck my mind is there was $10 million provided for continued funding for NEA, and another 20 percent of that, that leaves $8 million for distribution. That $8 million for distribution I think we can probably raise out of the pockets at least of those colleagues here who are such staunch supporters of the NEA.

One of the things that concerns me about it is the maldistribution of NEA funds. The majority of those funds go to D.C., New York, and L.A. My district is significantly larger than D.C. population. But the $6,000 we get in D.C., New York, and L.A., my district is significantly larger than D.C. population. My district is significantly larger than D.C. population. For example, a 20 percent of $6,000,000,000 in the district is significantly larger than D.C. population. My district is significantly larger than D.C. population.

It is a good old boy network. It is time to terminate that and depend upon the voluntary contributions totaling $9.5 billion a year out of the pockets voluntarily of citizens.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to speak to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm opposition to the rule. In my district the National Endowment for the Arts has supported such valuable programs as the Children's Creative Project, the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, Cal Poly Arts, the Santa Barbara Symphony Orchestra, UC Santa Barbara Arts and Lectures, Cuesta College Public Events, and the list goes on and on.

The National Endowment for the Arts also contributes to the economy of California. Funding for NEA is only a mere 0.001 percent of our Nation's $1.7 trillion dollar Federal budget, but this seed money snowballs when private and nonprofit sectors see the government's endorsement and then add to it.

Leslie Abrams, one of Maine's best comedienne, put it well: "A world without art is gray, lifeless, dull. The musicians, the actors, the dancers, the sculptors, the painters, the photographers, the choreographers, the writers and yes, even the comedienne like myself, are there to bring color and joyful noise to the world. We help others to find what is universal in our experience."

Support the NEA. Vote against this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM], a very valuable Member of this body.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if we want to save the arts and save the arts for children, $80 million goes to all States and the majority to New York or my State of Colorado. There was a Republican compromise back in 1995. As the chairman of the subcommittee, along with the majority leader, we brought moderate Republicans, conservatives, in an agreement to save the arts for 3 years. Give them $99 million, let them establish their own endowment, their own endowment, and take it off of taxpayers.

The rule does eliminate the organization, not the arts. If we want our rhetoric to go where it is and save the arts, let us put the money down there. When we talk about policy, when the Democrat went along with the majority they eliminated this amendment on an up or down vote because they knew it would pass, that the money would get to the children, not to the liberal NEA it said.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit troubled by this. I would say to my good friend that this rule is absolutely a gag rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Hefner].

Mr. Hefner. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit troubled by this. I would say to my good friend that this rule is absolutely a gag rule.
One of the greatest things for my kids, when they were going to school in this little country school, was when the local symphony from Charlotte or Raleigh or someplace would come and do a skit for them. They were absolutely entranced by it.

This is a good program. We want to weed out the bad things but, in my view, this rule is absolutely a gag rule to keep us from doing what is the democratic way in this House. Vote down this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We have heard a lot about a gag rule on this floor today. Let us be perfectly clear. This rule is an open rule. Any Member can stand up here and offer any amendment under an open rule that is allowed under the rules of this House. That is clear.

Several years ago I wrote a book, "Before Its Time," which dealt with balancing the Federal budget. In that, dealing with the arts, I said then the central question is whether or not the Federal Government should be subsidizing art and humanities, and went on to say, "As George Will points out, we had the poetry of Walt Whitman and the wondrous songs of Grandma Moses"—from my district—"without this kind of aid."

I went on to say that, "While it may be true that reducing funding would result in fewer of these activities, private funding can and should be able to fill the gap. In fact, subsidies account for a mere fraction of what the actual amount spent on the arts is. In 1990, Americans donated nearly $8 billion to the arts, culture, and the humanities.

The commitment to the arts goes far beyond the NEA." Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a dear friend, a fellow who has done so much for the NEA, and whose amendment should be made in order but it is not.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard in this debate, the fundamental question that is involved is the one that we had with respect to the Crane amendment. This is a question whether or not we will kill the NEA. This is a vote that will deprive me of the opportunity of offering an amendment that will allow the House to determine the question as to whether funds should be allowed to keep NEA in operation.

One point should be made, Mr. Speaker. If this rule is approved, it is inevitable that NEA will be stricken from the bill on a point of order and nobody will be allowed to offer an amendment with respect to NEA.

One point is indisputable. If this rule goes down, this rule will come back with only one change, the opportunity to offer an amendment for NEA. That is all that will be required. Therefore, if we are for the National Endowment for the Arts, as I know many of my friends on the Republican side are, then we must vote against this rule. It is that simple.

More than that, if we think that Members of the House should be allowed to vote on this question and not be required to accept it as an imprimatur from the Committee on Rules, we should vote against this rule.

The gentleman from California, Mr. DAVID DREIER, my good friend, talked about the fact that if NEA is killed, we will have the same kind of an arts community throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, nothing is further from the truth. NEA brings the arts to every American community, not just to the big cities.

Oh, we will have the big cities with their arts, as they always have. We will have Chicago and New York and we will have Houston and Los Angeles. And those are the big ones; but what about the small cities which have had wonderful arts companies that they have had. But the cities, small cities like Jessup, IA, or Gilpin, GA, populations of 2,500, will not be able to get the benefits of the arts.

I would refer my colleagues to page 3 of the hearings for 1994 if they want to see what happened to this small community which had this grant. It was a wonderful, wonderful experience for them and they will have Houston and Los Angeles. All of them will have the same kind of an arts community, not just to the big cities.

I hope we will have the big cities with their arts, as they always have. We will have Chicago and New York and we will have Houston and Los Angeles. All of them will have the same kind of an arts community, not just to the big cities.

More than that, if we think that Members of the House should be allowed to vote on this question and not be required to accept it as an imprimatur from the Committee on Rules, we should vote against this rule.

The gentleman from California, Mr. DAVID DREIER, my good friend, talked about the fact that if NEA is killed, we will have the same kind of an arts community throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, nothing is further from the truth. NEA brings the arts to every American community, not just to the big cities.

Mr. YATES and I have labored over this issue throughout all the years I have been here, and he, even years before I came, and I have found him in one instance to be a gentleman, a compassionate, a concerned, a sharing and a caring man, stubbornly holding to his point of view, but I appreciated him then and I appreciate him now.

Mr. Speaker, every year, in every summer that I have been here, Congress, we have dealt with the interior appropriations bill, and in each of these times the debate has been, more than anything else, about the National Endowment for the Arts.

In some respects I think that has been unfortunate because of all the good things that are covered in this bill that too often get overlooked. The National Endowment for the Arts has always been, in this case, bigger than life. It has always been a very small fraction of the total of the bill, in this case less than $100 million in a $14 billion bill.

The National Endowment for the Arts is small with respect to the extent to which the Nation supports the arts, $100 million or less as a part of the $1.6 trillion that American people put out. It is certainly small relative to the people's business, which is a $1.6 trillion budget that will be brought into balance as we complete all of this year's work.

What makes it so big? What makes it so big? It is made big by the concerted, well-funded, well-motivated efforts of the art elite in America, who want the focus to be on whether or not there will be funding done to arts, but whether or not they will be in control of the funding of the arts.

This rule, I said, makes in order the Interior appropriations bill, which has within it $10 million for support of the arts from the Federal Government; $10 million not protected by an exception to the rules of the House. The rule also makes in order an amendment that would give $80 million to support for the arts if passed.

So what we find here is people who mobilize their efforts to protect their control over $10 million as opposed to having local control over $80 million. My colleagues do not think this is about control? My colleagues do not think this is about power? My colleagues do not want to confess it is about an elite that says let us keep the money in our arts community centers across the country and within our control so we can decide what is art and what is not art?

That is precisely what it is about. Should we, in fact, have the good people of Iowa decide for themselves at the local level what they would support, or should they send off an application to a
board of art censors in the East who know better what is or is not art suitable for the people in Iowa? Should we have the local control? Should we have a fair disbursement of the money so everybody in this Nation on a per capita basis gets a fair share of the art? Or should the central government tell us what to see in our centers like Soho in New York City? Should we make it more possible for more children to have more Crayolas in their hands by virtue of local control where they can do art, or should we have a privileged artists and privileged troops and privileged organizations in our major cities have additional money that supports the already rich budgets they have?

This is not about whether or not there is Federal funding for the arts supported by the Congress. This is about whether or not the Congress will let that funding be controlled and disbursed by an elite group or whether it will be controlled and disbursed by the local communities.

If my colleagues want more funding for the arts than what is in the bill, if they want fair distribution of the funding for the arts that is in the bill, if they want local communities to determine what is or is not art that would like to see in their communities from this bill, vote "yes" for this rule and make this in order.

If, on the other hand, they want to perpetuate a system of art censorship held in the hands of a group of elite activists sponsored by the Federal Government of the United States for the express purpose of deciding this is or this is not art, then vote for control, vote against freedom, vote against fairness, vote for the status quo, and they can have that.

If my colleagues truly, in their heart, can reach down and say it is fair to continue the National Endowment for the Arts, which has been the single most positive force in our depriving black eye on the arts in America that I have seen in my lifetime, as opposed to what real people and their real communities did to celebrate the arts, music, classics in their own communities for 200 years before there was a National Endowment for the Arts, I say vote for this rule, vote for freedom, vote for the children, vote for the parents, and vote against elite control of art in America. (GENERAL LEAVE)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 181.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to this rule that would set the terms of the debate for the fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill. I must oppose this rule because it is a gag rule—it denies those of us in the House who support continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts the opportunity to make our case, and instead makes in order an NEA-killing amendment.

The bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee reduces funding for the NEA to $10 million from the current year's funding level of $99.5 million. That's on top of a 40 percent cut already inflicted on the NEA 2 years ago. I understand that Members of the Republican leadership have been spearheading the effort to eliminate the NEA—reminiscent of a Republican-led effort to get rid of Big Bird a few years ago—and that's why we have this rule before us. What I fail to understand is why the Republicans.

The NEA plays an extremely important role in educating our children about art and promoting the arts. Not only is this a worthwhile endeavor in and of itself—the arts enrich our lives and are an integral part of our culture—but the arts also contribute to a vibrant economy all across our country. In fact, to those who say the NEA is a waste of taxpayers money or a luxury we can't afford in a time of tight budgets, I say the NEA is a wise investment. While the NEA comprises only a tiny fraction of the Federal budget—approximately 1/1000th—for this small investment millions of nonfederal dollars are matched to further promote the arts, and the arts return more than $3 billion to the Federal treasury in arts-related commerce.

Throughout the NEA, the arts are supported in every State, reaching people in small towns and rural areas who otherwise may have no opportunity to enjoy music, dance, or theater. Eliminating the NEA and replacing it with a new bureaucracy that would be required to administer this unstated unspoken block grant system would jeopardize those opportunities and would end the Endowment's grants for lifelong learning programs such as those that serve our Nation's adults, senior citizens, and disabled citizens. Access to the arts that young people and adults now enjoy through public radio and television and touring cultural programs would be canceled.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule. Let us stand up for nurturing our children, to deny many of my constituents theater, museums, theaters, festivals, and other cultural activities for all our citizens while also strengthening local economies. New York City is home to numerous museums, theaters, and dance groups who rely on funding from the NEA. These attractions draw millions of tourists each year to our city, generating billions of dollars for the New York City economy while creating thousands of jobs for its residents. In my District of Queens, numerous arts programs rely on funding from the NEA. I was proud to have 12 cultural groups from my district benefit from the NEA during fiscal year 1997. If their funding were discontinued, it would have a devastating effect on their future and the Queens community.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a tragic mistake to destroy the National Endowment for the Arts. The positive influences it has had on our schools and communities are numerous and far reaching. I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair and damaging rule and should be defeated.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. This rule can work to ruin the livelihoods of numerous splendid artists in my district; halt the regeneration of the city of Cold Spring and several other struggling communities; and to denying many of my constituents theater, dance, opera, painting, and other artistic mediums.

This shortsighted decision to severely cripple our nation's preservation of culture will haunt us in the near future. All of us like to think of the United States of America as a civilized country, but how civilized is a country that abandons their commitment to the arts. How civilized is a country that does not prioritize art and culture as the inevitable cornerstone of our society? When we look for signs of early and ancient man, where do we find it? In the arts that ancient cultures left behind.

Abstain the argument of whether or not the NEA should continue, there is a yet a bigger concern being debated here—Democracy. This rule denies this Chamber a straight up and down vote on funding the NEA. It allows an attempt to reach compromise by block granting arts funds without any hearings. This attempt to tamper with the arts, operates on the premise of eliminating the NEA—a premise with which I cannot agree.

Henry Wadsorth Longfellow wrote that: "Art is the child of Nature; yes, her darling child, in whom we trace Her aspect and her attitude."

That quote leads me to ask one question. What kind of mother are we then if we deprive the arts? Allow a vote on NEA funding. Defeat this rule.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this unfair and damaging rule. The future of the National Endowment for the Arts lies to the balance. The important programs funded through the NEA play an integral part of our communities and schools, in turn, having a tremendous positive impact on the future of our children and society as a whole. As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I take a special interest in protecting the future of the NEA. The NEA plays a crucial role in providing the tools necessary to enhance the arts programs of our Nation. Without it, access to museums, theaters, festivals, and other celebrations of the arts would be greatly limited. We cannot allow this to happen. The arts play a vital role in education and enhance our communities. By promoting art programs in our schools, we create more well-rounded, self-confident students who excel in their studies. Art programs benefit our communities by bringing together a wide range of cultural activities for all our citizens while also strengthening local economies. (GENERAL LEAVE)
Let me tell you the many reasons that most Americans believe in government support for the arts:

The arts stimulate economic growth. For every dollar the NEA invests in communities, there is a 20-fold return in jobs and services, and considerable tax revenue.

The arts invest in our communities. The arts develop in our citizens a sense of community, and contribute to the livability for families in that community.

The arts are basic to a thorough education. Students' achievement and test scores in academic subjects can improve when the arts are used to assist learning in mathematics, social studies, creative writing, and communication skills.

I invite anyone who thinks the NEA is not needed to visit the Puppet Company Playhouse in Glen Echo Park, just a few miles from the Capitol.

It's a 200 seat theater created out of a portion of an historic ballroom at Glen Echo Park. The audience is usually made up of children accompanied by their families and teachers, representing the cultural and economic diversity of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. An NEA grant allows the Puppet Co. to keep the ticket prices low so that many young families can attend the performances. The associates who run the company work hard at maintaining salaries in the true spirit of keeping their company nonprofit.

I think most taxpayers would be pleased to know that they support such a worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative agenda could have far-reaching implications for the cultural vitality of our Nation. Therefore, I cannot support this rule.

Art is how we remember. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts so that the rich and cultural story of our past can be made available to future generations.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will not be present for this important debate, due to a death in my family. However, I strongly oppose this rule because it fails to waive points of order on this section of the bill that provides funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Waiving points of order on this section would protect the Appropriations Committee's work, and allow the issue of Federal funding for the arts to reach the House floor.

Numerous Members from both sides of the aisle testified yesterday before the Rules Committee in favor of allowing a straight up or down vote on the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] on the House floor. But instead, the Rules Committee decided to deny the Members of this body an opportunity to vote on this issue, which affects millions of people across the country.

Our Federal investment in the NEA is an investment in our children's educational development and in our Nation's economic growth. The $99.5 million we invest in the NEA yields a return of $3.4 billion to the Federal Treasury. I know of no other investment we make that has played an essential role in our society for over 30 years. It is simply unfair to make any decision affecting its continuation—and in turn affecting the millions of citizens who benefit from NEA-funded programs—without the benefit of a vote by the entire House of Representatives.

This is not a parochial issue. All Members of this House recently received a letter from Americans United to Save the Arts and Humanities, an organization of business leaders, expressing their strong support for the NEA. The CEO of the Xerox Corp., the chairman and CEO of Sun America, Inc., the chairman and CEO of the Sara Lee Corp., and over 100 other business leaders endorsed continued Federal funding for the NEA as well as the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH]. As their letter explained, "The NEA and the NEH have each been valuable components in creating a healthy business climate. We value employees with a solid education in the arts and humanities. " Exposure to an arts education produces workers with such skills as analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical judgment—key elements to success in today's competitive global economy."

The letter went on to say, "We recognize the tight constraints of the Federal budget. However, there is a clear parallel between the Federal investment in culture and the willingness of corporations, foundations and individuals to support cultural activity." Business leaders know how important the NEA's contribution to the arts is to the success of our Nation in the global economy.

The Rules Committee's failure to protect the NEA against points of order is simply a ruse to prevent a majority of House Members from exercising their will on this issue. Arguments that the NEA should not be funded because it is, under Federal income taxes, represents the State and special jurisdictional funding which is unauthorized are disingenuous. As we all know, a lack of authorization never prevents this body from appropriating funds for any program, unless opponents of that funding need a handy excuse. In fact, a Congressional Budget Office report from January 1997 states, "The OJB is unaware of any case in which appropriations have not been provided for a program solely because its authorization has expired." In fiscal year 1997, this House passed appropriations for 121 programs which were unauthorized. Obviously, authorization is not an absolute requirement, but one that the majority applies selectively.

The Ehlers/Hunter amendment to retain funding for the arts in the Form of State block grants is an unacceptable substitute. Federal leadership and funding play the essential role in the effort to make arts available in every community to every citizen. The State arts agencies rely upon Federal leadership and direct funding of national initiatives to attract private, corporate, and foundation support to the arts, especially from funders who can be encouraged to provide matching support on a regional and national basis. As Representative ESHOO, a majority applies selectively.

I support the NEA because it's a solid financial investment, helping to generate $3.4 billion in Federal income taxes.

I support the NEA because it's a solid educational investment, lifting America to new levels of cultural endeavors and bettering our nation immeasurably.

And I support the NEA because it's a solid investment in America's cultural heritage, bringing art to communities throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the arts and the NEA by voting to defeat the rule before us.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule for the Interior appropriations bill because it doesn't waive points of order on funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Unless this rule is defeated, the House will never have a straight up or down vote on funding for this vitally important agency—a vote that NEA supporters would clearly win.

A majority of the House is ready to offer the American people a full chorus of beautiful art, but opponents want them to settle for someone singing solo in the shower.

I support the NEA because it's a solid financial investment, helping to generate $3.4 billion in Federal income taxes.

I support the NEA because it's a solid educational investment, lifting America to new levels of cultural endeavors and bettering our nation immeasurably.

And I support the NEA because it's a solid investment in America's cultural heritage, bringing art to communities throughout the United States.

Most of the Members of this body may not be familiar with Wave Hill but the residents of the Bronx are proud of this facility which encompasses 28 acres of gardens and woodlands overlooking the Hudson River. Dances for Wave Hill is a series of outdoor performances produced by Dancing in the Streets, a group specifically founded with the intention of introducing dance to new audiences.

You might wonder what is so objectionable about Dances for Wave Hill. Strange enough, some groups are angry that there is no subway stop in the garden so they have labeled Dances for Wave Hill as an elitist program.
It is time we took a good look at the campaign of misinformation which has been aimed at the NEA. The funding for the NEA is money well spent and I urge all of my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the House appropriations committee which does not allow a fair and open debate, and vote on the National Endowment for the Arts, I urge my colleagues to consider the words of Elliott Levitas, writer, attorney, former member of the Georgia House of Representatives and former United States congressman representing the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. 

CULTURAL WAR RAGES IN AMERICA–ALL GREAT CIVILIZATIONS OF THE PAST HAVE PROVIDED PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS

By Elliott Levitas

Proposals in Congress to abolish the relatively minuscule public funding for the arts, humanities and noncommercial public TV and radio lie at the heart of a cultural war raging in America.

In the face of charges of elitism, budget deficits and controversial subject matter, the real issue is whether there is a vital role for government to fund and support the arts in the private sector in promoting, preserving and transmitting American culture.

Every great civilization has provided public support for the arts and culture. Whether it was Egyptian, Babylonian, Greek, Roman, Spanish, French, British or whatever, these towering forebears of our culture all provided essential support for their artists, writers, thinkers, architects and dramatists, in addition to funds made available through private sponsorship by patrons.

The great art traditions of China, Japan, India and the ancient civilizations of Central and South America, all derived support and encouraged the government.

Societies which did not provide this institutionalized support did not attain the heights of great artistic creativity, nor pass the test of time.

Indeed, if we apply the "cost-benefit" test, and evaluate the Arts Endowment, in accordance with the Budget agreement worked out between the White House and Congressional Republicans, I will not support a measure that goes back on the promises made to the American people to protect our remaining open spaces through the Land and Water Conservation Fund or protect our limited assistance to the arts through the National Endowment.

The impact of this small program is immeasurable. Today, more Americans have access to the arts than at any time in our history.

If we want to avoid the errors of the past and benefit from our achievement, let us follow the path that all great civilizations traveled. Let our government continue its small, but essential role in providing the seed to ensure that our American cultural flowering will continue to find greatness and will be there for future generations as they enrich our lives today.

Let us follow the Greeks and not the Visigoths.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to advocate on behalf of full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

Mr. Chairman, the arts are the heart of our Nation and the NEA is the heart of the arts. Today, there are those who would rip out the heart of the artistic community.

Current funding for the National Endowment is the most modest effort. It accounts for less than 1/1000 of 1% of our Federal budget.

The impact of this small program is immeasurable. Today, more Americans have access to the arts than ever before.

Each year, the Arts Endowment opens the door to the arts for millions of school children, including many at-risk youth.

The few isolated cases of controversial art work are not an accurate representation of the thousands of grants the NEA gives out each year.

Must we burn the entire orchard if there are a few apples that are not to our liking?

Join me to help lend a voice to the painters and the sculptors, the singers and the musicians and the actors—the artists of this country.

Esteemed colleagues, I urge you to join me in opposing this rule.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule, and in opposition to H.R. 2107 without the changes necessary to ensure that the NEA continues to provide the seed money for the arts.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered to be asked for and recorded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 216, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—217

Aderholt, Collins

Archer, Goodding

Armey, Goss

Baker, Graham

Baldenberg, Grange

Baker, Greenwood

Barr, Greulich

Bartlett, Hall (TX)

Barlow, Hansen

Bass, Hastert

Bateman, Hastings (WA)

Bereuter, Hayworth

Blair, Hefley

Billakis, Herger

Bliley, Hill

Bilirakis, Hilleary

Bilmes, Holbrooke

Blunt, Hoekstra

Bono, Hostertiller

Boehner, Hulshof

Bono, Hunter

Bonilla, Ehrlich

Borgerding, Emerson

Brady, English

Bryant, Hyde

Burr, Jenkins

Burton, Johnson (CT)

Calahan, Johnson, Sam

Calvert, Jones

Calvert, Kasch

Campbell, Kean

Campbell, Kean (NY)

Campbell, King (NY)

Canady, Kingston

Canada, Cranston

Cannon, Clay

Capuano, Kuhl

Carbajal, Kolbe

Casale, Kolbe

Chabot, Kline

Chandler, Kline

Chandler, Knollenberg

Chaney, Koelling

Chappell, Kolb

Christensen, Largent

Coble, Latham

Coburn, Latham

Coburn, LoBiondo

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas have a quorum present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 216, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]
Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. RA-HALL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Pursuant to House Resolution 181 and rule X, the Chair declares the previous vote on the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2107.

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. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a spirited debate on the rule. I think for those that are watching from the gallery it has to be quite evident, and those that are watching on C-SPAN, that this is a democracy, that each person has the opportunity to be heard and present a point of view. But, after we have had these discussions, we go for- ward.

I hope that as we take this bill forward that each Member will look at it on its merits, determine as we deal with the amendments what is in the best interests of the 260 million people we represent.

This truly is a quality-of-life bill because much of what we do in this bill touches the lives of Americans, and I want to say at the outset I hope that in our dealing with this legislation that it will have the same great spirit of operation that I have had with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] over the years that we have served on this committee. He has been a partner, as I was to him in the years we have worked together, and he has been a great individual to work with, and, most importantly, to call my friend. And while occasionally we would have a difference, in every instance what we did reflected what we felt was in the best interests of this Nation.

This bill represents an important accomplishment on a lot of common objectives. Much of what is in here, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and I have supported not only this year but in years past, and I think on balance, over the years, we have developed legislation that has been productive for this Nation.

The bill totals $131 billion. It is a few million dollars less than last year. But we have continued to fund the programs that are important to the people and that is to enhance the quality of life in these United States. The bill provides significant funding for all the agencies under our jurisdiction, but I think basically we have tried to ac- complish a couple of critical objectives.

One is to meet a backlog in mainte- nance. We have had the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture and the directors of the land management agencies and many others, testify about the enormous backlog of prob- lems that need to be addressed in our parks, in our forests, in our fish and wildlife facilities, in the Bureau of Land Management.

Here we see a chart that outlines the enormous maintenance needs. I think it is very important that we make every effort to address that in legisla- tion, and we have done that. We have done this as a team effort, both with myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. This includes things like the Smithsonian, $250 million that needs to be spent there for mainte- nance; the Fish and Wildlife Service, $536 million, and my colleagues can see all the different agencies. But we have done it in a fiscally sound and an environ- mentally responsible way. Much of this maintenance is important to the protection of the environment in this Nation.

For example, in the Everglades we have fully funded the administration’s request for the restoration of the Ever- glades. This is so important to all people, and certainly it is a team effort because the State of Florida is making a strenuous ef- fort. They have financially the help in bringing the Everglades back to what they have been in the past, is a very important part of our Nation’s ecosystem, a very important part of our Nation’s environment.

We have continued and enhanced the recreation, individual work that the land management agencies. This started 2 years ago. Prior to that time, fees that were collected in the Park Serv- ices, the forests, the Fish and Wildlife
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Service, went to the Treasury and consequently there was no incentive to do so. Last year, with the support of this body, we gave authority to the various agencies to collect fees, but the important difference was they got to keep them, and this has been a very successful program.

We have had support not only from the agencies, but the public. They like the idea that if they pay a few dollars to enter a park, that the money is going to stay there and not be sent to the U.S. Treasury.

The program is working out very well. This year we have added a new change, and that is that fees that were under the old program, collected prior to the inception of the new program, still went to the Treasury. We changed that. So now a hundred percent of what is collected at the agencies like the parks and forests and so on will be kept in that service. Eighty percent will stay right where it is collected, and I think that is a great change.

For example, in the national parks it is estimated that in 3 years it will amount to $400 million.

Now we have encouraged the agencies in the language of the bill to use this money to address some of the maintenance problems that I have outlined here.

We began last year an emphasis on forest health because that is important; the suppression of disease, forest fire reduction, vegetation management, wildlife habitat and watershed improvements. The testimony in our committee was clearly in support of the enhancement of the forest health program, a couple hundred million acres, a vast resource and asset of this Nation, and we have addressed that problem in many ways throughout this bill.

Fire management has been given priority. We see it on our televisions, the forests are burning, and of course to avoid this problem we have to manage the forests carefully.

We have required the Forest Service to operate under a multiple-use mandate. That means forestlands are available for grazing, for mineral exploration. The multiple-use mandate covers, as I mentioned, grazing, mineral exploration.

It is an interesting thing that this bill is $13 billion, but the activities that are part of this bill get an estimated $9 billion in receipts. So we only have a net cost of $4 billion, and those are resources that belong to all the people that are being developed in the mineral exploration, offshore oil, many different sources that are part of producing $9 billion for the Treasury of the United States and for the people.

I visited the Angeles National Forest just outside of Los Angeles, and to see families out there, who are in part of a city of something like 20 million people, have the opportunity to recreate outdoors. The kids can see a deer, can see other forms of wildlife, perhaps drop a line in the creek and fish. One of the beauties of the national forests is that they are available for the multiple use, and if my colleagues go to a place like Angeles National Forest, right on the edge of this city, they will realize how important this is. And this is true all across the country; Allegheny National Forest, and many others that are available for people to use.

Now we are going to have an amendment to cut the Forest Service road program. We will talk more about that at a later time. I think the Members that are listening or watching this, do not be too quick to commit on that. I think there are some very compelling reasons to not vote for this cutting amendment because it goes to our ability to rebuild and maintain existing roads. It is a very important environmental use of these funds. We have been very careful in the way that we have allocated resources to the Forest Service, and the dollars that are there are going to be used very closely to help the recreation user. Something like 77 percent of the roads are used for recreation. And when individuals and families go out on these roads, we need to ensure that they are safe, that they are comfortable, that they can get access to the facilities, 18,000 different recreational facilities in the national forest, and people need access to those facilities.

The bill provides for the construction of very little bridge along these roads, less than 2 miles to be exact, not very much. Ninety-five percent of the appropriated construction dollars for roads go for safety, for environmental improvements to existing roads and to close roads.

We obliterates, wipe out, more roads than would be built. We are trying to make the roads that are there usable to the public for the many multipurposes.

I would point out that the forests have tripled the visitor days of the Park Service, three times as much, because people can participate on a wide variety of activities on forest lands. The forests are a family recreation facility, so a steelworker in Johnstown, PA, can load up the family on his two weeks’ vacation, go to Allegheny National Forest, know when he follows a road that the bridge is going to be safe, that the road is going to be safe, that his camper is not going to go over the side of the hill and that he is going to enjoy that experience, as 87 million other Americans are doing each year.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will look at this amendment with caution and carefully consider these points.

We have over 121,000 miles of hiking trails in the national forests. Money in the roads budget also maintains those trails so people are safe, so people can travel time, but let me say to Members to look carefully before they take away this ability to carefully manage our forests, to provide the recreation user, the people of this Nation, a good experience, before we do something that will inhibit people’s ability to use this land, which belongs to all 260 million Americans.

Much of the roads budget is for maintenance. We want to make sure these roads are safe, and things like guardrails are just one example. We recognize that there is a greater interest in maintaining the forest for recreation purposes. Ten years ago, in fact, less than that, in 1980, only $1 billion was provided for over 11 billion board feet of timber harvest. The bill today is a little over 3 billion board feet. We have had a reduction of 66 percent, from 11 to 3.8 billion, because we are trying to balance the timber program and other multipurpose uses of these lands.

I would also point out, because of the practices, and they started under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] of maintaining forest health, that we are growing each year, getting new energy sources. I think, as I mentioned in the debate on the rule, is vital to a nation. Just think about it. Clothing is just one example. A lot of it comes out of a barrel of oil, but that is a small item. Think about how our industries are impacted.

I remember some of the Members were here in the late 1970’s when we had petroleum shortages, and how jobs were lost, how schools had to close down. We do not want that to happen again. Therefore, it is important that we manage our energy resources carefully. We fund the research. We do not do this carelessly. Our energy research programs require matching funds from the private sector. If we are going to have a technological development program, we want the private sector to contribute their share, because that means that they believe in what we are doing.

As a result of this research, we are getting new energy sources. I think, looking down the roads, this becomes very important for this Nation. For us to have the kind of growth that will get that deficit down to zero, we have to have available a lot of energy. That means that we need to continue the R&D in our programs.

We have a tremendous supply of coal. I know there will be some who oppose and we have rescinded, in this bill, $100 million of clean coal money, but we
also keep what is required to fulfill our contractual obligations to those who have committed to participate on a 50-50 matching basis, or even a greater private share. The average has been 60 private, 40 public to develop clean coal technology.

What does it mean? It means that this technology will be sold not only in the United States but all around the world. We hear a lot about China these days. China today is burning more coal than the United States, and we burn a lot in this country. The electricity that lights this Chamber is coming from a pound of coal or a ton of coal, but in spite of the amount that we use, China is using more coal today than we are. Therefore, as we develop the clean coal technology we can sell this to China, because they are developing also an environmental movement.

Likewise I would point out that we have an interest in this, because if they do not develop and use this kind of technology, those emissions are going into the atmosphere and will have an impact on all of us.

I think what we are trying to do in this bill, is encourage research in alternate fuels, and the use of coal in a clean burning way, and the Department of Energy tells us that by 2010 we will have technologies that will allow us to burn coal that emits 10 times less sulfur and nitrogen than is allowed under the current law, that is twice as efficient as conventional power plants, and emits less than half as much carbon dioxide.

For example, this bill provides for research into low emission boilers. What does that mean? It means that the boilers that will be developed, and this is all in partnership with the private sector, will be far more efficient than the ones we use today in our utility industry. That means we can burn the coal in a clean way, and at the same time have a high degree of efficiency.

The programs leverage a lot of support from the private sector.

I want to mention a little bit about the NEA. I know this does not have a wide range of interest, but the Bureau of Indian Affairs is vitally important to the over 2 million American Indians. We have a responsibility, a treaty responsibility and a responsibility as a nation that cares, to do what is right by the native Americans. We increase the tribal priority allocation by $76 million over last year. Why is that important? Because this promotes and encourages local control. We are trying to encourage the Indian tribes to become self-sufficient, to develop their own economy, to provide ways in which they help themselves in education, in jobs, and become part of the American dream. So we say to the tribes who manage their own affairs, we are going to give you more money to make your own priority allocations. This is important to the people that you represent.

We have had the debate on the NEA. I do not think we need to talk anymore about that. I would just say to all Members, this is a good bill. We have been very fair in what we have done on projects. We had 2,000 requests from all the Members, from literally, I suppose, almost every Member, 2,000 different items that were requested by our colleagues to be put in the bill. We have done a lot of these. We have done as many as we could. We have done them on a totally nonpartisan basis. I did not count, but I suspect if we added up the administration's requests plus the requests from our friends in the minority, we have funded more of those than we have on the majority side.

We valued projects on their merits and not as to the source of the request. We wanted to make sure that we did what was fair and what was good for this Nation, what was good for the people; trails, for example, in the Continental Divide out in the Western part of the country, and I could go on and on in pointing out some of the very constructive projects that have been funded in this bill that will, again, as I mentioned earlier, enhance the quality of life of the people of this Nation.

I hope all Members will take some time to study the bill and understand what we have tried to achieve. We have tried to achieve better management, we have tried to achieve things that will be good for this Nation that make a lot of sense in terms of expending taxpayer dollars.

For the record I would like to note two technical corrections to the report as follows: on page 67 and page 74 of the committee report—House Report 105–163, insert the word “International” before “Arid Lands Consortium” and on page 37 of the committee report—House Report 105–163, the committee bill funding level in the table for “cultural programs” should be $18,699,000 and the language on page 38 of the report for “Cultural programs” should say “The Committee has provided an additional $135,000 for uncontrollable expenses.”

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a table detailing the various accounts.
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1997 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 1998 Estimate</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill compared with Enacted</th>
<th>Bill compared with Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, Bureau of Land Management</strong></td>
<td>1,195,645,000</td>
<td>1,121,539,000</td>
<td>1,128,538,000</td>
<td>-67,110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource management</strong></td>
<td>526,047,000</td>
<td>561,614,000</td>
<td>591,042,000</td>
<td>+64,965,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>59,256,000</td>
<td>35,921,000</td>
<td>40,256,000</td>
<td>-19,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation of the national park system</strong></td>
<td>1,154,611,000</td>
<td>1,220,325,000</td>
<td>1,228,325,000</td>
<td>+77,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Park Service</strong></td>
<td>37,976,000</td>
<td>42,063,000</td>
<td>43,904,000</td>
<td>+5,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation and maintenance</strong></td>
<td>36,121,000</td>
<td>45,612,000</td>
<td>45,412,000</td>
<td>-3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>182,744,000</td>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td>150,381,000</td>
<td>-3,353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and State Park Service</strong></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-779,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Park Service (net)</strong></td>
<td>1,435,656,000</td>
<td>1,568,900,000</td>
<td>1,564,062,000</td>
<td>+128,204,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys, investigations, and research</strong></td>
<td>740,051,000</td>
<td>745,388,000</td>
<td>755,795,000</td>
<td>+15,744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals Management Service</strong></td>
<td>156,985,000</td>
<td>157,822,000</td>
<td>189,821,000</td>
<td>+17,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oil spill research</strong></td>
<td>6,440,000</td>
<td>6,118,000</td>
<td>6,118,000</td>
<td>-322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Minerals Management Service</strong></td>
<td>163,395,000</td>
<td>164,040,000</td>
<td>145,739,000</td>
<td>-17,856,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Surface Reclamation and Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>94,172,000</td>
<td>93,209,000</td>
<td>94,937,000</td>
<td>+765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>167,058,000</td>
<td>177,349,000</td>
<td>179,624,000</td>
<td>+2,539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Office of Surface Reclamation and Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>271,757,000</td>
<td>271,057,000</td>
<td>275,061,000</td>
<td>+3,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of Indian Affairs</strong></td>
<td>1,443,502,000</td>
<td>1,542,305,000</td>
<td>1,526,815,000</td>
<td>+83,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians</strong></td>
<td>100,531,000</td>
<td>125,118,000</td>
<td>110,751,000</td>
<td>+10,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian Guaranteed Loan Program</strong></td>
<td>69,241,000</td>
<td>59,352,000</td>
<td>41,352,000</td>
<td>-27,689,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian Guaranteed Loan Program</strong></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,004,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs</strong></td>
<td>1,618,274,000</td>
<td>1,731,779,000</td>
<td>1,663,918,000</td>
<td>+65,444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental Offices</strong></td>
<td>37,458,000</td>
<td>39,494,000</td>
<td>40,494,000</td>
<td>+3,026,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Assistance to Territories</strong></td>
<td>65,188,000</td>
<td>67,214,000</td>
<td>68,214,000</td>
<td>+3,026,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2107) — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1997 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 1998 Estimate</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill compared with Enacted</th>
<th>Bill compared with Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compact of Free Association</td>
<td>10,038,000</td>
<td>8,445,000</td>
<td>8,445,000</td>
<td>-1,593,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory payments</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>12,050,000</td>
<td>12,050,000</td>
<td>-1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Compact of Free Association</td>
<td>23,538,000</td>
<td>20,495,000</td>
<td>20,495,000</td>
<td>-3,043,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Insular Affairs</td>
<td>58,726,000</td>
<td>68,675,000</td>
<td>68,675,000</td>
<td>-87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental management</td>
<td>58,286,000</td>
<td>58,286,000</td>
<td>58,286,000</td>
<td>58,286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Solicitor</td>
<td>35,443,000</td>
<td>35,443,000</td>
<td>35,443,000</td>
<td>35,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>24,438,000</td>
<td>24,500,000</td>
<td>24,500,000</td>
<td>-62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Indian Gaming Commission</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Special Trusts for American Indians</td>
<td>32,126,000</td>
<td>39,337,000</td>
<td>39,337,000</td>
<td>-7,211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Departmental Offices</td>
<td>240,020,000</td>
<td>246,225,000</td>
<td>236,953,000</td>
<td>-6,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title I, Department of the Interior: New budget (obligational) authority (net)</td>
<td>6,335,559,000</td>
<td>6,566,851,000</td>
<td>6,518,192,000</td>
<td>+182,593,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(6,355,559,000)</td>
<td>(6,596,851,000)</td>
<td>(6,546,192,000)</td>
<td>(182,593,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-30,000,000)</td>
<td>(-30,000,000)</td>
<td>(-30,000,000)</td>
<td>-30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on guaranteed loans)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td>-34,615,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

**Forest Service**
- Forest and rangeland research | 179,769,000 | 179,769,000 | 179,769,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- State and private forestry | 135,431,000 | 135,431,000 | 135,431,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- National forest system | 1,275,179,000 | 1,325,672,000 | 1,325,672,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- Wildland fire management | 562,311,000 | 562,311,000 | 562,311,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts | 99,999,000 | 99,999,000 | 99,999,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite) | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 |
- Rangeland improvement fund (indefinite) | 6,611,000 | 6,611,000 | 6,611,000 | -184,000 | -184,000 |
- Tribe, tribal lands, and Indian projects | 92,000 | 92,000 | 92,000 | 92,000 | 92,000 |
- Midewin national tallgrass prairie restoration fund | 3,549,000 | 3,549,000 | 3,549,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- Cooperative work, Forest Service | 128,000,000 | 128,000,000 | 128,000,000 | +7,858,000 | +7,858,000 |
- Total, Forest Service | 2,919,564,000 | 2,368,595,000 | 2,848,165,000 | -271,399,000 | +279,570,000 |

### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

**Clean coal technology**
- R&D | -140,000,000 | -153,000,000 | -100,000,000 | +40,000,000 | +53,000,000 |
- Subtotal | -140,000,000 | -286,000,000 | -100,000,000 | +40,000,000 | +186,000,000 |

**Fossil energy research and development**
- New budget (obligational) authority (net) | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | -100,000,000 | -100,000,000 |
- Subtotal | -30,000,000 | -30,000,000 | -100,000,000 | +100,000,000 | +100,000,000 |
- Total, Department of Energy: New budget (obligational) authority (net) | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | +100,000,000 | +100,000,000 |
- Appropriations | (1,132,000,000) | (1,144,000,000) | (1,131,000,000) | (1,131,000,000) | (1,131,000,000) |
- Rescissions | (140,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) |
- Deferrals | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) |
- (Transfer) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) |

### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

**Indian Health Service**
- Indian health service | 1,806,209,000 | 1,835,465,000 | 1,829,006,000 | +22,799,000 | +6,457,000 |
- Total, Indian Health Service | 2,054,000,000 | 2,122,000,000 | 2,086,318,000 | +32,318,000 | +35,682,000 |

### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**Office of Elementary and Secondary Education**
- Indian education | 61,000,000 | 61,000,000 | 61,000,000 | 61,000,000 | 61,000,000 |

### OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

**Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation**
- Salaries and expenses | 19,345,000 | 19,345,000 | 19,345,000 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 |

**Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development**
- Payment to the institute | 5,500,000 | 5,500,000 | 5,300,000 | -2,000,000 | -2,000,000 |
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2107) — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enacted</th>
<th>FY 1998 Estimate</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill compared with Enacted</th>
<th>Bill compared with Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smithsonian Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>316,492,000</td>
<td>334,557,000</td>
<td>334,557,000</td>
<td>+ 16,065,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and restoration of buildings</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>+ 11,000,000</td>
<td>+ 18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>58,000,000</td>
<td>-10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-56,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Smithsonian Institution</strong></td>
<td>371,342,000</td>
<td>428,407,000</td>
<td>388,407,000</td>
<td>+ 17,065,000</td>
<td>-40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Gallery of Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>54,281,000</td>
<td>53,699,000</td>
<td>55,637,000</td>
<td>+ 1,556,000</td>
<td>+ 1,938,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings</td>
<td>5,942,000</td>
<td>5,942,000</td>
<td>6,442,000</td>
<td>+ 500,000</td>
<td>+ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Gallery of Art</strong></td>
<td>60,223,000</td>
<td>59,641,000</td>
<td>62,079,000</td>
<td>+ 2,056,000</td>
<td>+ 2,438,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and maintenance</td>
<td>12,475,000</td>
<td>11,375,000</td>
<td>11,375,000</td>
<td>-1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12,400,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>-3,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</strong></td>
<td>24,875,000</td>
<td>20,375,000</td>
<td>20,375,000</td>
<td>-4,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>5,840,000</td>
<td>5,840,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-4,840,000</td>
<td>-4,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>82,734,000</td>
<td>119,240,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-72,734,000</td>
<td>-109,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching grants</td>
<td>16,760,000</td>
<td>16,760,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-16,760,000</td>
<td>-16,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Endowment for the Arts</strong></td>
<td>99,494,000</td>
<td>136,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-86,944,000</td>
<td>-126,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td>96,100,000</td>
<td>118,250,000</td>
<td>96,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-22,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching grants</td>
<td>13,900,000</td>
<td>17,750,000</td>
<td>13,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Endowment for the Humanities</strong></td>
<td>110,000,000</td>
<td>136,000,000</td>
<td>110,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-26,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Museum and Library Services/Office of Museum Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and administration</td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>23,380,000</td>
<td>+ 1,390,000</td>
<td>-2,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</strong></td>
<td>231,494,000</td>
<td>296,000,000</td>
<td>143,390,000</td>
<td>-88,104,000</td>
<td>-154,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission of Fine Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>867,000</td>
<td>867,000</td>
<td>907,000</td>
<td>+ 40,000</td>
<td>+ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,745,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>+ 200,000</td>
<td>-45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Planning Commission</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,745,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>+ 200,000</td>
<td>-45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission</td>
<td>5,360,000</td>
<td>5,740,000</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
<td>+ 310,000</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Holocaust Memorial Council</td>
<td>31,707,000</td>
<td>31,707,000</td>
<td>31,707,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title II, related agencies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority (net)</td>
<td>6,792,244,000</td>
<td>6,532,095,000</td>
<td>6,450,237,000</td>
<td>-342,007,000</td>
<td>-82,858,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(6,932,244,000)</td>
<td>(6,819,955,000)</td>
<td>(6,550,237,000)</td>
<td>(382,007,000)</td>
<td>(286,858,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission</td>
<td>(-140,000,000)</td>
<td>(-153,000,000)</td>
<td>(-100,000,000)</td>
<td>(+ 40,000,000)</td>
<td>(+ 53,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(220,000,000)</td>
<td>(209,000,000)</td>
<td>(-11,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(209,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title III - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>368,562,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority (net)</td>
<td>12,514,435,000</td>
<td>13,099,496,000</td>
<td>12,966,426,000</td>
<td>-546,066,000</td>
<td>-131,517,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(13,297,843,000)</td>
<td>(13,415,496,000)</td>
<td>(13,058,429,000)</td>
<td>(199,414,000)</td>
<td>(317,517,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(368,562,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recissions</td>
<td>(-170,000,000)</td>
<td>(-183,000,000)</td>
<td>(-120,000,000)</td>
<td>(+ 40,000,000)</td>
<td>(+ 53,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on guaranteed loans)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td>(34,615,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(220,000,000)</td>
<td>(209,000,000)</td>
<td>(-11,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(209,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management............</td>
<td>$1,195,648,000</td>
<td>$1,121,539,000</td>
<td>$1,128,538,000</td>
<td>-67,110,000</td>
<td>+6,999,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>$670,596,000</td>
<td>$687,923,000</td>
<td>$725,126,000</td>
<td>+54,530,000</td>
<td>+37,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service..................</td>
<td>$1,435,858,000</td>
<td>$1,568,920,000</td>
<td>$1,564,062,000</td>
<td>+12,204,000</td>
<td>-34,838,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Geological Survey.......</td>
<td>$740,051,000</td>
<td>$745,388,000</td>
<td>$755,795,000</td>
<td>+15,444,000</td>
<td>+10,407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Management Service...........</td>
<td>$163,395,000</td>
<td>$164,040,000</td>
<td>$145,739,000</td>
<td>-17,656,000</td>
<td>-18,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</td>
<td>$271,757,000</td>
<td>$271,057,000</td>
<td>$275,061,000</td>
<td>+3,004,000</td>
<td>+4,004,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs...............</td>
<td>$1,618,274,000</td>
<td>$1,731,779,000</td>
<td>$1,683,918,000</td>
<td>+65,644,000</td>
<td>+47,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Offices..................</td>
<td>$240,020,000</td>
<td>$246,225,000</td>
<td>$239,953,000</td>
<td>-67,000</td>
<td>-6,272,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Title I - Department of the Interior: $6,335,598,000 | $6,666,851,000 | $6,518,192,000 | +182,593,000 | -48,659,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Service......................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy..............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Health Service.............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Gallery of Art............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Museum Services........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission of Fine Arts............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust Memorial Council........</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, Title II - Related Agencies: $6,792,244,000 | $6,533,095,000 | $6,450,237,000 | -342,058,000 | -62,858,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE III - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L 105-18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total: $13,514,435,000 | $13,099,946,000 | $12,968,429,000 | -546,066,000 | -131,517,000 |
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to substitute, I was always a substitute, it seems like, for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and to talk a little bit about this Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want everyone here to know that I have enjoyed the 21 years that I have had an opportunity to work with the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. R. ALPH REGULA], who is the new chairman on this committee and has served for many years, and worked under the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. SID YATES] when he was chairman. We have a very good bipartisan committee that tries to work together on these important natural resource issues.

Obviously, many on our side today are quite unhappy about the fact that we did not or will not get an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the National Endowment for the Arts, but we have an up or down vote. We lost by one vote. Now we are going to consider this bill.

I also believe that there is a lot of good that comes out of this bill. The Interior Appropriations bill provides funding for the National Park Service. It does provide funding and has in the past for the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, for the Forest Service, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the Bureau of Mines, for many of the energy conservation programs and alternative energy programs of the Department of Energy. So this is a very positive piece of legislation.

It also provides funding, as I mentioned, for the Indian tribes in this country. It gives a trust responsibility to those tribes. It is a serious responsibility. We also fund the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Of course, we have had debates on this floor over the Endangered Species Act, I would say to my colleagues here, there is probably not a congressional district in America that has been more affected by the Endangered Species Act than the Sixth District in the State of Washington. I have seen the harvest on our forest where there go down by about 96 percent, maybe 98 percent, because of the requirements of protection for the spotted owl and the marbled murrelet.

The President’s forest plan is in place in the Northwest. We have received funding under this plan to try and do something about watershed restoration, watershed analysis, ecosystem protection and management. All of that comes out of the Interior appropriations bill.

I want to remember to know that I think we have an outstanding chairman and an outstanding ranking member in the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and an excellent staff that has done a lot of very good and positive work on this legislation.

One of the issues that will come up today is the question of forest roads. This is a very controversial issue. Last year we had a major debate on this issue in the House of Representatives. I want to tell my colleagues, I feel that I did not do as good a job on this issue last year as I needed to. We won, we prevailed, but I do not think I explained it as well as I should have explained it. I worked up a little chart here, I think like any colleague to see it. It is a small chart. I think they will understand what it is.

This program here lays out the Forest Road Program that we have for the country. Of that, of the money that is being spent this year on the Interior Appropriations Program, there will be 2,000 miles of road reconstruction. This is going out and fixing up existing roads so they do not cause environmental problems, so that they do not cave in, so there is no erosion, they have to replace the culverts. They have to fix these roads.

Then, there are only 480 miles, this is under purchase or credit, only 480 miles of new roads being built, and most of those roads are short roads into areas where there has already been timber harvesting.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate at this time, I want to read a statement from Secretary Glickman; the Forest Service is in his jurisdiction. It fits in with what the gentleman is saying.

I letter from the Secretary to me today says:

However, the $41.5 million reduction the administration proposes goes too far in eliminating important construction and reconstruction efforts that provide public safety and environmental benefits.

Mr. DICKS. Another point, Mr. Chairman, if we do not have roads, if we have got forest fires out there, we have got to be able to get the men and women who fight these forest fires into those woods. And the road program is much less dense than it is on the BLM lands, much less dense than it is on private lands.

This is done very carefully. This is not being done by J ames Watt. This is being done by the Clinton-Glickman administration. Jim Lyons, former staff member here on the Committee on Agriculture, is in charge of the Forest Service program. He is a committed environmentalist. He has said that the amendment that will be offered by Mr. KENNEDY and the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. PORTER] goes too far. It will cut into the reconstruction of roads. It will cause environmental problems, and it will result in the loss of 400 to 500 people in the Forest Service to be laid off. It is a meat-ax approach to dealing with this problem.

Then, of course, we have some small amount of roads that are built with appropriated funds, 165 miles of reconstruction. This is going out and fixing up those roads again, and only 8 miles with appropriated funds are used for new construction. And, in fact, down here at the bottom of the obliteration of roads, 1,500 miles of roads in those Forest Service lands are being taken out, the ones that are no longer necessary, and they are being taken out and replaced.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

He talked about the billions of board feet that we are going to lose in terms of timber production. That means also hundreds of thousands of logging families who are going to have no where-withal to pay their mortgages, send their kids to college, and do all the other things that any other family does in America as part of the American dream. This will be a devastating blow to a lot of working folks in this country.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the other point is, we have to import about 30 percent of our saw wood timber today from Canada. And what that means is they are going out and harvesting like crazy up in Canada to supply the American market, because we are not harvesting at historic levels off of our Federal lands.

I think, frankly, we had to make some reductions in timber harvesting. I am not opposed to that. What I am opposed to is that we have it done now to a level that I think is clearly sustainable, which we are going to have this amendment today that will even take it down further, which is going to drive up the price of lumber. And it is not well thought out. It cuts into road re-construction money in the name of cutting out money for new roads, and it just misrepresents the facts.

I have never seen, in my entire career, and I have seen a lot of distortions in my entire career up here, believe me, but this one, what this amendment says it does and what it actually does, there is more distance between this and anything I have seen. It is not right. I think a lot of Members here have been misled, and if they actually knew the facts they would be voting against this amendment.

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

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

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

He has just made a very lucid, factually substantiated statement, the best I have heard in years on this floor about the issues involved in this question of timber harvesting and the relationship with the road program. The gentleman represents a great saw timber area of the country.

In my district, we have pulp wood principally and we do not have the big saw timber trees, but it is as important a yield for our forests, for the pulp and paper industry and the particle board industry, as the saw timber is for the lumber and homeowner and home building sector of our economy.

Some time ago, very important to understand, we are talking about a sustainable yield, a renewable resource in forestry. We are also talking about roads that are used for other purposes than for timber harvesting. There are all sorts of recreational activities that take place on these roads, and they never get, those other uses rarely get charged for the cost of the road construction that is always attributed to timber harvesting.

I know in the forests in my district and in northern Wisconsin and in the upper peninsula of Michigan that we now have an above-cost operation; that is, the cost of the road is more than amply paid back simply by the cost and the value of the timber harvesting. And there are all these recreational benefits that follow upon the road program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Ninety percent of the utilization of these roads is for recreational purposes. I am sure the gentleman knows in the forests of Minnesota the same thing that I know in the Olympic Peninsula. This is where the people go to recreate, they go to fish, go to the wilderness, they go camping, hiking, they go hunting, fishing. They use this road system. This is not an evil, terrible thing.

What is evil, what is terrible, what is environmentally dangerous is not to sustain those roads. What is misunderstood here today is that most of the money that is being taken out, most of that money would be used for road reconstruction to fix up problem roads and make them safer so that they do not wind up blowing out and going into the stream, and replacing culverts so that salmon can get back up and reproduce. That is a big part of the cut that is in this budget today.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated the case exceedingly well. And I just say that those who are advocating this amendment do not have in mind the roads and their utility or their significance. They really believe in this roads harvesting program. I think we have a fair balance of sustainable yield management on the national forests of this country. We ought not to cut it or gut it by means of this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman, out in region 6, used to be the No. 1 timber producing area in the Nation, we have gone from about 4 billion board feet down to about less than 1 billion board feet and an 80 percent reduction, an 80 percent reduction. Hundreds of mills have gone out of business.

All we are saying is, can we not have a little balance here? Let us remember that this program provides recreation and opportunities that are different, and it is not just timber harvesting. I am asking my friends, many from across the country, look at the facts here, look at what Secretary Glickman said. Do not just be swept up because you are not backed up by certain groups. I just ask for fair and equal evaluation of the facts. Give us that. Look at it and hopefully we will have the right vote.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, along with the gentleman from Minnesota the other point is, here is a 2 by 4. Seven years ago it was 22 cents a foot. Today it is 44 cents a foot. What does that translate into? Two thousand dollars to $3,000 more for a frame house, and that means that young people will have an additional burden when they want to seek that first home, because the forest cut has been so reduced. This saw foot comes out, a lot of it, from our national forests.

Mr. DICKS. That is why the home builders have made this one of their most important issues. They are very concerned about what the gentleman, the chairman has pointed out. We have created this shortage. When we create a shortage, we drive up the price. And so we are trying to do this fairly. We are trying to do it on a sustainable basis. We are trying to make sure that the money is used for demolition and for fixing up troubled roads. But with this amendment, we are taking away a huge part of the money that is there to fix up troubled, environmentally dangerous roads, and this is just because I am afraid the people who are offering this amendment do not serve on this committee and do not talk to the Forest Service and do not understand the complete implications of what they are doing. Their intent may be pure but what happens is not.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a very distinguished and productive member of our subcommittee.

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

I certainly want to congratulate him for a very hard effort, well-deserved applause in connection with this bill and certainly to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] who worked very hard on this bill as well. And the staff. I think we too many times overlook how hardworking the staff is to try to put this all together and get it to the floor and keep track of it all.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be part of it because it has been a pleasure to work on this bill. It protects our natural resources. Even though it is funded below last year's level, it keeps our Nation on track to achieve a balanced budget. So the time was difficult to try putting the numbers together, even though they are below last year's, to meet the priorities of our Nation and protect the environment but also protect our natural resources.

I am a member of a number of programs in this bill that needed increase. I want to call particular attention to a few of the highlights of the
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bill as they affect my region of the Pacific Northwest.

The National Park Service is an important agency to many Americans. It is going to receive a $78 million increase in funding, making it the third straight year that this committee has increased park operations.

The chairman also included a provision that allows parks and refuges and forests which participate in the recreational fee demonstration program to keep 100 percent of the fees, not to send them to Washington, but to keep them in the location in which they will do the most good. This is going to benefit Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area in my district. It is a new fee demonstration participant. We are going to keep a lot of those fees and use them to improve really the commercial activities and the maintenance activities that are necessary within the park itself.

We are going to also achieve a tremendous backlog maintenance problem in our parks, and that program will assist in that regard.

The native American programs in this bill are increased. The tribal priority allocation which was mentioned by the chairman is increased by $76 million. This funding goes directly to the tribes, directly affects my district in the Pacific Northwest and it bypasses the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I think that is a good approach.

I am at this bill does not meet the President's request in the area of Indian health because Indian health care's inflation is well above the normal inflationary rate, and for too long the native American population has been a low priority for the administration and the Congress and their health needs. I hope the other body will increase this funding level.

What I want to say, too, most importantly, following up on the debate that we have just had here and the discussion on national forest public lands, over the last 3 years we have spent an unsustainable $2.3 billion fighting fires on our national forest lands.

That is unacceptable, but that is due, in my judgment, to the fact that we have diseased forests and we have unmanaged forests. That is unacceptable. Should be to all Americans.

As a result of this, we have seriously addressed in this bill the issue of improving forest health. Disease suppression, forest fuel reduction, vegetation management, watershed improvements and reforestation have all increased. This is a good environmental bill.

With regard to the timber road issue that is coming up, I urge my colleagues do not be persuaded by some outside group that is going to score this bill by an amendment that is coming up is going to hurt the small operator. It will not hurt the big operator. It will hurt the small operator. And that will do damage to the forest health and the multiple use concept in our national forests.

Remember that about 80 million visitors go into the national forests and use the forest roads that are currently in place. And we are obliterating forest roads by a ratio of 4 to 1. Four times as many are obliterated as those that are built.

So Members should be very careful about this amendment because it is a red herring and we should not be persuaded by it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, I express my appreciation to the hard work and leadership of its chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and also to the very distinguished ranking member. Serving on this subcommittee, one gains an even greater appreciation of this body. I will experience when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] retires. So I thank him for his leadership.

I also want to recognize the professionalism of the staff on this bill. Debbie Weatherley, Loretta Beaumont, Chris Topik, Joel Kaplan and Angie Perry. Barbara Wainman, the chairman's personal assistant, Curt Dodd, and of course Del Davis, who has to assume a Herculean load, given the fact that the minority staff are so few in number with so many responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman has said, this is clearly one of the most important subcommittees in the entire Congress. We have some very controversial issues, though, and we are going to spend most of our time on those controversial issues. But it should be emphasized that there are some very fine things in this bill. For example, $136 million increase for the Everglades; a $78 million increase for the national parks; $42 million more for operating the Fish and Wildlife Service.

There are a great many needs within those organizations. I will not take the time now to go into them, but we are addressing those needs. There is a $16 million increase for natural resource science research by the U.S. Geological Service. These things go unmentioned because we focus exclusively on the controversial issues.

Thirty-one million in program increases go to native Americans. Very much deserved. The Indian Health Service will bring more Indian health care to communities. In fact, we are providing modular dental units on reservations where dental services are sorely lacking.

But, of course, there are some deficiencies in this bill, at least in my opinion, and in the opinion of the ranking minority member. Weatherization assistance is an example. I wish we could do more in the way of weatherization assistance because we decrease it by over $30 million.

Remember that because I have a background in cold cell research, I think, has a great deal of potential, which may not be realized because we are cutting back on that almost entirely. That has potential for meeting the clean air standards.

Most important of all we are going to focus on the NEA and it needs to be focused on. It should be restored to its existing level of $99 million.

The value of the logging subsidy to private timber companies is over $250 million a year. The taxpayer foots this bill to build roads in forest areas 87 percent of which would otherwise be uneconomical. They've built 378,000 miles of road. Fifty percent more road than in nonforest service lands roads that cause landslides, erosion and silting of our rivers. Enlargement to the arts deserves to be funded. Private timber companies don't.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting now that we have come into this interesting bill, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has done some super work on, and a lot of people, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], have worked very hard on this particular piece of legislation. I think it is interesting that most of us who campaigned on the idea that we do not want any tax increases, we are against tax increases, if anything we are going to balance the budget this year, we come up with an amendment that is pending that is called the Kennedy-Porter amendment which, in effect, is going to raise taxes indirectly on every American.

How is it going to do that? Well, one thing, those of us who come from the West, I hope people realize that last year there were more fires in our public lands across America than any time in history, and that cost over $1.2 billion to fight them.

I am a member of the Committee on National Security and we have requests from the Forest Service, BLM, and every firefighter: Give us some of those old airplanes; we want to convert them to tankers because we have to go in and fight those fires.

So they are going to save $41,000, according to this amendment. At the same time we are going to spend billions and billions of dollars and we are going to decimate the West. There goes the West, the West, the West.

And yet when we want to go in and kill the pine
beetle, which is taking them out, no, here comes these same environmental groups saying, oh no, you cannot do that, and they put injunctions on it.

Now, the professional foresters came in before the committee I chaired for a few years ago. If we do not kill the pine beetle by taking that section out, they will kill every tree in here. And if they kill every tree, that beautiful green forest becomes toothpicks. And then they say and we will have a flood and the roads we will have to clear. And then they say we will have a sure bet we will have a flood. And then they say it will take Mother Nature 200 years to bring it back to the way it was.

So why did we not just go in there when we had the opportunity and take care of that infestation of pine beetles? Now, because we could not go in there and do that, we now have what we call a fuel load. So we have a fuel load in America heavier than we have ever had. Why do we have the fuel load? Because we cannot go in, we do not have the roads, and we cannot thin the forests. We cannot take down all these downed fuels.

So what do we have? We have fires. And we can count on it. The best people in America are saying that we will have more fires in America this year than we have ever had. So we are going to spend millions of dollars fighting the fires when we could have the roads that the people could go in.

What about these young people that want to build homes? The gentleman from Ohio talked about the increase. I remember in 1967 when I built a home for me and my wife and my family that I thought was wonderful, and I looked at the 2 by 4’s and they were 83 cents apiece. I bought some 2 by 4’s the other day and they are $4 apiece. Now, there goes the cost up.

Keep in mind what we will do with this amendment from Porter and Kennedy. First, we are going to raise the taxes of Americans rather substantially; second, all the people will not be able to use them, and 90 percent of it is used for recreation and, third, we will burn the West. So let it burn, my colleagues, and vote for this amendment they have here; do not let it burn and vote against the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a member of the committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I too, would like to express my great respect for our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. REGULA] and our outstanding leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOGLIETTA] and I am very strongly in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in a nation of such wealth and cultural diversity, it is a tragic commentary on our priorities that we are here today debating the elimination of the National Endowment for the Arts, an agency that spends less than 40 cents per American each year. One of the standards by which we judge a civilized society is the support we give to the arts. In comparison to other industrialized nations, the United States falls woefully behind in this area, even with a fully funded NEA.

But let us be honest, my colleagues. This is not a fight over money. The Republican leadership wants to eliminate the NEA because they are concerned about artistic expression in a free society. This battle is not about defending the values of mainstream America, this is about pandered to Pat Robertson and the Christian Coalition. The Republican assault on the arts, on cultural expression itself, is an outrage and it must be defeated.

Polls overwhelmingly show that the American people thank the Federal funding for the arts because students, artists, teachers, musicians, orchestras, theaters, dance companies across the country benefit from the NEA. For many Americans, whether they live in the suburbs or the rural areas, the NEA is critical in making the arts affordable and accessible.

If those reasons are not compelling enough for some, let us just talk dollars and cents. Because for every $1 the NEA spends, it generates more than 11 times that in private donations and economic activity. That is a huge economic return on the Government's investment, and we certainly do not need to be from New York to see the impact of the arts on a region's economy.

Instead of debating this issue on the merits, the NEA opponents delight in telling sensational stories about objectional projects. Let us be very clear on the facts. Out of more than 112,000 NEA funded grants over the past 30 years or so, 450 were controversial. That is less than 0.04 percent of all grants.

Moreover, under the very able leadership of Jane Alexander, the NEA has restructured the grant process to ensure the mistakes of the past cannot be repeated. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Ehlers-Hunter amendment and preserve the NEA.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to request a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] regarding the status of ongoing restoration work at the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to address the gentleman from Pennsylvania's concerns about this important work. And I might add also that if the gentleman saw the chart of backlogged maintenance, this is a classic example of how we have neglected to maintain an extremely valuable resource of this Nation.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, recla...
subcommittee. I appreciate his fine work in bringing this legislation to the floor. And I join my colleagues in expressing great esteem for our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for the great tradition that he brought to this Congress of support for the arts and support for preserving our national and natural heritage as well. It is indeed an honor for every one of us who serves in this body to call him “colleague.”

So it is with regret that I rise to oppose this amendment that will come up later, the Ehlers amendment, and hope it will not be part of this legislation at the end of the day.

As I am fond of saying in this Chamber, there are so many fig leaves around here that it is beginning to look like the Garden of Eden. Today’s fig leaf is the Ehlers amendment, which is supposed to give cover to those who voted to eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts, but alas, it is a transparent fig leaf.

It is interesting to me that, in the course of the Committee on Rules debate and debate on the floor, our Republican colleagues said that we had to eliminate the $99 million in funding for the NEA because it is a fig leaf. Now, hiding behind the transparent fig leaf, the Republicans say that we can vote for $80 million through the Ehlers amendment. It is clear that this is not about reducing the deficit; it is about content restriction; it is about conformity instead of creativity.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMENDARIZ], the distinguished majority leader, when he spoke earlier, said that the Ehlers amendment would put more Crayolas in our children’s hands. Yes, and that is just about it. The Ehlers amendment would amount to about $1 per child for the arts.

Do we not want more for America’s children than the Crayolas the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMENDARIZ] wants more for his new grandson, who was born yesterday? I am pleased to welcome him to the grandparent’s club, the best club there is. Let us hope that our grandchildren can express themselves freely. In order for that to happen, we should reject the Ehlers amendment and bring back the NEA.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ehlers amendment.

The Ehlers amendment. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS].

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleagues that there are many positive features in this bill. But I am particularly sensitive to its cultural institutional components, and here the bill deserves a mixed review.

I am pleased that funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities is being sustained, not in abundance, but at current levels. On the other hand, I lament what is happening to the National Endowment for the Arts.

What is most troubling about this, in my judgment, is that we here in the Congress have taken on the role of art critic. The critical judgment about what is good or what is bad art, and the electorate has not asked us to do that.

I am also extremely bothered by the large, devastating cuts to the Wilson Center down the street. The Wilson Center is a distinguished center. It would be extremely short-sighted if we were to destroy this very excellent research center.

Mr. Chairman, my first contact with Congress came more than a decade ago when I testified on behalf of the arts and the humanities, and I gave my testimony to the committee directed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who is now my colleague.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has given years of distinguished service to our national cultural institutions, and I want to say that I am so honored to be working at his side.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentle- man from Ohio [Ms. PERRY], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PERRY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], for yielding me the time, and I rise in opposition to the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

This amendment eliminates funding allocated to the forest road program. But this program builds, improves, and maintains forest roads. Those who support the amendment argue that the forest road program provides a subsidy. I respectfully disagree.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend to my colleagues this piece of literature prepared by Price James, the American Forest Resource Council. This road program does not contain a subsidy for timber purchasers and provides an efficient and effective mechanism for financing road construction and reconstruction.

These roads are an important tool used to manage the resources in our national forests. Just last August, a staffer of mine spent 14 days fighting wildfires in Oregon. It was the forest roads that provided him and other firefighters with their sole access over land to the safety of their fire camp 6 miles away. Without such roads, access over land would have been next to impossible, causing a great loss of both time and energy.

But if you seek access for our wildland firefighters that is important, these roads also provide access for our resource managers and foresters, hunters, fishermen, and those who just want to take a walk in the woods.

I urge Members to look past the political rhetoric that many groups would have you believe, and support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentle- man from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. He and I worked on this bill many, many years. He knows it thoroughly. And, for the most part, I think that this bill reflects good judgment on his part.

In view of the fact that the bill and the rule have killed NEA, I will not support the bill. In many respects it is a good bill. It provides additional funds for building our parks, our natural resources, but it devastates almost equally important cultural programs.

I mentioned what it had done to the National Endowment for the Arts. And although it gives its approval to appropriations for the National Endowment for the Humanities, it kills the Woodrow Wilson Center, which I think has done good work over the years, and it suspends work on the Museum for the American Indian. We have been waiting year after year after year for our museums to be supported by the people who first inhabited this country.

So, Mr. Chairman, again I pay my tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. I look forward to working with the Senate to add some important and critical elements to this to the cultural aspects of it; and I hope that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will work with me in that respect.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I will use my last minute to announce what I have been advised, and that is that the leadership advises that they would like to work to between 10 and 12 tonight.

The objective would be to finish by 2 p.m. tomorrow, and I think we can easily do that if we work until that time.

We will probably roll votes until about 7 p.m., and then after we have done that group, we will roll again for a couple hours. So this, I think, will give the Members an idea of what the rest of the evening will be like as far as the schedule and we can anticipate for tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I just close by saying this is a good bill. I hope all of our colleagues will look at it as we go through the various amendments and then on final passage.

Mr. ENNSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment to H.R. 2107. This amendment would increase funding for the payments in lieu of taxes (PILT) by $19 million. These payments help defray the costs of law enforcement, fire prevention, and search and rescue, and infrastructure needs to the counties that must provide these essential services, yet do not have the revenue stream normally provided by private property tax collection.
Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Interior appropriations bill in its current form. It shortchanges the Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF]. It shuts down the National Endowment for the Arts. And it is packed with irresponsible government subsidies such as the timber roads credit and the untested and untested special breaks for clean coal technology. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to address the threats faced at the Federally owned lands.

Thankfully, we have some opportunities today to fix some of these problems and send the President legislation he can sign.

My colleague from California [Mr. MILLER] plans upon offering an amendment that will restore the commitments the leadership made to the President on funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF]. This amendment will provide for critically important land exchanges: the New World Mine in Montana and Headwaters Forest in California. Some of my colleagues oppose these purchases, and I respect but disagree with their views. But that is not the point. The point is that this provision was part of the budget deal that this Congress agreed to with the President. There are a lot of aspects of this budget agreement that this Congress likes, and this budget agreement with, but I, along with more than 300 of my colleagues, supported the budget agreement when it passed on this floor. As Members supported the budget deal the Congress/Clinton compromise, it is only reasonable to have a reasonable compromise to the same. Specifically the commitment to increase the LWCF by some $700 million, that is the Miller amendment that will be offered in good faith and in accord with the budget agreement.

Similarly, the bill in its current form shuts down the National Endowment for the Arts. A number of my colleagues insist on making inflammatory, and I'm sad to say inaccurate, statements about the NEA and its priorities. The fact remains that most of the money we spend on the arts goes to providing cultural experiences for children in communities across the Nation who would not otherwise enjoy such opportunity or experiences. The President, furthermore, has indicated that he will veto this bill if Congress does not restore funding for the NEA.

Instead of standing on the unadulterated public interest, this House should continue funding the NEA at previous levels. This would have been a compromise. While I and a number of my colleagues would like to strengthen our commitment to the arts, I recognize that this is currently not likely. So I am willing to face reality and move forward with the legislative program for our Nation. I would have hoped that those who disagree would at some point be willing to do the same.

In addition to these important amendments, we will also consider adding the Klug-Miller-Foley amendment for Guam. This provision was included for the social and educational costs of Free Association between the United States and its former territories of Free Association, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, and the Republic of Guam, that can freely migrate to Guam under the provisions of the Compact of Free Association between the United States and these nations. Appropriations to reimburse Guam for the impact of the Compact are authorized under Public Law 99–239. In the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 1997 [P.L. 104–134], 6 years of partial reimbursement for Guam was included for the social and educational costs of this migration. I am pleased that H.R. 2107 again includes $4.58 million as partial reimbursement to Guam. I would like to thank Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member YATES for their leadership on this issue and for working to fulfill this important Federal obligation.

H.R. 2107 also includes an additional $1 million for brown tree snake eradication research as requested by the administration. This program is vital for efforts to control this non-native species which has decimated Guam’s indigenous bird species and is the cause of countless power outages.
Throughout the island, I thank Chairman Regula and his staff for their willingness to take a serious look at this problem and understand the ongoing and potential impact of this uncontrolled non-indigenous species. I am also pleased that technical assistance to the territories has been increased by $1 million to approach a more adequate level and has remained separate and distinct from funding to control the brown tree snake. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues and the other body to see that all of these important provisions remain intact.

Mr. DAVE SCHAEFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to note a matter which is of great concern to myself and the members of the Commerce Committee on both sides of the aisle. H.R. 2017, contains language which would allow the sale of approximately 10 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The legislative language in H.R. 2017 changes existing law regarding the drawdown of the SPR, and violates House Rule 21 which prohibits legislating in an appropriations bill. Yesterday the Rules Committee to issue a rule which did not waive points of order against this language. Unfortunately, because of some miscommunications, the rule waived the point of order and an objection was made to the unanimous-consent request to move to the rule.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the point of order which would lie against this provision was waived. However, I have spoken with Mr. Regula and Mr. Solomon about this and I understand they will work with me to see that this language is removed at conference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

Amendments printed in House Report 105-174 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, are debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, are not subject to an amendment, and are not subject to a demand for division of the question.

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 Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business and that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The Clerk reads as follows:

H.R. 2017

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 FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1998, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, NAMELY:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interest 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 96-467 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a); 581,991,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,043,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-467 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which $3,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4606(a)); and of which $5,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 1998 subject to a match by an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for challenge cost share projects supporting fish and wildlife conservation affecting Bureau lands; (additions) to the Mining Law Administration program operations, 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 $581,991,000; and in addition, not to exceed $5,005,000, to remain available until expended, from annual mining claim fees, which shall be credited to this account for the costs of administering the mining claim fee program, including the costs of administering communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities: Provided, That appraisals which are not available for the destruction of unhealthy, unadapated, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire use and management, fire preparedness, suppression operations, and emergency rehabilitation by the Department of the Interior, $280,103,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $5,025,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: Provided, That such funds are also available for fire and forest management service and fire suppression operations from other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 3469(a), are not eligible for hardship subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of the colloboration with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. As the gateway for more than 12 million immigrants between 1892 and 1954, Ellis Island holds a unique place in our Nation’s history. More than 90 million Americans trace their roots to Ellis Island, and 1¾ million visitors from around the world tour the island every year.

Unfortunately, some parts of the island are not receiving the attention they deserve, and last month the National Trust for Historic Preservation included the south side of Ellis Island on its annual list of the 11 most endangered historic places in the United States.

The south side of Ellis Island consists of more than two dozen buildings that served as hospital wards during the first part of this century. These buildings have great historical significance. In fact, the cure for pink eye was discovered there.

Due to years of weather-related damage, however, the hospital complex is seriously decayed. Roofs are caved in, walls are crumbling, and in some buildings stalactites of lime hang from the ceiling. These buildings are literally falling apart, and allowing them to decay beyond repair would be a national disgrace.

I am very pleased that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has included report language in the bill at my request that directs the Park Service to come up with an immediate plan to stabilize these buildings. I also want to reiterate my hope that, working with the Senate, we may be able to find a small amount of money in the bill to begin basic emergency repairs in the future.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for her interest and efforts. Ellis Island truly is a national treasure that has desperate needs for construction repairs.

Unfortunately, the Park Service construction budget is severely constrained by its overwhelming backlog of critical maintenance projects, $570 million, as our chart showed, which consists of serious public health and safety issues.

Should the Senate provide funds for the project, and if the other priority construction needs are met, I will give serious consideration to supporting the project. It is a good project and deserves support. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] to ensure the project’s successful completion.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman. We really owe it to the memory of our ancestors and for the benefit of future generations to preserve these buildings. I am very appreciative of the chairman’s support for getting us on the path to do just that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk reads as follows:
Mr. CARDIN. I understand the presence of the gentleman from Ohio under this year and particularly that the Park Service's fiscal year 1998 construction budget included two extremely high cost projects, but the Fort McHenry project is also a priority and is in danger of being cut off in the middle. The Senate allocation is more generous than the House numbers. Should the Senate provide funds for this project, can I ask the gentleman to support the funding construction at Fort McHenry?

Mr. REGULA. Fort McHenry is one of this Nation's great historic treasures. Were the Senate to fund this project and if the other high priority needs for construction are met, then I would support this moratorium to supporting the project. It is an important project and deserves funding. I look forward to working closely with the gentleman from Maryland to ensure the successful completion of this construction in a timely and efficient manner.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy, but before I do, I want to commend the chairman and the subcommittee for placing a moratorium on the acceptance and processing of mining claim patent applications made under the Mining Law of 1872. By the continuation of this moratorium, I think the subcommittee expresses the view of the majority of the Members of this body, if given the opportunity, they would vote for a comprehensive reform of the Mining Law of 1872.

While I do commend the Committee on Appropriations for continuing this patent moratorium, I think it is important that we be up front in recognizing that this provision is only a Band-Aid that will not staunch the hemorrhaging of the public's mineral wealth under the Mining Law of 1872. Radical surgery is what is required. I hope that one day we will get around to doing that.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill provides $4.5 million for grants to the eight heritage areas designated by the Omnibus Parks Act signed into law last year. Of this amount, three heritage areas are to receive the maximum amount allowed under this law: $1 million each, because the committee has determined they are further advanced. That leaves $1.5 million for the remaining five heritage areas.

Is the committee's intent for the National Park Service to distribute this funding roughly evenly among those five heritage areas, with no area receiving less than $200,000?
Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REGULA. That would be the intent of the committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and commend him for his work on this bill as well as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks], the ranking minority member.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for engaging in this colloquy with me regarding the heritage areas, an initiative that I know he and the members of the committee have long supported and supported very strongly.

I would like to speak particularly of the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor in my State of Rhode Island as well as the bordering State of Massachusetts. This is one of the real examples of State partnership between Massachusetts and Rhode Island that we have. I also want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McGovern] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Neal] as well for their long work on this issue.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Regula] for the manner over the years in which he has treated the Blackstone funding priorities. It has been very encouraging and he has been more than generous with his time as well as his support of this project. I know that since I represent the town of Blackstone that this really commemorates a remarkable part of the manufacturing history of America. I am delighted with his pronouncement today that he will support us on the Senate side when this legislation goes to conference.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Neal]. This is a real example of us working together on a bi-State issue, but one that pulls us all together because of the nature of the heritage corridor.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGovern. I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding to me, and I want to associate myself with his remarks as well as the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Neal]. The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor is a crown jewel of the National Park Service and showcases our natural resources while preserving the history of that area. I want to also express my deep gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Regula]. We genuinely appreciate his consideration of our comments regarding this subject, which is of tremendous importance to not only Rhode Island but Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I want to thank both my colleagues from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficult choices the chairman and the members of the committee are faced with, but I want to discuss with the gentleman the fact that this bill provides no construction funds in fiscal year 1998 for the Blackstone Corridor.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Regula. I understand the gentleman's concern.

I, however, want to point out that the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Project is one of the flagships of our national program. It has set a standard. Let me assure the gentleman that our decision had nothing to do with the competitive nature of this support for the Blackstone Corridor. The National Park Service has a $5.6 billion backlog of major priority construction projects; $575 million of that deals with critical backlog maintenance, needs such as failed water systems, broken sewer lines, deteriorating utilities, unsafe dams and other major health and safety projects. I might add, as I said in the opening statement, we are very sensitive about the backlog maintenance problem.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I appreciate the gentleman's position and I know the committee's support for the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Corridor. I have the chairman's sensitivity to the notion of passing the bill last year as we did during the last Congress and putting some of the construction funds in place, but then it is sort of analogous to building a house but not completing it. We do not want the State to jeopardize this project by not following through on our commitment to it as we did through the authorization bill last year.

Should the Senate allocation in this year's bill be more generous than the House number and should the Senate provide the funds for this project, can I ask the gentleman as chairman and the members of his committee to consider supporting this project once again as he has done in the past?

Mr. Regula. I would advise the gentleman were the Senate to fund this project for fiscal year 1998 and if the other priority needs for construction are met, I very much hope that we can provide the construction funding for the Blackstone Heritage Area. It is a good project and it deserves strong support. I do look forward to working closely with the gentleman from Rhode Island and the other two gentlemen that spoke to ensure the ongoing success of this project.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. We certainly appreciate the chairman's consideration and look forward to working with him for the success of this project, which means a great boon to our area in northern Rhode Island and Massachusetts as well, which has seen a great growth in jobs as a result of this wonderful model project in this corridor. What a heritage corridor can do for the economy of a given region, I want to thank the chairman for his work on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended, (31 U.S.C. 6901-07), $113,500,000, 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 NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS AND MR. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. Sanders and Mr. Sanders

Page 5, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $19,000,000)."

Page 59, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $47,500,000)."

Mr. Sanders. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment which is being introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bass] and myself does two important things that most Members of this body agree with.

First, it deals with the very serious problem of underfunded mandates, of forcing citizens in close to 2,000 counties in all 50 States to pay more in local property taxes than they should be paying because the Federal Government has fallen very far behind in its payment in lieu of taxes on federally owned lands. This amendment addresses this problem by increasing payments in lieu of taxes by $19 million, from $113.5 million to $132.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, I should add here that this amount is exactly the amount authorized for fiscal year 1995, when Congress passed the reauthorization for PILT in 1994. In other words, this amendment provides what the Congress promised cities and towns all over this country 3 years ago that we should be doing. We made a commitment, we should honor that commitment, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, the PILT program was established to address the fact that the Federal Government does not pay taxes on its own land.

These Federal lands can include national forests, national parks, fish and wildlife refuges, and land owned by the
Mr. Chairman, despite an increase that was granted 3 years ago in the PILT authorization levels, the actual appropriation has been kept at a very low level, resulting in a revenue shortfall to local communities in real terms. For fiscal year 1997, for example, local governments will receive only 60 to 70 percent of the payment level which was set in the authorization. This amendment would begin to address this unfunded mandate by increasing the payment in lieu of taxes program to where it was in real terms 10 years ago.

The formula by which payments in lieu of taxes are determined is a complex one, and each property is treated somewhat differently, but on average, on average, if this amendment passes, each local government would see a 17 percent increase in PILT money, and that is a significant advantage to thousands of communities all over this country.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion recently about evolution and our concerns for local communities and local government. It is high time that the Federal Government accepted its responsibility to do right by local communities.

Mr. Chairman, the $47.5 million that we are using for these purposes, in other words, deficit reduction and increasing PILT payments to local communities all over America, would be transferred from the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program. According to the report of the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution which passed the House last year, the Republican resolution, and let me quote from that, and I quote:

The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the oil crisis in 1973 triggered this activity. Returns on this investment have not been cost effective, particularly for applied research and development which industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technologies in fossil energy research program that once the technology is developed, the Government is out of it. We do not spend any money on commercialization. Once it is proven successful in the laboratory, then it is up to the private sector to take over from there.

I simply say that to point out that we have tried to make these programs very efficient. We have restructured the program so that we are not committed to large costly demonstration projects. But my colleagues have to remember that this country relies on fossil fuels for the majority of its energy requirements and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. That is coal, oil, and natural gas. This is what makes this Nation great; this is what drives this economy.

I think one of the great advantages our Nation has over our European competitors is low-cost energy. It is reflected in the fact that we have a 4 percent growth in the economy. In 1997, we hope that the deficit will be down under $50 billion. But to do that, we have to keep research in fossil fuels, we have to ensure that in the future we are going to have the advanced technologies that will allow us to use our fossil energy sources in a very efficient and environmentally sensitive way. To date, some of the critics contend that we should put more money into alternative energy sources and abandon research on traditional energy, the energy resources that fuel our economy, but I think that does not make sense given the realities of today's economy and the importance of fossil fuel.

I think that a lot of this research is designed to reduce the environmental impact of the use of fossil fuels because realistically that is going to be our energy source in the foreseeable future. And if we want to leave for future generations the opportunity to have the same quality of life that we have had, we have to ensure that we can use fossil fuel in an energy-efficient way and that we can use it in an environmentally safe way.

What does that add up to? It adds up to research which improves the technology which develops new fossil fuel technologies which reduce emissions, which use energy more efficiently, and it creates jobs at the same time we explore the alternative energy sources.

We have done that in this bill, and I think it would be as much in terms of this Nation's economy to take money out of this fossil research program. It will cost $47.5 million from research to provide $19 million more for PILT. It would be nice to give these additional credits to local counties. We have done that while trying to stay within our allocation. But to cut our fossil energy research program would be very shortsighted in the long haul, and for that reason I have to strenuously object to this amendment.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sanders-Bass amendment which would restore much needed funding to the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program, PILT Program, payment in lieu of taxes.

Each year thousands of counties across this Nation lose out on millions of dollars in property tax revenue simply because the Federal Government owns the property. While the PILT Program was established to compensate for this fact, it is woefully underfunded. Since it was adopted in 1976, the PILT Program has neither kept pace with its authorized funding levels, nor with the true costs of providing services in support of the Federal lands.

We have repeatedly tried year after year to increase PILT payments, and unfortunately there is never any money for the PILT payments. And, as I said, it has not kept pace with the funding levels, the authorization levels, and that is why there is strong support of the Sanders-Bass amendment. But if my colleagues take a look at it from an equity point of view, local governments have a right to be compensated for untaxable land which is owned by the Federal Government within their jurisdiction, for providing services to Federal employees and their families, and to the users of the public lands. PILT funds are used by these communities for important programs such as education, law enforcement, emergency search and rescue, fire and emergency medical services, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, there are many counties where the Federal Government is the largest land owner, and our school districts cannot even afford to build a school because most of the land is encumbered by the Federal Government and is nontaxable. Therefore we do not even have a tax
base to put forth a school system and to maintain a school system.

Therefore I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for equity by voting in favor of the Sanders-Bass amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the balance of his time to me, and I hate to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOYLE], but I am going to do a colloquy in a few moments. But bottom line is the program that we are talking about here is corporate welfare. That is what the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program is, and that is not just my opinion. I remind the Members that it was the 1997 budget resolution of the Republican party which said, and I want to repeat this:

The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the energy crisis of 1973 triggered this activity. Returns on this investment have not been cost effective, particularly for applied research and development which industry has been doing. Some of this activity is simply corporate welfare for the oil, gas and utility industry.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote from the Congressional Budget Office:

In the area of fossil research and development, commercial firms already spend a great deal of money to develop new technologies. The major new technologies that enhance recovery, for example, have come from private industry, not DOE.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important point to make, and I want the Members to hear this:

Among the beneficiaries of the petroleum research and development program are some of the largest multinational energy conglomerates in the world, including: Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, ARCO and Shell.

When kids around the country cannot get an education because this land is their land, the public land is not paying taxes, payment in lieu of taxes, should these major multinational corporations be the industries that we are subsidizing? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, this project, the fossil energy program, is being targeted as one of the dirty dozen corporate subsidies by the Stop Corporate Welfare Coalition, which includes National Taxpayers Union, Taxpayers For Common Sense, Progressive and Citizens Against Government Waste.

Mr. Chairman, this concept is supported by progressives and conservatives and people in between. Let us stop subsidizing large multinational corporations that do not need taxpayer money. Let us help local communities all over America get the payments in lieu of taxes that they need.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I rise in support of the amendment before the committee this evening, and I want to certainly thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior for having crafted a bill that has created more headaches than I would ever want to have in a given week.

The question here really is, as he puts it, a question of priorities. There are over 2,000 counties in this country in 40 States, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] said 50 States, that suffer as a result of chronic underfunding of the payment in lieu of taxes system in this country. The amendment that my colleagues have before them today will not only buy us time to fix the PILT issue but also the deficit reduction.

Now, as other speakers have mentioned this evening, communities with significant Federal lands cannot collect the same kinds of property taxes as communities that do not have Federal lands, and as has been mentioned before, the Federal Government moved to create a system whereby payments will be made in lieu of property taxes, but these authorizations and these commitments have been chronically underfunded.

In fact, today the Federal Government only pays a little more than 60 percent of what they are obligated to pay. What is the result of this? The result is that we have for communities in the affected areas a Hobson’s choice. Either they can disproportionately increase taxes in order to meet their funding obligations, or they can provide fewer services: education, fire, and other services that are so necessary for communities.

I would not be standing before the Members today concerned with this amendment if it was not for the fact that this is a question of equity and fairness. We are talking about adding $19 million to the $132.5 million, which would bring the funding level up to what it was supposed to have been in fiscal year 1995, when I entered Congress.

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

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to rise in support of this amendment and thank my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for the excellent work they have done with the amendment.

I would just like to take a moment to underscore the important point the gentleman has made, that this is about inequity, it is about meeting our commitments, meeting the commitments that we originally made, and that by putting that forward, $19 million to make up some of this difference, we move with a system that is fairer, one that helps us meet our commitments, and one that provides a lot of these towns with property tax relief, because so many of them rely on their property base for the taxes that they use to pay for municipal services.

So while I would like to commend the chairman for his work in putting together this bill, I would like to lend my support to the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from Vermont, and encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that if we were to fully fund the PILT program in fiscal year 1998, we would have an obligation of $224 million. We are talking about $132.5 million, so we are certainly not asking for everything that is really due.

I just want to conclude by saying that this is a bipartisan amendment. Any time the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and I are producing an amendment together, Members can be sure it is bipartisan. It is an issue of fairness, an issue of giving what is due to the towns, giving the towns what they are due. It is not full funding, as I said a minute ago, but Mr. Chairman, it is a step in the right direction.

If Members support equity, if they support help to communities that need assistance in funding for critical services in areas where there are Federal lands, please support the Sanders-Bass amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is attempting to increase funding for Payment In Lieu of Taxes, which is not necessarily a bad initiative, but he seeks to do so in a very reckless manner. The fossil energy program is one of the least understood and most important at the Department of Energy, supporting important cost-shared research and development activities to ensure energy resources we use the most cleaner and cheaper.

This also enhances our energy security as these resources are our most abundant domestic sources of energy. The Energy Information Agency has predicted that we will continue to rely on these resources and these sources of energy for over 85 percent of our energy needs well into the 21st century.

Additionally, any commitments the United States makes for cooperation with a global climate change will necessitate that we find ways of reducing emissions without crippling our economy. Thus, it is vital that we maintain this
modest commitment to cleaner and more efficient energy.

Over the last several years fossil energy has undergone significant downswinging, roughly 10 percent each year. Now is not the time to seek additional cuts to this program. R&D work is conducted throughout the United States by a wide range of small and large companies. This amendment calls for an across-the-board cut, which in no way takes into account the needs of specific programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, in Minnesota if a private citizen fails to pay his or her property tax bill within 7 years, they lose their property. The Federal Government is 20 years behind in keeping up with its payments to the counties of northern Minnesota and elsewhere around this country under the terms of the Payment In Lieu of Taxes legislation.

Twenty-five years ago, as a staff member for my predecessor, J ohn Blatnik, who served in this body, I helped write the language that became the Payment In Lieu of Taxes law that is in place today. As a Member, I have worked to keep it in place, to expand it, to update it. But it has not kept pace with the needs of the counties in which these great Federal landholdings are located, and it has not kept pace, by any means, with inflation.

These are lands held in public trust for all Americans to enjoy, and they do come from all over the United States to enjoy the land of northern Minnesota, the boundary waters, canoe area, the Voyageurs National Park, Superior National Forest, I can go on with several others, and I will not name them. But who is stuck with the bill? When the accident happens on the highway between Duluth and Grand Portage, MN, up in Cook County, it is the Cook County sheriff's department that has to come to scrape the bodies off the highway. It is the Cook County hospital that has to stay open 24 hours a day to accommodate them, in a little county of 3,600 people, 94 percent of the land in public ownership, most of it Federal, and they do not have the resources to sustain the total needs of that area and all the tourists who come from all over America to enjoy this land, and then they say, well, take care of our health needs, take care of our safety needs, take care of our requirements, law enforcement requirements, while we are in your midst?

All of America holds these lands in trust, and all of America should help pay the bill. We have not kept pace with the demand. That is what this amendment simply does.

It is unfortunate, I say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, that it comes out of a project or out of a resource or a fund that benefits a resource in his district. That is the budget economy we are dealing with. I also happen to have iron ore mining and manganese deposits in my district, and the research conducted by the Bureau of Mines was terminated. The Bureau of Mines in Minnesota was eliminated under this budget economy of ours. That is unfortunate.

But this is an obligation of all Americans to those who live in the area where we took land and said we are going to hold it in public trust. Let us take St. Louis County. We could put the whole State of Massachusetts into St. Louis County; not all of the people, but the geography. Some people might say, that is a good thing; not the folks in northern Minnesota, however. That is how big this county is, 3,000 miles of county roads that have to be maintained on this little county budget.

All we are saying is increase, increase the funding under this Federal program to help this county take care of search and rescue, law enforcement costs, lost hikers who are out there in the Superior National Forest who need help. Someone has a fishhook in their eye in the Boundary Waters canoe area, they have to be treated in the Cook County Hospital, or in the Cook Hospital in St. Louis County.

Sanitary enforcement, planning and zoning, health services, groundwater, surface water, all of those are needs that the county has to attend to, and they do not have the resources to deal with it. All we are saying is help them keep pace.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, let me pick up on a point that the gentleman has made. In 1980 in real dollars PILT payments were $1.8 billion. Today they are $113 million. It is the communities and the children and the citizens of those communities who are suffering. I just wanted to reiterate that point.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that elaboration.

We are simply making an appeal for fairness, those of us who represent areas with large land jurisdictions in Minnesota, Vermont, and elsewhere, who have to provide services. Those communities who have to provide services.

Sanitary enforcement, planning and zoning, health services, groundwater, surface water, all of these are needs that the county has to attend to, and they do not have the resources to deal with it. All we are saying is help them keep pace.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking our chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, for his outstanding work he has done on this major piece of legislation and involvement in working with all of us. We commend him for that.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases payments in lieu of taxes funding for counties and schools by $19 million, to $132 million for fiscal year 1998, while at the same time reducing the Federal deficit by $29 million. More than 20 years ago this Congress recognized the serious inequity created in areas containing a high percentage of Federal property. Since the Federal Government does not pay taxes on its own property, these areas were left without any source of funding to provide infrastructure for local schools and county services.

In 1976, we attempted to correct this inequity and provided funding in the form of payments in lieu of taxes, or PILT payments. However, since providing these payments, this Congress has failed to fully fund the PILT Program. Each year 1,789 communities in each of the 50 States lose needed Federal payments due to the failure of the Federal Government to appropriately compensate these communities for lost property tax revenue on federally owned lands. The Sanders-Bass amendment corrects this shortcoming, and provides an increase of $1.86 million of necessary funding for the communities in my State of Vermont.

To put this amount into perspective, many of the areas that will receive this funding were recently under water when the midwinter storms caused severe flooding. In January, the State of California suffered approximately $1.8 billion in damage. Each of the 10 counties in my district were declared a natural disaster area. The $1.86 million in PILT payments is sorely needed to rebuild after this serious disaster.

There are other reasons, however, to support this amendment. This money goes directly to local schools and rural counties who can least afford a loss of funding. In one California county, recent funding losses have forced the school district to cut out extracurricular activities, including sports and field trips, food service for one of its elementary schools, library services, two-thirds of its transportation services, all fine art programs, teacher training courses, a school nurse program, and all capital expenditures.

If these same cuts had been made in urban and inner city areas, lawsuits would have been filed and service levels undoubtedly have been necessarily restored.

Mr. Chairman, today we heard a lot of discussion over the need for Medicare and the need to provide medical services for our elderly residents. Before any of our citizens can receive Medicare or Medicaid assistance they first must be able to have roads to travel on to get to the hospitals, ambulances to carry them in when needed, and hospitals to go to. By underfunding our rural counties, it is forced these counties to cut back on county services. These county services include road maintenance, ambulance service, search and rescue, law enforcement,
snowplowing, bridge maintenance, hospitals, and all local ground support for maintenance of Federal lands.

If the county services were to go away, the Federal Government would not have an infrastructure in place to service the Federal lands. When visitors get lost on public lands, it is the county search and rescue that comes to their aid. When visitors to public lands need police protection, that need is filled by county services.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Sanders-Bass amendment because it gives necessary assistance to counties otherwise left without a source of funding. I urge my colleagues to vote for public schools and county services by supporting this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if we are engaged in a comparison of the size of the counties that we represent, I would like to enter my entry in the contest. My good friend, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Sanders], and I represent San Bernardino County, which is larger in size than the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, and Massachusetts combined.

Both of us, while we support the PILT program, oppose the offset provision that is contained in this amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Sanders].

May I stress that while the support for this amendment deservedly is bipartisan, the opposition is also bipartisan. I would like to make that very clear.

Let me say in case there is any doubt about it that my very large county is probably about 75 percent owned by the Federal Government, and we benefit as much from PILT payments as any other county in the United States, probably considerably more because we are the largest county in the United States. And if there was any way that we could provide adequate funding for this program, other than taking it out of research programs which I have been supporting for the last 30 years, I would be very happy to support this amendment.

But I want to make it clear that the target for funding the PILT program is not a proper target. If there is any question about the value of energy research and specifically fossil energy research to this country, we ought to dispel it. This country has had a flourishing, developing, expanding economy because we conducted research on energy technologies of all kinds, beginning with the atomic energy program in World War II, and I have been involved, of course, with that program which preceded the creation of the Department of Energy.

Now, what can we say that would elevate the priority for energy research? I have tried to defend these research programs over the years in every way that I could. I think all of you know that according to most economists, half of the economic growth in this country, the incremental product, stems from investments that we make in research. We make it in solar energy research; we make it in fuel cell research. We make it in all kinds of research. And we support a multitude of research programs because he would say they are corporate welfare. The biggest corporate welfare. The corporate subsidies. They are corporate welfare. I happen to know a lot about corporate welfare. The biggest corporate welfare program in the world was the oil depletion allowance, which provided a very healthy subsidy to a very profitable industry over very many years until we woke up to the fact that it really was corporate welfare and we eliminated it.

These programs of cost-shared research, in which the role of the Federal Government is frequently only 5 or 10 percent, leverage the most important investments by the private sector that can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Brown of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, we should be proud of the fact that these shared research programs exemplified by the fossil energy research programs have contributed as much as they have. Have they all been successful? No. Over the last 25 years, I could give my colleagues a long list of those which did not produce and which were canceled, sometimes without being completed. Much of our nuclear program could be criticized. We have got nuclear plants around the country that were built but never used. My good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] has some in his area. But do we regret the fact that we spent money to develop the world's best reactor? I hope not. The nature of research is that you get some winners and you make a few losers once in a while. But if you do not continue to make the investments, you will never make progress.

I will stand in every case where an offset is made from public research to support a worthy program and oppose it, much as I would like to support the worthy program. We are cutting at the lifeblood of this country's future when we begin to take out the funds for this offset from research programs of any kind.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by expressing appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Regula] for the fine legislation that is before us, but I would like to say a few words in support of the Bass-Sanders amendment and give an example from my own district.

Last fall, as many of my colleagues know, President Clinton, with a few quick words and the stroke of a pen, created the massive Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in southern Utah. Contained within the 17 million acre monument are two counties in Utah, Kane and Garfield Counties. Thousands of tourists are now flocking to this area because it has been advertised in virtually every travel magazine in the country and the burden of those tourists falls squarely upon the 10,000 residents of those two counties.

These small counties have excruciatingly small tax bases. Garfield County, for instance, is 98 percent owned by the Federal Government. Yet every local resident must now pay for the costs of law enforcement, search and rescue, trash pickup, and other services incurred by tourists to the monument. That is fundamentally unfair.

Since we as Americans own the land, the Federal Government, not the residents of Kane County or Garfield County, should pay those bills.

This amendment is an important incremental step toward placing more of the costs of Federal lands where they belong, on the Federal Government. I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on the Sanders-Bass amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern they have for PILT.

Let me point out to my colleagues that we put in $12 million more than was requested by the President in his
budget. We recognize how important this is to those who have Federal lands, and for that reason we increased the PILT program $12 million over what the President requested.

But, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] pointed out, the cost of fossil energy research and development is also an important program. And we have, over the years, developed synergetically advanced technology, as has been stated many times. We can burn coal more cleanly and efficiently because of the fossil energy research effort. For every barrel of oil we produced, we have left two in the ground. And we have invested millions of dollars under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] in developing technologies to recover these resources.

The reason we have cheap fuel in this country, the reason our economy is the strongest in the world, is in part because we have readily available energy resources and that is the result of the things that we have done in the past in fossil research, a result of the committee, the Committee on Science, having the vision to authorize these programs.

We have another problem. That is, we are broken contracts, but we have contractual obligations. If we take $47 million out of the fossil research program, we are going to breach contracts. We are going to have lawsuits against this government.

We have already reduced the fossil program 30 percent. So let me say, and I endorse what the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] said, PILT payments are, but this is not the place to take the money because we want to keep those jobs, we want to keep this economy strong. We will not get to a balanced budget unless we have growth in the economy. Energy is the lifeblood of this nation. It is critical to continue to develop these advanced technologies to lead us to the next 100 years.

And let me say, too, in our fossil research programs, we have insisted on cost-share participation from the private sector. This is not a giveaway. And one of the reasons these programs have been so successful is because the private sector is involved with their own money.

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

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman is saying. As I pointed out in the general debate, this bill is less than last year, not much but it is less and, therefore, we simply cannot do all the good things we would like to do. But I think to take money out of the fossil research programs is vital. These are contractual relationships. The government, the United States Government has a responsibility to complete these contracts because the private sector has invested its money, and to suddenly pull the rug out from under them would be not only unfair but could be very costly in lawsuits.

Far more important, if this nation is to continue to grow, to have jobs, to continue to be a world leader, we need to develop the fossil energy resources so we can use them in an environmentally safe way, we can use them at a low cost to our economy; and certainly we have a responsibility to do so. The President is attempting to do so. That, again, emphasizes how important research on fossil energy is to the future of this nation.

If we are to meet these new more stringent standards on air quality, we have to continue the fossil research programs. As the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] pointed out, I do not quarrel with the PILT program. That is why we increased it $32 million over the President's budget request. But I think to take money out of the fossil program would be a serious mistake in terms of the future of this nation.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words from the request of the gentleman from Vermont.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for the outstanding work that he has done on this budget. I applaud his efforts. We just disagree on this issue.

This is the bottom line. It is not complicated. You have heard it from conservatives and progressives, Democrats, Republicans and Independents. This is tripartisanship. The issue is that we have 1,700 communities throughout the United States who are not receiving fair compensation from the Federal Government.

In fact, in 1980, in real dollars, they were receiving then $180 million in PILT payments. Today it is $113 million, significant reduction in PILT payments.

In terms of the fossil energy research and development program, what we have got to ask ourselves is whether or not we are subsidizing Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips, Shell, and those are profitable multinational corporations. I frankly do not think they need these subsidies. I would simply point out that opposition to the fossil research program is widespread from conservatives, from progressives. It was targeted as one of the quote unquote dirty dozen corporate subsidies by the Stop Corporate Welfare Coalition which includes the National Taxpayers Union, not necessarily a progressive organization, I do not get a terribly high rating from them, Taxpayers for Common Sense, USPIRG, Citizens Against Government Waste.

The choice is clear. Do we stand up for the kids who are not getting adequate education throughout this country because of lack of Federal payments, or do we stand with some companies that really do not need the subsidies. I would urge a "yes" vote for the Sanders-Bass amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, in a brief colloquy.

I first want to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Ohio and his staff and the ranking member and the staff of the minority for the tremendous effort they have put forth in bringing this legislation to the floor. I realize the many challenges that they have and the many needs that we have throughout the Department of the Interior and the demands on Interior appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment to increase funding for the National Park Service for a project in my district known as Seminole Rest, a historic site renovation project at Canaveral National Seashore. Although I will not offer that amendment, I strongly support efforts to develop this site in a manner which preserves both its resources while making them available for public enjoyment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope and understanding that the gentleman will work with me and the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior to help preserve and develop this project, Seminole Rest at Canaveral National Seashore.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his
comments and I would be pleased to work the gentleman and with the National Park Service to find appropriate means to address the problems at Seminole Rest.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman and I will submit a more lengthy statement, a complete statement, for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern that we may miss an opportunity to save a resource of great significance to both my State of Florida and our Nation—Seminole Rest, located at the Canaveral National Seashore. This 26-acre site sits on the edge of Mosquito Lagoon in one of the last pristine environmental preserves along the East Coast of the United States. On this property are located three cultural resources; a shell midden known as Snyder Mound as well as two historic buildings; the Instone House and the Caretaker's House.

Seminole Rest holds archaeological resources which reflect periodic occupation over a period of about 2000 years. In fact, Snyder Mound is one of the most significant and unique shell middens in the United States. This midden contains the remains of shellfish and other refuse discarded by prehistoric Indians who inhabited the site as early as 800 AD and may represent as much as 700 years of prehistoric occupation. The two historic houses are significant for their design and integrity, and have been located on the property since before 1890. On March 19, 1997, Seminole Rest was listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

I strongly believe we should be acting to develop Seminole Rest in a manner which preserves its resources while making them available for public enjoyment. Additional property north and south of Seminole Rest should be acquired both to act as a protective buffer and to provide for an interpretive display—one which would trace the history of the Indians who inhabited the site. Further space exists for marine life exhibits, limited public boat-launching facilities and boat tours from Seminole Rest to Canaveral National Seashore.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, despite the obvious archaeological and historical significance of this tremendous resource, Seminole Rest today lies in a state of abandonment and deterioration. Despite the obvious potential of Seminole Rest, the two houses on its property are in desperate need of repairs and restoration. And with many other shell middens lost over the years to erosion and construction, Snyder Mound is one of the last sites of its kind and may be lost as well. However, I am concerned that the appropriations bill before us today lacks the critical funding which would permit the National Park Service to act to save this resource.

Today I had intended to offer an amendment to provide an additional $2 million to the National Park Service for operation and maintenance so that it might act to save Seminole Rest. I will instead withdraw my amendment and have agreed to work with both my distinguished colleague, Chairman REGULA, and with the Service to ensure that we preserve and develop Seminole Rest as a national and historic resource.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 15, insert:

PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES

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: $42,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Miller of California:

For expenses necessary to carry out section 205 of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, $42,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his reservation of his point of order.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the record.

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

There was no objection.

The purpose of this amendment which I am offering is to try to reinsert into this bill, the legislation that is before us, the $700 million, for the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the acquisitions that were discussed within the Committee on the Budget and within the budget agreement agreed to between the committees. The President and the President of the United States.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, as most Members understand, was intended by Congress to provide the resources to protect, enhance, and expand our Nation's parks, wildlife refuges, public lands and forests. The trust fund has accumulated some $12 billion and is growing at the rate of nearly $1 billion a year.

So when the conferees to the budget agreement provided for priority land acquisitions of some $700 million, they were not being fiscally irresponsible at all. What they were trying to do is to get this Congress to meet its obligation to the people of this country to make sure that the legacy of this country with respect to the greatest of our natural resource assets, our parks, our refuges, our wilderness areas and those areas yet waiting to be acquired is preserved.

The other is in the Headwaters Forest in northern California, where we have one of the last remaining stands of old growth forests, of redwood trees, that clearly the Nation has made a decision they would like to preserve. Certainly the people of California recognized that these forests deal about the heritage of this country and the importance of those forests to the American people.

Again negotiations have been entered into, including the State of California, the Federal Government, this administration, Members of Congress to try to come to an agreement for the purchase price. This $700 million would allow these two purchases to go forward and also providing additional money for other purchases and priority projects within the agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that some people who perhaps do not know as much about the priorities and the needs of the Park Service got involved in suggesting to the committee maybe where this money should have been spent, and they would have been better off not doing that. But I am also terribly afraid that we will lose the opportunity to have this money be used for this purpose should this bill go forward without this amendment to it, and we will lose the opportunity both for the acquisition of the Headwaters and of the New World Mine and the backlog.

It is interesting, as we told Members we were going to offer this amendment, a great many Members have called our office saying could they be included. That is not our purpose in offering this amendment. That is a proper question for the Committee on Appropriations; that is just saying that I offer this amendment in the spirit of many of the Members who are on the floor today with deep concern about our natural resources. That is not to in any way minimize the struggle and the work product of this committee, because this committee has been handed a menu of desires by Members of Congress on an urgent basis and the committee simply does not have enough money to meet those. So I say that because I think this committee has done an outstanding job. I just would hate to lose the opportunity that this money within the budget agreement provides us.
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate first of all the chairman's leniency here, and I want to compliment my friend from California for bringing this issue up.

Our committee struggled with this issue. A decision was made not to put the money in at this point. I happen to believe, and I hope that by the time this bill is done that we will have the $700 million then.

I had the chance to visit northern California, the redwoods myself, just a few days ago during the recess. I wanted to see this Headwaters area. And I think it is absolutely essential that we move forward. Others are more expert on the Yellowstone issue.

I know our chairman had concerns about the backlog of maintenance and other things and, hopefully, we can work out something in the conference committee on this issue if the gentleman's amendment is stricken. I regret that it will be, I think it will be, but I think bringing up this issue is very, very important. I hope at the end of the day we are able to acquire these properties and make the progress which I know the gentleman and many of us would like to see accomplished in this Congress.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks, and again I hope that people understand the spirit in which this amendment was offered.

I appreciate the chairman reserving his point of order rather than making it at the outset so we would have an opportunity to discuss a matter which is obviously very, very important to those of us in California, but I think also to many of our colleagues, as we struggle to provide for the backlog of acquisitions and maintenance and repair to the public resources in this country.

I want to again commend the chairman. I wish I could have stood up and had a colloquy with the gentleman, because everyone was doing so well in these colloquies, but, unfortunately, I only had an amendment so it has not worked out quite as well as I wanted it to. But I appreciate the gentleman's reservation and allowing me the time to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] still reserve his point of order?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Perhaps the gentleman would like to exercise a point of order.

With respect to the $700 million that was negotiated, I do not think anyone in this room was part of that negotiation, but the $700 million, wherever it came from, is restricted to land acquisition.

The problem I have with this is that we are looking at this backlog of unmet maintenance needs of $14 billion. We look at construction projects, and we have heard of them today. Frankly, Indian facilities are a tragedy. What a happy and sad story. That is no open to schools and hospitals on Indian reservations is a disgrace. There are so many unmet needs. And today, when the United States already owns nearly 30 percent of the Federal land, I do not think it makes good sense to proceed to commit another $700 million to the purchase of enormous additional acreage. Before we start buying more, let us take care of what we have.

Most people realize that almost one-third of the United States is Federal land. And on those lands and on these facilities we have this $34 billion in unmet needs, $34 billion of neglect. To go out and buy land, I think, would be a mistake in judgment and in establishing priorities, which we have to do on this bill.

Now, I would point out to the gentleman from California, he mentioned the New World Mine and the Headwaters area, but there is no environmental impact statement at the moment, there is no current appraisal, there is no habitat conservation plan, there has not been a hearing in our committee and there is no comprehensive overview.

The President told us earlier this year that they did not need us. They did not need the Committee on Appropriations; they were going to handle this under FLPMA by exchanging lands and giving the owner of Headwaters a building in Los Angeles and so on. Then, suddenly, they discover they need money.

Let me point out again that priorities-wise we have a lot of other things: failing sewer systems at Yellowstone and Glacier, unsafe access routes at Cape Cod, at Eisenhower, at Shenandoah, leaky roofs at the native American schools in Oklahoma, Maine, and Arizona, condemned kitchens, ineptative plumbing in Washington and Arizona in detention facilities, fire hazards, deteriorated dams and levees, endangering habitat and public recreation, erosion of water control structures, 100 abandoned mine shafts and the list goes on, all a great danger to the people of this Nation.

Priority-wise, to spend $700 million, adding to the 30 percent of America we already own would be a serious mistake in the face of all these needs that face us.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Perhaps the gentleman would like to exercise a point of order.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that I think he is making a terribly important and valid point and that is why I alluded to, in my remarks, that I wished when the deal was cut they had spent some time with people who had spent most of their legislative life dealing with these issues and a better package could have been put together.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] suggested there may be an opportunity over the life of this bill to get some of this money included, and I would hope it would be. I also hope it would be included with the full input of the Committee on Appropriations so that we can go to where the priorities are. I would say that there is a lot at stake both with respect to the New World Mine and the Headwaters.

I would also just say that the United States recently won a very important court case that said that we owned the lands that were contested off the coast of Alaska, and it is about $1.5 billion. I have introduced legislation. I would hope this committee would take a look at whether or not that money could be put into restoration and the backlog that has so troubled the chairman and the rest of us. Because the gentleman's priorities are exactly right, but somehow we have to find the money to deal on both fronts, both with acquisitions and with the standard of care we owe the American people with the current resources.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the problem here, under the Land and Water Conservation Fund legislation, we do not have an authorization to do backlog projects with that money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman is in a position on the authorization committee to help us solve that problem. That would be, I think, a good change, and we could have a balance between new acquisitions and taking care of the backlog. I think that would be a very good outcome here.
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I know it is one the chairman, I think, thinks is the right direction to go.

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to speak for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the
The distinguished gentleman from Ohio, that will be lost without action geared species and their habitat. It is a forest ecosystem that protects endangered species and their habitat. It is a long-waited goal that is vital part of our northern California Headwaters Forest. This is an extremely vital part of the Great Basin ecosystem that protects endangered species and their habitat. It is a long-waited goal that is now before us, and it will be lost without action now. We do not want to risk this great, unique wonder of nature, because once lost, it is lost forever.

I would also say that in addition to my own area that I am interested in, I think the New World Mine property is an important acquisition because it would threaten Yellowstone National Park if we could not do that. But, as I say, the gentleman is quite correct, he was not appropriately approached for this appropriation because at the time another remedy was being sought. They themselves have been exhausted. We do have an agreement now which I hope, further along in the process, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] said, that we will have a chance to revisit this.

I once again thank the gentleman for the way he does protect our natural resources and listens to our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Amendment to provide increased funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Fund is needed for far too long while the backlog of environmentally sensitive lands has increased to a critical stage.

The budget agreement provided $700 million for the land acquisitions under the fund and yet the committee chose not to include this amount in this bill.

We have waited for years to address the enormous backlog that exists, as well as to act on new priorities that will be opportunities lost without this funding.

For instance, there is now an agreement, concluded after exhaustive negotiations, between major timber interests and the Federal Government to acquire important lands in the Headwaters Forest. This is an extremely vital part of our northern California forest ecosystem that protects endangered species and their habitats. It is a long-waited goal that is now before us and will be lost without action now.

In addition to this important acquisition, the New World Mine property that would threaten Yellowstone National Park is a priority acquisition. In addition, we have reached this natural treasure—one of the crown jewels and original parks in our national system.

We had an agreement; the money is in excess of the subcommittee allocations, by $700 million, for land acquisition. In addition, Mr. Chairman, section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, states that 333 of our colleagues supported the budget agreement authorized these funds as an addition to the 602(b) allocations, so it wouldn't take money from other programs.

The Appropriations Committee failed to include these funds in this bill. It seems contradictory to me that we will spend all of this time debating an amendment that was already agreed to overwhelmingly by this body.

The land and water conservation fund serves as a primary vehicle for land acquisition to protect the natural, historic, cultural, and outdoor recreational resources that must be guarded and preserved so that they may be passed on to future generations.

President Theodore Roosevelt 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.”

There is not a congressional district in the country that has not benefited from the parks, recreation facilities, wildlife areas made possible by this fund. For years Congress has denied allocating all of the money that is available to the land and water conservation fund from the revenues received from oil and gas leasing on the outer continental shelf. Last year, Congress only spent $138 million of the almost $900 million that was collected. This year, Congress has authorized an additional $100 million but it is still less than one-third of the money available this year and only a trivial amount of the more than $10 billion of the accumulated unappropriated balance.

Mr. Chairman, it is late that we use this money as it was intended. The Amendment must pass for two important reasons: first, it keeps us from violating the budget resolution and second, it is a positive step toward in the mission of the land and water conservation fund to protect our resources and promote recreation.

The Committee on Appropriations filed a revised subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1998 on June 24.
that has been previously read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 Offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ

Page 2, line 13, strike "$581,591,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$576,930,000".

Page 60, line 20, strike "6367,765,000" and insert in lieu thereof "6363,896,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that I have had scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and they have determined that this amendment will save taxpayers $4 million in outlays this year. I ask that I be authorized to present this amendment at this time.

I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and the ranking member, in whose stead the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] was here for us instead of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for permitting me the presentation of my amendment to the Interior appropriations bill.

I believe that the amendment before us offers the Members of the House an outstanding opportunity to save taxpayers' dollars, to reduce the deficit. My amendment gives an opportunity to eliminate some government waste and inefficiency in favor of deficit reduction and modest funding for programs that promote local community solutions to energy conservation.

My amendment would reduce funding for the Bureau of Land Management's Public Domain Forestry Program from the committee recommendation of $5,653,000 to $2,1 million out of a budget of only $5.6 million. This amendment would also increase by $2.1 million dollars the appropriation for energy conservation programs.

Specifically, and I wanted the legislative history to reflect my intention, this funding would be allocated to the Department of Energy's urban heat island research and highly reflective surfaces program. Those programs would provide technical and scientific assistance to local communities to assist with planning and implementation of measures to reduce energy costs for cooling in public commercial and residential buildings.

At the 10 demonstrations sites already established by DOE, every dollar in Federal funds has been matched by $7 or more by local and State governments, utilities, business groups, and nongovernmental institutions. Nationally, the cost benefits of implementing measures such as the use of highly reflective surfaces program are estimated to reach $4 billion a year. However, we cannot attain these savings unless we dedicate more money to research.

These cost-effective benefits stand in clear contrast to BLM forestry. The BLM forestry program has been found to consistently operate at a significant loss to American taxpayers. Rather than being an economically self-sufficient program, as required by Federal law, the BLM forestry program fails to offset even the cost of administering the program. In fact, the more money the agency has devoted to this program, the more taxpayer dollars have been wasted.

Based on data collected by a nonprofit public employee organization, the program stands to lose more than $30 million during the next 5 years. For this reason, Taxpayers for Common Sense and the Concord Coalition support eliminating funding for BLM forestry.

In addition to the economic and budgetary reasons for eliminating the program, experts believe it is threatening the unique transitional forests that exist in many regions around our nation. Disregard for the National Environmental Protection Act has also been well documented in the administration of this program.

As we work to balance the Federal budget, I feel well, we should not devote our precious resources to inefficient programs. This is a simple amendment that accomplishes three goals. We devote $2.5 million to deficit reduction. We increase by $2.1 million for energy conservation. We bring under control a wrongful and environmentally damaging program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and work with me to reduce the deficit, eliminate waste, and increase savings for future generations.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] in this. But to take $4.6 million out of a budget of only $5.6 million for the BLM forestry program would be a serious mistake.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ]. I do believe the chairman has made a compelling case here about why this cut to the public domain program would be devastating to the BLM and to those communities that rely on it. I just regret that the gentleman did not have a better source, but have I to be in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reiterating my time, I urge the defeat of the amendment. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] will work with the Department of Energy in the urban heat island research programs, but it would be a great mistake of judgment to tamper with the BLM forestry program. I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for not raising a point of order and allowing me to offer this amendment, so I want to use my time first to get that out of the way.

I would like very much to look at the green scissors coalition have found this program environmentally and fiscally unsound. Let us
face it, it helps a lot of large, huge timber companies who are going to continue to chop down timber regardless of those $5.6 million. One of those companies alone that used this program estimated their gross last year was $1.6 billion. We are not talking about small, ma and pa operations where this money is used. They are rather large companies which use this money.

So rather than allow huge companies to chop down trees on the clean, we should finally act as a government program that wastes our precious natural resources by chopping down those trees in an environmentally dangerous fashion that they will do, and with our taxpayers' dollars. They really do not need the subsidy. We can use it, obviously, in our inner cities throughout the Nation.

And there are 10 programs, and it is good, and the chairman is absolutely right, there is money, $700,000. But really we got 10 programs and some of the money. There was more money before for these programs. There is less money today and I just wanted it see if we could get more money, so I proposed this amendment.

I know that we have agreed to a voice vote, Mr. Chairman, on this, and so I thank the chairman once again for allowing me this opportunity to present this amendment.

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

I would only point out that these are small, very small companies that do this forestry program in conjunction with the BLM. These are not large companies. It is obvious by the amount of money involved here.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that according to the Forest Service data, this is true for BLM, 95 percent of all timber sales in 1996 were purchased by small timber companies purchased only 5 percent of these timber sales. There is a perception out there that this is going to the big boys, but they are not involved. It is the small companies that are involved.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I commend the gentleman from Chicago for his concern for his community, and I hope he will work with the Department of Energy to address his problem. I have to oppose this because of the impact it would have on the BLM forestry program.

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

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Just to add one quick word, it is not who is purchasing, it is who is selling timber.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].
the park. During that time I learned a great deal about the needs of Yellowstone and the unfortunate decay which has occurred to its infrastructure. Miles of roads along with buildings, water systems are in dire need of not only repair but replacement.

My amendment will authorize $5 million to be dedicated to the replacement of the Old Faithful wastewater treatment facility. No example of degradation on the Yellowstone infrastructure is more glaring than the degradation of the sewer system at Old Faithful. The Old Faithful plant was built over 60 years ago, in 1930. Then it was redone, refurbished in 1974, and it has not been touched since then. It is in very bad disarray.

Right now there is substantial use of that facility in the winter months. When the park was built, it was not designed for winter use. As a point of information, one of the 4 sewers at Norris Campground has already failed and the other 3 can fail at any point. Unfortunately, the sewer system at Old Faithful is in the same condition. It is right now polluting the water with sewage from the restrooms.

The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality inspected this facility last year and found a number of immediate problems, and they are faced with the possibility of closing the Old Faithful area. This is extremely alarming, knowing that the surrounding streams are being contaminated with discharge from this plant.

The National Park Service has established an internal system of setting funding priorities in the parks. What they do is whatever projects they can fund fully, that is what they fund. That has helped the small parks, but it has truly hurt the larger parks like Yellowstone and Yosemite, because the repairs are very expensive and so they are put off. As a matter of fact, there is no line item construction funds for Yellowstone in either 1998 or in 1999.

Mr. Chairman, this year Yellowstone is celebrating its 125th anniversary. In 1872, President Ulysses S. Grant signed a monumental piece of legislation that is the National Park Service that I am very committed to addressing with the scarce resources that we have. I think she makes a perfect case for what I have talked about in the backlog of unmet needs. Yellowstone is one of the crown jewels of the National Park System, and this is one of the unmet maintenance needs that need her attention in the National Park Service that I am very committed to addressing with the scarce resources that we have. I think she makes a perfect case for what I have talked about in the backlog of unmet needs. Yellowstone is one of the crown jewels of the National Park System, and this is one of the unmet maintenance needs that need her attention.

The amendment so that the problem at the colleagues to support this much needed funding for the years to come.

The park system when they vest Yellowstone in either 1998 or in 1999. Is no line item construction funds for park management, knowing that the surrounding streams are being contaminated with discharge from the restrooms. They are very expensive and so they do what they can to address backlogged maintenance. We need to address backlogged maintenance. We are very sensitive to the problem.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, with that assurance, then I feel I do not need to offer the amendment at the appropriate time in the process.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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 land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent counties of Oregon and California, and may be expended under the authority of the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, which have been damaged or destroyed by fires, floods, or storms, or by the activities of persons, or to aid in the reclamation of lands; $101,406,000, to remain available until expended.

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and for improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1711), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 cent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 5 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 shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title I of the Act of August 28, 1912 (30 Stat. 876).

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and for improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1711), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 cent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 5 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 shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title I of the Act of August 28, 1912 (30 Stat. 876).

PRODUCER ASSISTANCE

For service charges, deposits, and forfeitures for administrative expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed $10,000. Provided, That notwithstanding section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579, any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeitures, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriated 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 by the Bureau of Land Management, which have been damaged or destroyed by fires, floods, or storms, or by the activities of persons, or to aid in the reclamation of lands, or to make necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; 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 his certificate, not to exceed $10,000. Provided, That notwithstanding section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579, the Secretary 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 Secretary determines that such services are capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to the administration of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; for maintenance of the herd of
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long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the National Fish and Wildlife Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended, $591,042,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999, of which $11,612,000 shall be available until expended for operation and maintenance of fishery mitigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan. Authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, to compensate for loss of fishery resources from water development projects on the Lower Snake River, not less than $2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the National Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $5,190,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

**CONSTRUCTION**

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, investigation, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $40,256,000, to remain available until expended.

**NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND**

To conduct natural resource damage assessment 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.), Ozone Layer Protection Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-380), and Public Law 101-337; $4,128,000, to remain available until expended; Provided, That under this heading in Public Law 104-134, strike “in fiscal year 1996 and thereafter” in the proviso and insert “hereof and hereafter”, and before the phrase, “or properties shall be utilized” in such proviso, insert “, to remain available until expended.”

**LAND ACQUISITION**

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, 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, $228,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND**

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Cooperative Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1534), as amended, $14,000,000, for grants to States, to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended.

**NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND**

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1976 (16 U.S.C. 717s), $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY OF NEW YORK**

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MALONEY of New York in the item relating to “Department of the Interior—U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—National Wildlife Refuge Fund”, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by $500,000)”. In title I in the item relating to “Department of the Interior—National Park Service—Conservation Planning (NCCP) program” and of the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by $500,000)”.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment on behalf of the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] who has been called away due to a death in her family.

The amendment would designate $500,000 for critically needed repairs and restoration at the historic Susan B. Anthony home in Rochester, NY. The Susan B. Anthony House witnessed some of the most important moments of the women’s rights movement. As Anthony’s residence for her entire adult life, the house was the site of many visits and planning meetings between Ms. Anthony and her fellow activists, including abolitionist Frederick Douglass. This is also the place where Ms. Anthony was arrested for voting in 1872.

The Susan B. Anthony House is a vital part of our Nation’s heritage. It is part of a complex of sites in upstate New York that include the Women’s Rights National Historical Park and the National Women’s Hall of Fame, celebrating the history of the women’s rights movement.

Next year we will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the first women’s rights convention in Seneca Falls. In terms of the women’s movement, the women’s rights convention in Seneca Falls is considered the most important single event for women’s rights possible. Just 2 weeks ago, we held a ceremony here in Congress moving a statue of two of the organizers of that convention as well as Susan B. Anthony herself into the Capitol rotunda. These women are finally taking their rightful place as important leaders in our Nation’s history.

**1915**

Next year many leaders in our Nation will come together for this historical anniversary for a year’s worth of events on women’s history, rights and suffrage. Celebrate 98 will educate and inspire the State of New York and our entire Nation with the story of the women’s rights struggle. What is important to realize and put into context is that the Susan B. Anthony House is not only a national historic landmark but a critical part of our Nation’s history. It is not only a museum of Miss Anthony’s pictures and papers, along with her trademark wire-rimmed glasses and Quaker shawl, but hundreds of pictures and papers and documents of her sister suffragettes.

Mr. Chairman, there is no national museum of women’s history in the United States. The Susan B. Anthony House has filled that void by collecting the history of the movement and preserving it as best they could with volunteer labor and donations for the past 47 years.

Today time, weather, and Band-Aid repairs have taken their toll on this house. The Susan B. Anthony House recently launched a major initiative to finance a complete renovation and restoration of the property. In addition to needed repairs and maintenance, this project will begin the hard task of restoring the house to its appearance during Miss Anthony’s lifetime.

Both the house itself and the collection pose special challenges. Many of the papers are fragile, and special preservation measures must be taken if they are to survive for the benefit of future generations. No national catalog has ever been made of the collection.

This amendment would provide a modest one-time investment of $500,000 toward the Susan B. Anthony House restoration project. These funds would be used toward an historic structures report for the site and some basic physical repairs to the house. The historic structures report is a mandatory document for all national historic landmarks and provides a sort of baseline for repairs. This report will set the parameters for restoring the property to its appearance during Miss Anthony’s lifetime.

The $500,000 provided by this amendment is only a first step toward restoring the house. The vast majority of the funds needed will be supplied through private donors and contributors. This amount is a modest contribution by the Federal Government to express our support for this vitally important piece of our Nation’s history.

This amendment is the very least our Government can do to show the importance of the Susan B. Anthony House and the women’s rights movement in our history. The amendment would offset this $500,000 by deducting the same amount from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s wildlife and refuge account. The amendment represents only 1.7 percent of the $29 million increase granted by the committee over the administration’s request for that account. It is a minuscule 0.18 percent of the account’s total appropriation of $274 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. MALONEY of New York was allowed to proceed for an additional minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the committee provided that this generous increase was to be used toward preparations for the National Wildlife Refuge System’s 100th anniversary in the year 2003. Therefore it
only seems appropriate to use some of this funding, considering that the Susan B. Anthony House will be a major attraction during the 150th anniversary of the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls next year. Surely Susan B. Anthony was a pioneer for women's rights including the right to vote, to own property, and to participate as equal partners in our democracy and our society. Susan B. Anthony revolutionized the lives of half our Nation's population. Surely she deserves no less than our full support. This amendment does not attempt to provide full support, but merely a token for the restoring renovation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

I want to say, first of all, we extend our sympathies to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] on the death of her sister, and I think I speak for all the Members in that respect. I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] handling this matter for her.

Mr. Chairman, we have over a million structures on the National Register of historic places, and all of them have a very deserved place in this Nation's history. But we have a backlog of $500 million in refuges maintenance which this amendment would further exacerbate.

Mr. Chairman, this project is not within a unit of the National Park system, and what we have tried to do here in this bill is take care of what we have rather than creating new programs. The Park Service has advised us, in fact, that they cannot even spend these funds without specific legislative language authorizing the project. And as I pointed out earlier, we have a $14 billion backlog of maintenance projects. I will not recite all of those again, but even in the Fish and Wildlife Service we are faced with a $500 million backlog of maintenance projects. I will not recite all of those again, but even in the Fish and Wildlife Service we are faced with a $500 million backlog of maintenance projects. And if we were to adopt this amendment, we would offset it by decreasing Fish and Wildlife Service resource management by an equal amount of $500,000, and with the backlog that exists in these facilities it would be a very unjustified policy decision to make this action.

We had almost a hundred Members of Congress write to the committee in support of increased funding for the refuge system, and we could not answer a lot of those, we could not respond to a lot of those simply because we do not have enough money. So I think, as a matter of policy, it simply does not fit to take $500,000 out of the Fish and Wildlife Service to do this, particularly in light of the fact that it is not a unit of the National Park Service and in light of the fact that we have the millions of designated historic structures that have similar needs.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the fact that Susan B. Anthony played an enormous important role in this Nation's history, but nevertheless I think it would be an unwise policy to invade the funds that we now have for Fish and Wildlife Service resource management, and in light of this I regretfully have to urge the Members to vote no on this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word to respond.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman's concerns for the underlying budget restraints, but I wanted to point out that before us today and included in the budget are two national historic landmarks which are already in the bill, and expended point out that the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] has made over and over again, that there is no national women's museum in this country and that the Susan B. Anthony house has served as such a museum in gathering the materials, the history of the woman's movement of the country, it is certainly deserving, and I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but I certainly wanted to point out that Ohio and Maryland have two items in the bill, and we are hoping that given the fact of two historical landmarks in the bill, the gentleman would consider this additional historic landmark given the fact that there is no women's museum in this country.

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentlewoman is saying, but I would point out that the two that she refers to, one is a President of the United States, and the State is putting in a lot of money. What we are putting in is a small amount. The other is a project of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hooyer], and again the State of Maryland is putting in a lot of money.

I do not think there has been any indication here that there is any money being proposed by the State or any other entity to support this, that the total cost that is being proposed would be Federal, and I think perhaps the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] would like in the future to find some matching funds that would make this kind of a project more attractive.

Mr. Chairman, I would still urge a vote of "no" on this amendment.

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered with the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk reads as follows:

REWARDS AND OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4221±4225, 4241±4245, and 1538), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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, $30,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RHINOCEROS AND TIGER CONSERVATION FUND

For deposit to the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Fund, $400,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (Public Law 103±391).

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

For deposit to the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, $800,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 108 passenger motor vehicles, of which 92 are for replacement only (including 57 for police-type use); not to exceed $400,000 for payment, at the discretion of the Secretary, for informing rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized or approved by the Secretary, and not to exceed $60,000 for sole use on his certificate; 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, which are utilized 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, upon determination that a 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 contractor is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: 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 Appropriations Committee on the legislative basis the permittees on a reimbursable basis, and for the general administration of the National Park Service, excluding not to exceed $2,500,000 for the Volunteering-in-Parks program, and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which were authorized by law and to publish and disseminate the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project. Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and section 207(c) of Public Law 101-816, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and is to remain available until September 30, 1999.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Provided further, That activities funded herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants. Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated for the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and section 207(c) of Public Law 101-816, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and is to remain available until September 30, 1999.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities administered by the National Park Service, $129,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which $1,000,000 is to be used for administrative expenses, and for the purpose of acquisition of the Elwha and Glines dams shall be used solely for acquisition, and shall not be expended until the full amount of the purchase price is paid to the United States by the President of the Senate of a full and complete report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and section 207(c) of Public Law 101-816, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and is to remain available until September 30, 1999.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (RESCISSION)


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 Appropriations Committee on the legislative basis on which the permittees on a reimbursable basis, and for the general administration of the National Park Service, excluding not to exceed $2,500,000 for the Volunteering-in-Parks program, and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which were authorized by law and to publish and disseminate the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project. Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and section 207(c) of Public Law 101-816, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and is to remain available until September 30, 1999.

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460–4–11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition 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 Appropriations Committee on the legislative basis on which the permittees on a reimbursable basis, and for the general administration of the National Park Service, excluding not to exceed $2,500,000 for the Volunteering-in-Parks program, and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which were authorized by law and to publish and disseminate the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project. Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and section 207(c) of Public Law 101-816, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, Public Law 100-203, and is to remain available until September 30, 1999.
$15,000 under this head shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of the Minerals Management Service concurrently made payments in settlement of amounts owed to Indian allottees or Tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments.

**OIL SPILL RESEARCH**

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4022 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 5301 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $94,937,000, of which $35,103,000 is authorized to be transferred into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

**OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-85, as amended, section 401 of Public Law 98-303, as amended, to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $94,937,000, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, an additional amount shall be available until expended, from performance bond forfeitures in fiscal year 1998: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to reclamation regulations promulgated by the Office through grants to States, moneys collected in fiscal year 1998 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 notwithstanding appropriation for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending 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 95-85, as amended, of which not more than 25 per cent shall be used for emergency reclamation projects in any one State and funds for federally-administered reclamation projects under this proviso shall not exceed $11,000,000: Provided further, That funds made available to States under title IV of Public Law 95-85 may be used, at the discretion of the Director, to collect these debts: Provided further, That funds made available to States under title IV of Public Law 95-85 may be used, at their discretion, to purchase 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 of the Clinton-Gore Administration’s Oil Spill Control and Reclamation Act: Provided further, That the State of Maryland may set aside the greater of $1,000,000 or 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of the total of the grant funds made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended, (30 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), if the funds are deposited in the Abandoned Mine Drainage Abatement and Treatment Fund established under a State law, pursuant to which the interest earned on the amount is exped.
For the cost of guaranteed loans, $4,500,000, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including management and vocational education training, and project-specific maintenance (with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the territory’s commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets): Provided further, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this head in the 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 economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 233 of the Compact of Free Association, and for economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Republic of Palau as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 233, and 23 of the Compact of Free Association, $20,445,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by Public Law 99-259 and Public Law 99-658.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, $56,286,000, of which $1,000,000 to exceed receipts from official fee and representation expenses, and of which up to $1,200,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $35,443,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $24,439,000.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Indian Gaming Commission, pursuant to Public Law 100-407, $1,000,000.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEES FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooper-ative agreements, compacts, and grants, $32,126,000, to remain available until expended for trust funds management: Provided, That funds for trust management improvements may be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs: Provided further, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 1998, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), 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 this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with written notification of such funds from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from Indian real estate resources the Capital Fund, 15 aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement and which may be obtained for economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia through assessments of long-term lease transactions, increased approved capability of local operations and maintenance institutions and agencies (including management and vocational education training), and project-specific maintenance (with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the territory’s commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets): Provided further, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this head in the 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).
by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds from such disposition, such funds as may be necessary to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft: Provided further, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the "Department of Commerce, "Office of the Solicitor", and "Office of Inspector General" may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund or the Consolidated Working Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within the Department, office, or component) 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: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished with similar appropriations which must be requested as promptly as possible. 

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any non-year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency rehabilitation of forest fires, including suppression actions on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the suppression of emergency rehabilitation of forest fires, including suppression actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oilspills; response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oilspills; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual oilspills; and suppression actions on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 177(b) of Public Law 99-196 (99 Stat. 1141) and for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any non-year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such transfers as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a prairie State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: Provided, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for expenditures to reimburse other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression or forest fire rehabilitation: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished with similar appropriations 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 such replenishment funds are credited.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, for rental of equipment, and for services rendered by officers, employees, or contractors when authorized by the Secretary, for the recognition, management, or valuation of mineral lands, and for the construction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment for emergency rehabilitation purposes.

SEC. 104. 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 service personnel's field offices, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for libraries and membership associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code Sec. 201).

SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for obligation in connection with contracts issued for services or the making of reimbursements for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

SEC. 107. No final rule or regulation of any agency of the Federal Government pertaining to the recognition, management, or validity of a right-of-way pursuant to Revised Statute 2477 (43 U.S.C. 932) shall take effect unless expressly authorized by an Act of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the Final Outer Continental Shelf Planning Act of 1991. Provided, That if the President determines, on the basis of the allegations and facts which may be demonstrated in the proceeding, that the Secretary's determination is not legally or factually supported, the proceeds may be expended by the Secretary to settle the case or for other purposes consistent with the express purposes of the Act. Provided further, That the court in determining the amount to be remitted to the United States or in obligations incurred by the United States or in obligations incurred by the United States in connection with the determination of the amount to be remitted, shall not allow any increased costs of litigation, interest, or penalty assessment.

SEC. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore leasing, or the approval or permitting of any drilling or other exploration activity, on lands within the North Aleutian Basin planning area unless expressly authorized by an Act of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 110. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the Final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997-2002.

SEC. 111. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

SEC. 112. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450, et seq.) may be invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium only in obligations of the United States or in obligations or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States.

SEC. 113. (a) Employees of Helium Operations, Bureau of Land Management, entitled to severance pay under 5 U.S.C. 5595, may apply for, and the Secretary of the Interior may pay the total amount of the severance pay to the employee in a lump sum. Employees paid severance pay in a lump sum and subsequently reemployed by the Federal government shall be subject to the repayment provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5595(i) (2) and (3), except that any repayment shall be made to the Helium Fund.

(b) Helium Operations employees who elect to continue health benefits after separation shall be liable for not more than the required employee contribution under 5 U.S.C. 8905(1)(A). The Helium Fund shall pay for 18 months the remaining portion of required contributions.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this or previous appropriations Acts may be used to establish a new regional office in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGE LAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and range land research as authorized by law, $387,644,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperatives with and providing technical forest and range land assistance to States, Territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities, $157,922,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, for forest planning, inventory, and monitoring, and for administrative expenses associated with the management of funds provided under the heads "Forest and Rangeland Research," "State and Private Forestry," "National Forest System Development," "Helium Operations," "Reconstruction and Construction," and "Land Acquisition," $1,364,480,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 per centum of all monies received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (43 U.S.C. 616a(i)): Provided, That up to $10,000,000 of the funds provided herein for road maintenance.
shall be available for the planned obliteration of roads which are no longer needed.

WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire suppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency forest suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned over National Forest System lands, $699,715,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations previously transferred for such purposes.

[1390]

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 11 offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]; and the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the second amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 199, noes 230, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYE-S-199

Abercrombie Burr Davis (FL)
Ackerman Camp Deal
Allen Andrews Balduccin
Ballenger Banchfore
Beccera Berreter"""" Bereuter
Berry Blalock Bishop
Blumenauer Bonior Bonato Boswell Boyd Brown (FL) Brown (OH) Brown (VA) Bryant

AYE-S-77

Abercrombie Ackerman Andrews Balderston Bane Beck Becafera Bernier Bereuter Blalock Bishop Bloemer Bone Bonior Bonato Boswell Boyd Brown (FL) Brown (OH) Bryant

NOT VOTING-5
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Mr. SALMON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

RULES COMMITTEE PROCEDURE REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION TO BE CONSIDERED DURING WEEK OF JULY 14, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, in making the two announcements, let me also announce that we do not expect any votes between now and about 10 o'clock. There will only be one more amendment, and perhaps an amendment thereto, so that there is no reason for Members to stand around here talking if they do not want to for the next hour and a half.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet during the week of July 14 to grant a rule for consideration of the foreign operations Appropriation bill for fiscal year 1998. The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations on July 9 and will be filed tomorrow, July 11. The bill is scheduled for floor action on Wednesday, July 16. That is next Wednesday.

The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which would require the amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this case amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table.

Mr. Chairman, because of the tight schedule, if we appropriate the amendments, the Committee on Rules plans to meet Monday at 5 p.m., that is this coming Monday, on the Appropriations Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 1998. It is scheduled for floor consideration on Tuesday, July 15. The bill has been ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations and the report is expected to be filed tomorrow.

The Committee on Rules is contemplating an open rule for this legislation. If Members have amendments to the bill, and they comply with House rules, there is no need to submit the amendments or to testify before the Committee on Rules. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to draft their amendments. Again, it is not necessary to submit amendments to the Committee on Rules or to testify as long as the amendments comply with House rules.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, could the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules or any of the Republican leadership tell us what we are going to be doing for the rest of the evening at this point?

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, reclaiming my time, I can tell the gentleman that there is an amendment about to be offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] that will not take but a few minutes.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, perhaps the chairman can enlighten us about what the plan is for the rest of the evening.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] to explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we will go to the amendment at this point and prior to that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] has an amendment which I am going to accept.

After we finish with the gentleman from Colorado we are going to go to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. I would assume that that is probably going to take a considerable amount of time and that would be all we would get done tonight.

Mr. DICKS. Does the gentleman intend to vote on the Kennedy-Porter amendment tonight?

Mr. REGULA. I would hope so, yes. I would like to finish it tonight.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will continue to yield to the gentleman to explain what might happen on the next vote on the Porter amendment. Will the Committee stay in Committee and continue to vote on the Kennedy-Porter amendment or will they roll votes over until tomorrow? What is the intention of the chairman?

Mr. REGULA. We are going to try to do that, depending on how much time the Porter amendment takes. The goal is to get an amendment that we can finish by 2 p.m. tomorrow. So we want to keep moving. And any votes after the Porter amendment we will roll over.
Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman from New York alluded to a bill before the Committee on Rules on Monday on veterans. I thought there might be some chance that we may hear that Friday.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio, that all up to the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. If they can file their report tonight, I would be more than glad to meet tomorrow to save the Committee on Rules from having to come back here Monday when there are not going to be any votes until Tuesday at 5 o’clock.

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is what I am referring to.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would ask my good friend to use his persuasion and get it done.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I used my persuasion on the Interior rule and nothing happened.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would suggest the gentleman persevere.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

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

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. Skaggs:

Page 46, line 14, strike “$599,915,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$600,000,000”.

Page 58, line 18, strike “$100,000,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$101,000,000”.

Page 59, line 10, strike “$312,153,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$313,153,000”.

Page 60, line 20, strike “$636,766,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$646,766,000”.

Page 60, line 25, strike “$149,845,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$153,845,000”.

Page 61, line 6, strike “$120,845,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$123,845,000”.

Page 61, line 7, strike “$30,000,000” and in lieu thereof insert “$30,000,000”.

Mr. SKAGGS (during the reading).

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to consideration of this amendment at this time in the bill en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the bill’s funding for energy conservation and efficiency programs by $8 million. These additional funds would be used for several programs at the Department of Energy, for State energy programs, and for weatherization. It also makes a small adjustment in the funding for energy conservation and efficiency by $8 million. These additional funds will be used for several important research and development programs of the Department of Energy, for State energy programs, and for the weatherization program. It also makes a small adjustment in the division of funds for the fossil energy programs.

I greatly appreciate the willingness of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, to work with me to develop an amendment that he will accept and therefore should not be controversial.

As Chairman Skaggs knows, this amendment does not go as far as I would have liked. I think these programs should receive an even greater increase in funds. But the amendment is a compromise, and just as it does not do all that I would have wanted, it goes further than would Skaggs as reported. So, adopting this amendment will not affect the improvement over the bill as reported, and I hope it will set the stage for further improvements when we get to a conference with the other body.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

This amendment adds $8 million in budget authority to the energy conservation accounts. Of that total, $3 million is for the weatherization program; $1 million is for the State energy program; and the rest is allocated as follows: Building equipment and materials will be increased by a total of $3 million. Of that total, $250,000 will go to research in developing gas-fired heat pumps for heating and cooling residences and smaller commercial buildings (“Hi-cool Heat Pump program”); $1 million will go to the lighting programs, to support a variety of research programs including work on improved light fixtures, advanced lamp technologies, improved lighting controls, more sophisticated light distribution systems, and possibly work along lines suggested by the Hybrid Lighting Partnership; $1 million will be for cooperative efforts between DOE and companies such as the manufactured-housing companies and utility firms to increase the adoption of efficiency measures in the marketplace—efforts that have been part of the “Energy Star” program, but that don’t include other aspects of that program such as the training of retail personnel; $150,000 will be to expand efforts to develop practical “supersimulation” materials, by working with insulation manufacturers; and $600,000 will be for research projects concerning windows and glazing, including advanced window glazing, electrochromic “smart” windows and other new technologies that can produce great energy savings.

Three programs in the industry sector will receive a total increase of $1 million. Of that—

$300,000 will be for Industrial Assessment Centers, university-based centers that provide no-cost energy and environmental audits to help small and medium-sized businesses; $300,000 will be for the “Motor Challenge” program, under which industry-government partnerships promote a systems approach in encouraging the adoption of fuel-efficient electric motor systems; and $400,000 will be for the “NICE-cubed” program, which provides competitively-selected grants to state-industry partnerships aimed at encouraging deployment of energy-efficient technologies and to demonstrate technologies that can improve energy efficiency, reduce waste, and save money.

Finally, the amendment will make a modest increase ($1 million) in funding for the consolidated fuel cell program, part of the fossil energy research and development activities of the Department of Energy.

The amendment is fully offset. The increases in the energy conservation accounts are offset by a reduction in the advance funding for forest service firefighting activities, and the increases for the fuel cell program is offset by an additional rescission from the clean coal program. These offsets will not have an adverse effect on these activities.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Skaggs amendment which provides a much needed increase in funding for energy conservation programs. Included in the amendment is an additional $600,000 for the window research and glazing program. This program provides funding for a promising new technology with enormous energy savings potential for the commercial windows market.

It is my expectation that this funding increase will be used to further the development of products enhanced chemical vapor deposition (PECVD) for electrochromic technologies. This technology provides a flexible means of controlling the amount of light and heat that passes through a glass or plastic surface. Such a capability could provide Americans, and indeed much of the world, with a premier energy saving opportunity in building construction. The Department of Energy has estimated that placing this technology on all commercial buildings in the United States would produce savings equivalent to the amount of oil that travels through the Alaska pipeline each year.

In recognition of the importance of this technology, my home State of Florida has provided $1.2 million in State funds to the University of South Florida which is utilizing a license associated with technology developed by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado. I believe the additional funds for the windows and glazing program will be available to assist with this excellent example of a public-private partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman Solomon for his hard work on this amendment, and Chairman Rice, for his willingness to accept it. I believe it is a common sense amendment which will enhance our nation’s important energy conservation programs and
allow the United States to remain at the forefront of major new conservation technologies.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, re-
claiming my time briefly, I also want-
ed, if I could, to ask the chairman to engage with me briefly. I believe he has received a letter from the Secretary of Energy. I have a copy which I would like to put in the RECORD at this point. It is, I think, a very helpful indication of the administration’s willingness to work with the chairman in some areas of concern to the subcommittee in the building program in particular.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gen-
tleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] rel-
ative to the Secretary’s letter and my amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment. We appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is willing to work out a compromise on this, and in view of that, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, re-
claiming my time, let me also inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] as to when I can expect to receive the secretary’s correspondence to the chairman in the RECORD at this time.

As I mentioned a minute ago, I expect that the chairman finds this a very forthcoming expression of intended cooperation and accommodation by the administration in some areas that were of concern to the chairman in this particular part of the bill, and I just wanted to ask the gentle-
man’s consent on that point.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, we have no objection to putting the letter in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your interest in helping us reshape the energy conservation programs of the Department of Energy and your continued support for the objectives of these programs. I know that we share the view that investments to increase the productivity of energy use are critical for finding ways to meet environmental goals, to increase American energy security, and to promote economic growth.

I know that the House Committee on Appropriations has expressed concerns about the management of programs designed to improve the efficiency of the buildings. While the Department’s programs in this area have been highly successful in the past, I share your concern that they need a careful review. I agree with your observation that the programs should be focused around a set of objectives that are both clear and easily explained. These programs must be developed in close cooperation with the business and other groups who must be our partners in this work. Their support for our programs is vital to our success.

We are working to redesign our programs and will give the views expressed in the FY 98 House Interior Appropriations Committee report very serious consideration. Later this year I will provide you with a strategic plan that responds to the Committee’s request; I want to assure you that it will receive personal attention. The pursuit of energy efficiency—and the opportunities for improving the energy efficiency of buildings, in particular—it is essential that the federal government’s programs be well-focused and adequately supported.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you in more detail in the near future.

Sincerely,

FEDERICO PENA,
Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, I have been a strenuous supporter of funding for the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Conservation Program funded through the Department of Energy accounts in the Interior appropriations bill. I have offered amendments in prior years to increase funding for these programs and I continue to support strong increases for these programs that go to the heart of the Federal Government’s co-
operation in community-based solutions to the energy needs of the people in our boroughs, town-
ships, and counties.

I want to thank Mr. SKAGGS for working with us in supporting increased funding for these important programs. Today’s amendment increases Weatherization by $5 million to $124 million in fiscal year 1998 and increases the State Energy Program by $1 million to $30 million. Even though the amendment is small, it begins to move in the right direction. The Appropriations Committee had supported flat funding with no inflation increase.

I also want to commend Chairman REGULA and his staff for his work on this very difficult appropriations bill. It is important to stress, however, that these two programs have taken the brunt of the cuts in the Department of Energy conservation accounts since fiscal year 1995, when Weatherization was funded at a level of $226 million and the State grants received $53 million. These cuts of almost 50 percent have affected people in every con-
gressional district. Weatherization helps low-
income Americans through the installation of insulation and otherwise improving the energy efficiency of homes. On average, these im-
provements save these poor households over $200 a year in energy costs. That makes a huge difference. The State Energy Program provides leveraging of funds to conduct en-
ergy improvements in schools and hospitals so that more money can go into education and health care. This program reaches into small business and homes to reduce energy costs and apply innovative technologies to solve our energy challenges.

These programs are still grossly under-
funded. I want to stress to my colleagues that I hope we can increase these funding levels in con-
ference. I will carefully observe our actions and I look forward to working with Chairman REGULA in balancing important interests, but providing critical resources to aid people in need.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-
man from Colorado [Mr. SKaggs].

The amendment was agreed to. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of the Forest Serv-
ict, not otherwise provided for, $160,122,000, to remain available until expended for con-
struction, reconstruction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for con-
struction, reconstruction and repair of forest roads in our national forests. It is an essential part of the Small Business Administration defini-
tion of small business as defined in title 13, Code of Federal Regulations, part 121.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the legis-

tative provision beginning with "pro-
vided further" on page 47, line 2, through "part 121" on line 6. This lan-
guage violates clause 2 of House rule XXI, which provides a provision con-
taining legislative language in a gen-

eral appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule. The second of the unprotected provisos under the heading "reconstruction and con-
struction," by restricting the avail-
ability of the purchaser road credit to a specified class of companies, includes legis-
lislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

Therefore, the point of order is sus-
tained and the language is stricken from the bill.

Are there any further points of order against the language read?

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will design-
ign the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-

ows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER:

Page 46, line 20, after the dollar amount in-
sert "(reduced by $1)".

Page 46, line 126 after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $1)".

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I hate to offer any amendment to the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

There is no one in the House for whom I have more respect and admiration, and I assure my friend and all of our colleagues from the West and so-called timber districts that my difference with him and with them is one only of policy.

The amendment that I offer, together with the gentleman from Massachu-
setts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], the gentle-
man from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], the gentleman from Maryland [Ms. MORELLA], and the gentle-
man from California [Mr. ROICE] will put an end to the use of taxpayer subsidies for the construction of log-
ging roads in our national forests. It will reduce the $99.5 million road con-
struction and reconstruction account
Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not affect recreation and general purpose roads, and it will not reduce the money for maintenance and road obliteration. Factoring in the roads under a separate account. Under this amendment, if timber companies want to build logging roads with their own money, they can; and there is $5.9 million left in the account for the Forest Service to inspect and oversee their work.

Under the present system, logging companies receive incentives to build roads but the taxpayers are left with future maintenance costs. A majority of the roads in our national forests were constructed through the purchaser road credit program.

The credit that is issued by the Forest Service is for an estimate of the cost of the road that, according to the GAO, are never compared. That may be a further indirect subsidy.

Bottom line, there is no accountability for the estimate and credit offered by the Forest Service.

To argue that the purchaser road credit program does not offer a subsidy is absolutely absurd. If there was no subsidy, Mr. Chairman, the timber companies would not care if it is eliminated, and, very obviously, they do. The fact that the Price-Wasserhouse study says otherwise is refuted by the fact that it was paid for by the American Forest and Paper Association.

Mr. Chairman, the Forest Service is a land management agency. It was not created to be in the business of building roads. The two other land management agencies, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, do not subsidize the construction and reconstruction of timber roads on their lands. Neither should the Forest Service.

The timber companies build a lot of roads under the Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs, but not with the taxpayer’s money.

I appreciate the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee to improve the forest road program by limiting the number of roads that can be constructed in our national forests.

My colleagues will hear in the debate that only 8 miles of roads will be allowed to be built by the Forest Service. That is by the Forest Service, Mr. Chairman, and does not take into account the road credit program. Factoring in the roads under this program, the total is 302 miles of new subsidized timber roads at a cost to the taxpayer of $41.5 million.

Under this amendment, the roads can still be built, the logging can still take place, but the timber companies will have to pay for the cost of building the roads needed for the timber harvests. That is the way almost every for-profit company in America works in our state of Massachusetts. Yes, they pay their own costs of doing business. That is called free enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, we already have 380,000 miles of roads in our national forests, enough to encircle the planet more than 15 times. 15 miles of road for every square mile of national forest. Do we really need more subsidized roads?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter amendment.

First I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. Dick], that I thought that when the House got rid of B-1 Bob that it might be the last we have seen of someone in that particular line of work. But we have got B-2 Norman to replace him, who has become the Paul Bunyan of costs.

The House of Representatives voted less than 2 weeks ago on a spending cut package to balance the Federal budget. Wrapped in those proposals were billions of dollars of reductions in the country. It is all in the budget. Money needed to pave our highways and fill our potholes, money needed so that hard-working families can get to work on time, so that economic goods can be efficiently shipped to the marketplace, and so that the parents can get their kids to schools safely.

Yet today we are considering an Interior appropriations bill that contains millions of dollars to subsidize the construction of logging roads in our national forests so that wealthy timber companies can haul off even higher profits. Not enough money to fix our national highways, but plenty to spare for big profitable timber companies like Weyerhaeuser, Georgia Pacific, and International Paper.

American taxpayers will no longer stand for such corporate welfare schemes. Paul Bunyan and his blue ox Babe never needed a pocketful of Federal cash to do their job. But if we listen to the cries of the timber interests, their industry would go down the river if they were pulled away from the subsidy trough.

My colleagues would think that if we were going to allow private timber companies to come in and remove Federal assets from our forests for their own profit, at the very least these companies would have to pay for the roads that are needed to get to that timber. What is next? Paying for gasoline for the corporate jets? The American taxpayer can pay off even miles of roads that crisscross our national forests, which is more than eight times the size of the U.S. Interstate Highway System.

I am joined by my colleagues today to say, enough is enough, we do not need any new taxpayer subsidized logging roads. If new roads for logging purposes are warranted, practical and profitable, why should not these corporations pay for them themselves?

The amendment I offer today with my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will end the practice of taxpayer subsidies for the construction of these new logging roads. We cut $41.5 million from the construction and reconstruction component of the Forest Service roads budget.

Our amendment only affects the construction and reconstruction of logging roads, themselves. It does not touch funds for recreation or general purpose roads or trail construction, nor does it affect the budget for the maintenance of the existing infrastructure.

The Forest Service fiscal year 1998 budget notes show how they would use the $41.5 million for timber roads. They want to spend roughly $10 million to build 1.3 miles of new timber roads and 381 miles of reconstructed timber roads. The remaining $31.5 million was designated for the design and engineering of timber roads under the purchaser credit program.

This program gives trees to timber companies in exchange for their cost to build the roads, another taxpayer giveaway that must end. This amendment leaves intact the $5.9 million the Forest Service requested to inspect and oversee the work when timber companies build roads under the purchaser credit program.

We still want the Forest Service to inspect and oversee their work. We just no longer want to reimburse timber companies for the cost of these roads. The savings we get from this amendment will be applied for deficit reduction.

We must stand up against the special interests and reverse this wasteful and environmentally damaging spending. The environment suffers because building new roads in our national forests has had a devastating impact on direct habitat loss, water quality, and wildlife populations.

Road construction, particularly on steep unstable slopes dramatically increases the risk of landsliding, erosion, and siltation of the streams. Such damage requires us to be more than idle observers.

Some points I would like to reiterate about this amendment.

The amendment will cut only money from the budget that would be used to build logging roads. We have never touched the funds that are needed to repair or maintain roads in the existing national forest infrastructure. There is $85 million in this bill under the entirely separate section entitled "Federal Aid in the State Highway System." We do not touch the funds for building the general purpose or recreation roads or the construction of trails.
This money plain and simple is a direct handover to the lumber companies for going in and harvesting trees. All we say is if you want to go in and cut down the trees, pay for the roads yourself, and do not look to the Federal taxpayer for the subsidy.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKS to the amendment offered by Mr. PORTER.

On line 2 of the Porter amendment strike the figure $41,500,000, and insert $5,600,000.

On line 4 of the Porter amendment strike the figure $1 and insert $25,000,000.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to my colleagues today, many of which feel that the Kennedy-Porter amendment goes too far, that it makes too deep a cut in the timber purchaser credit program. It also makes a severe cut in appropriated funds, most of which are being used for reconstruction of timber roads. Only 8 miles of new roads are being constructed under appropriated funds.

Where I am offering here is a compromise. This will allow us to go forward and do the reconstruction, and it will also provide half of the money for timber purchaser credit.

By the way, most of the timber sales, over 75 percent of the timber sales, go to small businesses. These are not going to the elite. Most of them have gotten out of the business, at least in the Northwest, because they export off their private lands and they get very little if any Federal timber.

My colleagues have to understand what has happened in the timber area. We used to do about 10 to 12 billion board feet nationally each year. This year we have come down, and this is the history here, and in recent years we have come down to about 3.7 billion board feet. We have cut in third the timber program in this country.

What happens when we do that? What happens when we create this shortage? First of all we import. Over 30 percent of the softwood that comes in today comes in from Canada. They are up there cutting like mad to meet the U.S. market requirement. The other thing that happens is it forces up the price of lumber. We have got a letter here from a homebuilder says that the average house has gone up about $2,600 per house because of increased lumber prices. So consumers have paid something like $2.8 billion more than they would have had to pay for the new houses over the last several years.

I ask tonight for some common sense, for some compromise. This is an amendment that will not devastate these programs. By the way, in case somebody did not understand, one understands they do not shrink in and do timber harvesting without roads. Ninety percent of the roads we have are used for recreational purposes. They are used for fire suppression. They are used to get people out into those great recreational areas. The Forest Service lands provide more recreational opportunity than our National Park System. That is something that is not well understood by some easterners from Massachusetts or anyone else who feels that the forest area for Massachusetts ever wants to come out.

I will be glad to take him around and show him a few of the roads. But, seriously, these roads are very important in terms of the transportation system. I want to argue that the quality of roads on the Forest Service lands are much lower than either BLM lands or in Forest Service lands.

The problem with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] have come up with is that they want to cut $41.5 million out of appropriated funds for timber roads. Most of that money, almost all of that money, I think $40 million of that money, is not used for reconstruction. Reconstruction means going out and fixing up roads that have problems and doing it so that you can put in culverts, you can fix the roads so if you have a big storm, they do not break apart and go sliding out and winding up in the salmon streams. That is why I have changed that part of their amendment to go to $5.6 million which is the administration's budget request. I think we now fix that part of the amendment. When we preserve some of the money for purchaser credit so that the smaller companies out there can still use this program, which is important for them because they have a hard time. If they do not have this, they are going to have to finance the roadwork themselves, and some of these smaller companies have a difficult time doing that.

We have a way of fixing that with the timber purchaser credit which will then allow the Forest Service to do some of this for them. There are two groups that are going to get really hurt by this amendment and doing away with timber purchaser credit. One is the counties going to lose 25 percent of what they got before. Those Members who have been worried about PILT, counties get hurt here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the counties get hurt and the small businesses who have used this program. That is why instead of eliminating it as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] do, I have kept it in at $25 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to go camping with the gentleman from Washington sometime, but this issue has nothing to do with recreational roads.

Mr. DICKS. Of course it does.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will just yield to me for a moment.

Mr. DICKS. Second, the gentleman says that the cost of lumber will go up. Only 4 percent of the lumber in this country comes totally from our national forests. We have got 389,000 miles of forest, and we have only got 1.3 miles worth of new roads.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, first of all, these roads are used by people for recreational purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKS. All of them are used. When we do reconstruction on those roads, it is to keep those roads available for recreational purposes. The gentleman is taking out a big part of that money.

I am surprised that we even have, and I think it is 5 percent, by the way. Look at what we have done to timber harvesting in this country. We have taken it down to here. I know that some people will rest until it is probably below this line. That is simply not right because we have a responsibility. We can manage these forests on a sustainable basis. This is not James Watt running this place down there. It is Jim Lyons who used to be on the staff here of the Committee on Agriculture, it is Dan Glickman, it is Albert Gore, it is Bill Clinton, it is Bruce Babbitt. These are the people that are managing these forests.

I want to say is that these people are managing this properly. They have also said that the Kennedy-Porter amendment goes too far. We have a letter here today and let me just read a couple of salient paragraphs:

“Small timber business purchasers would be adversely affected because of potential financial troubles they may encounter as they operate timber sales if the purchaser credit program is eliminated. Accordingly, the administration urges Congress to allow the Forest Service to do the purchaser election. The administration also supports reducing the construction of new roads on national forests as reflected in its budget. However, the $41.5 million reduction the amendment proposes goes too far in eliminating important reconstruction efforts that provide public safety and environmental benefits.”

The administration opposes the Kennedy-Porter amendment because it simply goes too far. This is a decent compromise.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to point out that I too got
a letter from the Secretary after I received the letter that he sent to me at the gentleman's request, I get a letter from him later this afternoon indicating to me that he has no idea of what it was that the gentleman had talked to him about.

Mr. DICKS. No, no. Dan Glickman is a longtime member of the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] has again expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In clarifying the letter that I sent you this afternoon, the administration supports reducing the construction of new roads within the national forest system primarily for the environmental reasons and because of the extensive cost to maintain the road system that already exists.

In fact the President's budget proposes to eliminate the purchaser road credits for timber, which the gentleman just refunded in his amendment.

Mr. DICKS. By 50 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The President opposes your amendment.

Mr. DICKS. I never said the administration supported my amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But the gentleman certainly said Mr. Glickman supported his amendment.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I think the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] is interesting, but I have some questions.

One is that on the purchaser road credits because of the volume of timber sales in the Reagan and Bush administration, then they dropped off sharply in the Clinton administration, large businesses as well as small businesses are carrying these purchaser road credits as assets on their books. If the purchaser road credits are eliminated in any form, that would be a taking of assets. Can the gentleman reassure me that in his amendment that would not occur?

Mr. DICKS. If my amendment is adopted, of course, we will keep the program going. Even if it is not, I am confident that there is nothing in the Kennedy-Porter amendment that retroactively takes away anybody's right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dicks was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the gentlewoman that there is nothing in my amendment and I do not believe anything in either amendment that would adversely affect prior timber purchaser credits. We would certainly work to put language in at some point to make sure that is a clear understanding. We will work with the chairman and the administration to make sure that is taken care of.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] because I do believe it could conceivably take away those credits. I would appreciate language that would make sure that did not happen.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. I think the point that is lost here, too, is that taking out this money which takes away the ability to reconstruct roads means we are going to have environmental problems. What this gentleman is proposing is a good environmental vote because it preserves the necessary money to reconstruct these roads in a way that not only can the public use them but we will avoid siltation, we will avoid a lot of problems that would result in an environmental degradation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] has again expired.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto in 1 hour be equally divided.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, reserv-...
on both amendments be concluded by 10:30 p.m. and that half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and half the time be controlled by myself.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield to the request of reservation, Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in trying to obtain a time limitation. I have been trying to do that working with the majority party for the last 45 minutes, but I do not think it is an especially sweet deal when all of the time is controlled by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and we will try to work it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a minute real purchaser credits because again this is one of the situations in which we have been debating where myth seems to override fact. And let me try to bring back to what is actually at stake here with respect to real purchaser credits which have been, they have been accused of being the handshake. It is a process that has been accused of being a subsidy, and let me explain exactly what happens:

If I am a timber purchaser and the forest service has a sale, the forest service identifies the amount of money for the road. When I bid the timber contract, I determine by my own assessment what the road is worth. If the road is in my estimation, in the estimation of the Forest Service, too expensive, I bid less on the timber. If I think I can build a road for the amount of money that is explained through the engineering process in the Forest Service, or less, than I bid more for the timber. So I adjust my timber bid depending upon my assessment of the road allocation determined by the Forest Service and by the engineering process.

When I am through the road is a wash. I do not bid the road to make money on trying to get the timber contract. So when it is all over, there is no advantage to me in the road process. However it is an advantage if I am a small business man because some way I am given a credit for the expense of the road in more timber.

That is the size of it. There is not a subsidy around it; there never has been.

Now do not press me. Look, I am from the west, I am from a timber country. My gosh, I am probably kidding my colleagues. But my colleagues all know Price-Waterhouse. My colleagues all know that they are a very successful auditing company in the United States. Price-Waterhouse has examined this issue. Price-Waterhouse says this is not a subsidy. Price-Waterhouse says there is not any big timber companies, and therefore I suggest that a third party witness says and disputes, disputes the thought that this is some sort of subsidy and therefore some sort of corporate pork. It is not.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is not an environmental issue, and it is not even a budget issue. This is a question of the management of forests.

Now, if we assume that we eliminate all of the appropriated money, as has been suggested. When we eliminate all the appropriated money, we eliminate the engineering process in America.

Now those of my colleagues who want to shut down the operation of every timber program in America, they are right, they are right. Go with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. You betcha; that is what is done.

If my colleagues believe in the management of forests for the protection of everything we want to protect, the endangered species, the water quality and quantity, the stream bank programs, the wildlife, and when I am finished I will tell them, then my colleagues have to realize that if we roads for the protection not only of the structure of the forests, but what about wild fires? What about recreation? What about all the opportunities that we all enjoy in the forests? Eliminated.

If we eliminate by the same token, the forest or the timber credit program, we have eliminated small business. Seventy-five percent of all contracts in the forests are given to small business, 75 percent. One of the reasons that they are still in business is simply because of the road credit program because, yes, they can collect their money earlier, they do not have to wait until the end of the program, they do not have to wait 3 years. Sometimes these contracts are out 3 years. They can assume timber in exchange for the cost, the cost of the road. Not profit, the cost. Therefore, my colleagues, this is not, should not be couched in the terms that we have heard.

So suppose there is a program that has appropriated funds for engineering, supporting any program that protects someone, road purchaser credits is essential to the health of the timber industry in the west.

Please understand this is the issue.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a unanimous-consent request, and I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not care who makes the unanimous-consent request. I think there is bipartisan agreement on the committee at least.

Mr. REGULA. That is the request I am going to make.

Mr. OBEY. And I think we ought to just proceed with the request, so why does the gentleman from Ohio not go ahead?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Porter amendment and all amendments thereto close in 80 minutes, the time be allocated as follows: 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEN-
Mr. Chairman, the debate, as I understand it now, will be for 80 minutes, 20 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks], 20 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], 20 by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Porter], and then after the 80 minutes of debate, then they will be intermingled. We will take votes on the Dicks substitute, and following that there will be a vote on Porter-Kennedy.

Then I want to announce to the Members that I am going to make a statement that is completed it would be the intention of the Chair to continue to take amendments with no further votes tonight. We will go to Line 7, Page 76 and stop just before the NEA issue, and the committee at that point will rise. So we would have two more votes tonight at the end of the 80-minute period in which we debate the Kennedy-Porter and the Dicks substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I do not take any action on the NEA issue tonight. We are going to stop just prior to reaching that point, which is Page 76, Line 7.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am having difficulty still hearing what the gentleman has said. I just want to make sure. There will be which other amendments, then debated tonight after these two? The Klug? Royce?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, any amendment will be in order that a Member might wish to offer until we reach Line 7, Page 76. If there were any votes ordered, they will be rolled over.

Mr. OBEY. All of the votes will be rolled?

Mr. REGULA. That is correct, there will be no votes after Porter-Kennedy and Dicks.

Mr. OBEY. One additional question.

It is essential that we not be in the committee markup marking up the transportation bill tomorrow when the NEA vote comes to the floor. Do we have an assurance that that double duty will not occur?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am advised by staff that the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Livingston] is trying to work this problem out to avoid the very thing the gentleman from Wisconsin described.

Mr. OBEY. My point is I want assurances that the debate on NEA will not occur while we are in full committee marking up because we cannot be in two places at the same time and everyone feels very strongly about that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DeGETTE].

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to a couple of points made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks].

First of all, this issue that everybody, all of the recreational uses, are generally increasing the Xiao AAO has stated that 70 percent of all Forest Service roads are designated as closed to vehicular traffic or for rough, high clearance vehicles. These logging roads are built for and used primarily by logging companies, and are generally inaccessible to vehicles driven by most Americans. I spent a lot of time in the national forests in my State, and I will tell Members that recreational users do not use these logging roads.

Second, with respect to the thought that housing sales will drastically increase if we cut this program, the truth is only 4 percent of all timber activity in the United States occurs in our national forests, and yet there are 377,000 miles of roads crisscrossing these national forests. That is a lot of road. That is a lot of drive. That is a lot of use by people.

I want to respond to a few comments I want to respond to a few comments. We have no greater admiration for anyone than I have for the gentleman, especially with the hard work he has done to bring this bill to the floor today. So many of my colleagues and friends who I vote with most of the time are on the other side of the issue. But this is an issue that if one is a fiscal conservative and one also loves the environment, it is a natural amendment to vote for.

Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straight here. First of all, we have heard the number of miles we are talking about, 380,000 miles. That is 15 times around the world. That is a lot of miles to be built in the national forests to be cut.

Mr. Chairman, the amount of logs that are taken out of the national forests is a very small amount of the total number of logs in the United States. It
only represents 4 to 5 percent of the total amount of commercial logging in the United States. So we are not talking about devastating the entire logging industry of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are two major reasons I believe we should be supporting the amendment: first, as a fiscal conservative, it is an issue of money. GAO did a study here about a year or so ago talking about the money. It costs us hundreds of millions of dollars every year to run this program. In 1995 it was $234 million net cost. It was $278 million in 1995, and it was $455 million back in 1994.

So the total cost of the timber harvesting business is costing the Federal taxpayers money. Why should the Federal taxpayers be subsidizing this program? That is what it is, is corporate welfare, when it has a subsidy. It is a net cost. The GAO said that.

Mr. Chairman, the other issue we talked about is the environment. It does affect the environment, especially when we combine logging, logging, with the roads. I am not opposed to logging in the national forests. My environmental friends may not agree with me on that issue, but I believe it is sustainable, logging in the national forests.

But there are some environmental impacts we have to be concerned with, because when we cut the trees and make the logs it allows more water to flow down over the roads. Roads raise the inside water into the streams, taking all the silt that builds up in there and the rocks and such, and it has caused damage to streams out West, so there are some environmental impacts that we have to be concerned with.

If Members are fiscal conservatives, if they believe in smaller Government, if they want to reduce the size and scope of the Government, this is a good amendment.

Let me conclude with a couple of quotes from some editorials, lots of editorials around the country. One is from my area of Florida and Tampa. This is a conservative newspaper, by the way. Their editorial says, "This issue," talking about logging, "should unite both conservatives who want to cut to Big Government and environmentalists who want to stop the destruction of America's woodlands." It says, "The issue for Congress should be easy. Washington shouldn't spend taxpayers' money to despoil public resources."

From USA Today yesterday, let me read one paragraph. "Fact is, the road-building subsidy is an anachronism, a fossil from the last century when Federal policy was aimed not at managing resources but rather enhancing economic development and westward expansion. Well, times change. The railroads now stretch from sea to sea. The land has been tamed. Let the timber industry pay its way, or at least pay for its own roads."

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD three newspaper articles:

QUIET ROADS BRINGING THUNDERING PROTESTS—CONGRESS TO BATTLE OVER WHO PAYS TO GET TO NATIONAL FOREST TREES

(By Carey Goldberg)

COEUR D'ALENE, ID.—They are only pretty little roads, the kind that inspired Robert Frost, the kind that bring memories of bumping happily over canopyed ruts on a bike. Or family outings jouncing by your past lacy walls of birches to a beloved pond or hunting ground.

But in the current battle over logging in the country's national forests, woodland roads are the focus of the debate. Loggers are increasingly blamed for contributing to floods, like those that have destroyed parts of Idaho, for shifting changes in rivers and streams for the fish that live in anastated fish stocks in rivers and lakes around this town in the Coeur d'Alene (pronounced kur dE LAINE) National Forest.

The cost of building roads is also increasingly cited as the reason that many national forests lose money on timber sales. And the dirt roads so web the country's woods, with more than 380,000 miles nationwide—enough to circle the globe nearly 15 times—that here in Idaho, one square mile of forest can be riddled by as many roads.

"We're concerned about the road network we have and the fact that it's two and a half times the size of the national highway system, which is 550,000 miles," said Jim Lyons, the Agriculture Department Under Secretary who oversees the Forest Service. "Our No. 1 water quality problem in the National Forest System is that network.

The opposition to logging roads has reached the point, some national conservation groups say, that they expect it to spark one of the biggest environmental fights in Congress this session.

"This is going to be a pretty big show-down," said Marty Hayden, senior policy analyst for the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, of a proposed amendment that would slash money for the roads.

The amendment, offered by Representative Joseph P. Kennedy II, a Massachusetts Democrat and John Edward Porter, an Illinois Republican, would prevent the Forest Service from using taxpayer money to build more roads. The measure has support from both environmentally inclined lawmakers and fiscal conservatives who oppose corporate subsidies, joined in an alliance known as "Green Scissors."

The timber industry and its allies are fighting the measure, saying that construction of the roads has dropped significantly, from 483 miles in 1996, at a cost of $74.3 million from 1.311 miles in 1991, at a cost of $1.49 million.

The American Forest and Paper Association, an industry group in Washington, D.C., also challenges the assertion that the Government has been misspending money for logging roads. In a sworn affidavit, a group spokesperson, said a recent Price-Waterhouse report commissioned by the association found "that, no, this is an efficient and effective way to build road reconstruction" in national forests.

The Forest Service has obliterated more than 18,000 miles of roads in the last 6 years. But a large share of roads were constructed, the Price-Waterhouse report noted.

The Clinton Administration is taking something of a participatory position. Mr. Lihning, said, requesting only a small amount for new roads in comparison to what it is asking for maintaining, reconstructing and oblitering logging roads.

But the Administration is also, for the first time, pushing for the abolition of the program under which timber companies subtract the cost of road-building from the price they pay for the trees they log in national forests, called the purchaser credit plan.

The road fight plays out in Congress, where environmentalists here in the Idaho Panhandle and in eastern Washington, where national forests are some of the most heavily roaded country, say they are wrestling with the stipulation that stems from a first-hand knowledge of the damage roads can do. "Roads have largely destroyed the Coeur d'Alene River here because they have killed a death of a thousand cuts," said John Osborn, founder of the Inland Empire Public Lands Council, a forest advocacy group.

In Spokane, Wash. "This is the worst case of watershed damage in the National Forest System."

Roads damage ecosystems in several ways, scientists say, and when heavy road-building is combined with cutting all the timber in an area, known as clear-cutting, the result is a one-two punch.

Trees absorb water. When they have been cut, more water flows down slopes like those that dominate the Coeur d'Alene National Forest.

When roads wash out, the scientists say, they dump rocks and soil on lower slopes and into streambeds; even when they remain intact, roads act as channels and contribute further to the erosion of lands and streams. The overall effect is that the streams and rivers fill with silt, the scientists say, and the silt mean ruined fish habitats and more flooding.

"It took only one-half the water in 1996 to cause the same damage as the floods in 1974 because the river flooded so much more easily," said Barry Rosenberg of the Inland Empire Public Lands Council.

In an effort to reduce the complement of fish species in an area, said Chip Corsi, a biologist at the Idaho Fish and Game Department. Researchers have found that as little as 1.7 miles of roads per square mile of forest have that effect. Mr. Corsi said, adding, "And here we have from 4 to 10 to 15 up to 20 miles of road per square mile—so it's extreme."

He added that roads can also hurt some forms of wildlife by opening their areas of the forest to other species, whether noxious weeds or human beings.

To the detriment of all image roads do, Mr. Corsi and others said, is to watersheds, and warnings to that effect have been coming from scientists and environmentalists for years. The heavy forest fires in the Northwest in 1996—including landslides that cost several lives—focused particular attention on the perils of forest roads.

Last June, the proposal by Representatives Kennedy and Porter that the Government stop reimbursing the timber companies for road construction lost by just one vote in the House. The new head of the Forest Service, Michael Dombeck, said when he was appointed in February that the national forests are some of the most heavily roaded areas. More than 380,000 miles of land are roaded.

The construction of roads in the national forests has already shrunk significantly. Mr. Lyons said that under the Forest Service's current proposed budget, it would build only 8 miles of new roads and timber purchasers would build an additional 300 miles, of which 132.6 miles would be in currently roadless areas. More than 2,000 miles of road would be reconstructed.

Even that is too much for environmentalists, who argue that the money should be spent on repairing old roads to minimize the damage they cause.

According to calculations by Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, a whistle-blower group of Federal, state and local workers in resource management, the Forest Service loses millions of dollars each
year on timber sales; in extreme cases, the group says, road building can cost the agency $1,000 for just $100 worth of timber. But the cost of building roads and the price of timber vary tremendously.

In areas like the North Fork of the Coeur d'Alene River here, state employees worry that there is not even enough money in the budget to maintain roads that exist, let alone to obliterate them.

Viewed from the air, the forest is so ringed and edged and swirled with roads that in places it looks like a giant potter's wheel. It is because of areas like this that the discussion in Congress is expected to be so charged.

"Part of the problem," Mr. Lyons said, "is trying to explain to people what you need in terms of road maintenance and reconstruction and obliteration to protect the resource—deal with salmon habitat and things that matter in the Northwest. There is this perception all the money we request for roads goes into building new roads."

[From USA Today, July 9, 1997]  
TIMBER! LET SUBSIDIES FALL

Congress this week will try again to end the ridiculous practice of paying loggers millions to build roads.

More than 100 years ago, in 1893, Congress created the National Forest Reserve as a means of protecting the nation's woodlands and important fish streams from the scouring clear-cuts inflicted by the 19th century timber industry.

Like many good resource-management ideas in those bad old rubber-baron days, the provisions didn't last long. In 1897, Congress voted to permit logging in the reserves, and the era of subvention timber industry cutouts and subsidies continues to finance tax-payer dollars today. Among the most egregious: a program through which taxpayers spend millions of dollars a year to build roads that loggers use to harvest cut-rate federal timber.

There is much to complain about when it comes to timber sales, which routinely cost the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars a year. But the issue at hand is far narrower. For the second year running, a bipartisan congressional alliance of environmentalists and timber-industry enthusiasts would much prefer clean creeks and pristine forests to more roads and additional erosion, pollution, and deforestation.

The issue for Congress should be easy. Washington shouldn't spend taxpayers' money to despoil public resources.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds. I want to respond to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], who indicated this is a program which supports small businesses. The truth of the matter is that out of the 12,000 companies, only 33 of them are small businesses. They receive 4 percent of the total road-building program in our national forests this country.

Mr. DICKS, does with this amendment, by 50 percent according to the Clinton administration, I checked on this, we would eliminate all new road building, including any roads into roadless areas, under the purchase credit program. That is the way they would use that reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds. "On the road-building subsidies, what you need in terms of road maintenance and reconstruction and obliteration to protect the resource—deal with salmon habitat and things that matter in the Northwest. There is this perception all the money we request for roads goes into building new roads."

Mr. CHENOWETH of Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH], chairman of the authorization subcommittee.

I had hoped to come to the floor to do fund to maintenance and add funds to removal, but it is not allowed under the bizarre rules under which we consider appropriations bills at this point.

There is a $440 million backlog, everybody admits to that, for maintenance. But they are saying, we are just cutting construction and reconstruction. No, you are not just cutting construction and reconstruction. Much of that backlog is reconstruction, and reconstruction is maintenance to the rest of us in the world, but not to the pointy heads down at the Forest Service. We need to get that work done.

Reducing purchaser credits by one-half, which the gentleman from Washington, Mr. NORM DICKS, does with this amendment, by 30 percent according to the Clinton administration, I checked on this, it will eliminate all new road building, including any roads into roadless areas, under the purchase credit program. That is the way they would use that reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds. "On the road-building subsidies, what you need in terms of road maintenance and reconstruction and obliteration to protect the resource—deal with salmon habitat and things that matter in the Northwest. There is this perception all the money we request for roads goes into building new roads."

And it's not as though we don't have roads already. The national forests are latticed by 377,000 miles of roads, almost twice as dense as some cities.

Do the road-building subsidies have economic importance? Hard to see how. The national forests account for only about 4 percent of the nation's timber production, hardly enough to affect prices or jobs. Other factors are far more influential. Between 1950 and 1994, the timber harvest increased by 64 percent, while employment in the wood and paper industry fell 4 percent.

Fact is, the road-building subsidy is an anachronism, a relic from the last century when federal policy was aimed not at managing resources but rather enhancing economic development and westward expansion. Well, times change. The railroads now stretch from sea to sea. The land has been tamed. Let the timber industry pay its own way, or at least for its own roads.

WHY WASTE MONEY ON LOGGING ROADS?

Washington spends about $30 million a year subsidizing the construction of logging roads in national forests. These roads cause erosion, pollute creeks and deface the wilderness. They are blamed for landslides that occurred during the flooding in the Northwest last year.

As U.S. Rep. Elizabeth Furse, an Oregon Democrat who is working with both Repub-"
Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, the 1998 appropriations bill will fund the reconstruction of 160 miles of damaged Forest Service roads. Through the purchaser credits program an additional 2,000 miles of roads will be reconstructed. Reconstruction will protect riparian systems, provide access for forest health prevention, and biodiversity protection.

The Kennedy-Porter amendment will eliminate these programs, including reconstruction, which will lead to an overall demise of the resource.

By effectively eliminating the roads program, the Kennedy-Porter amendment will seal the fate of thousands of small timber companies and businesses that depend upon the Forest Road Program.

Mr. Chairman, I find two very interesting common threads running with the sponsors of the Porter-Kennedy amendment. None of the sponsors that are from the Republican side, anyway, and I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], have any forest roads in their district. They do not serve on any of the natural resources subcommittees.

Furthermore, I find it interesting, these same individuals will debate strenuously for a subsidy for the NEA, $99.5 million last year. They debated strenuously for a subsidy for people's pleasure. Yet, we find them all excited about road credits, which are not a subsidy. I know these are intelligent people, and I know they understand the difference between subsidies and road credits. There are no direct subsidies going from the Federal Government to timber companies.

Furthermore, I want to make it clear that in 1996, small business brought 75 percent of the U.S. timber, 75 percent. It is not the great big timber companies. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] was absolutely right.

I want to ask the sponsor of this amendment, if it will not affect the lives of his constituents, it will affect the kids. I ask him to talk to the children who live in Elk City and Grangeville, ID, and the children of other timber-dependent communities throughout the country how they will make up the funding they count on for their schools that come out of timber sales.

I ask him to tell the sawmill owner in Bonners Ferry, ID, how he can now afford to purchase a timber sale to keep his mill operating. The Kennedy-Porter amendment will effectively shut down the national forests. If we pass this amendment today, our hands are tied. Fighting wildfires and addressing forest health problems will be nearly impossible.

Mr. KENEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy amendment, and am opposed to the amendment of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], my classmate.

Mr. Chairman, I think that our colleague and friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, raised the question before. He said if you have too many roads already and you cannot maintain them, then why are we going to build more?

That is really what this big fight is all about, because we are falling behind. We have the 380,000 miles of roads. We cannot maintain them. And we get studies that come back that look at the economic aspects, but they do not look at any of the physical aspects, the nontangible aspects in terms of what is happening with these roads in terms of fragmentation, in terms of erosion.

All these issues we have been talking about are being compounded by a program that is basically out of control. This does not cut down timber sales. The BLM, the State programs do not rely upon the type of program that the Forest Service has instituted that has built all these roads. And the fact is that most of these roads, 80 percent of them have nothing to do with or little to do with recreation. In fact, if that were the case, we could not have recreated any of these forests before the roads were built. We know that is not accurate.

When we talk about, small business, the definition of small business is 500 employees or more in these forest industries Road Credit Program. You say this is a small business program. Of the 13,000 companies involved, only about 30, 35 of them do not qualify for the purchase or credits. What this is is we are setting up a bank account. We are borrowing out the money, and we are not even checking what is happening in terms of what the consequence of the road building results.

The consequences are turning out to be a program that is out of control, that is heavily subsidized. I admit that this particular procedure is a blunt instrument in terms of dealing with this issue. We should deal with it much more surgically. But that is not the choice we have in terms of this rule or what is presented today in this chamber.

The choice we have tonight is to vote up an amendment that will in fact eliminate or stop this particular wasteeful subsidized program. We have got a choice of doing it the way the States do it. It will continue timber cutting, saying you are going to do it the way the BLM does it, you are going to do it the way the States do it. It will continue timber cutting but on a business basis not on the basis of Federal Government subsidy but on the basis of business economics in the market place not the Federal dole.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands.

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

I chaired this committee on the Forest Service for a while, had a lot to do with it. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] came up with some very good things. These folks say that there is no recreation. It is obvious where they are coming from.

I have spent my life in the outback in Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, that area. I was a guide at one time. I think I understand it very well.

Let me just say, they are used for recreation, about 90 percent. All these roads that are going to be built, they are going to have people who hunt, fish, camp, watch birds, and they are going to be on it. What I worry about is so-called Joe Sixpack, which a lot of us may fall into that category. I worry about the guy that does not have the opportunity to go out on that land, take his camper, take his kids, put up a tent and enjoy it for a little bit.

We are telling him, you cannot do this anymore. A guy I really worry about is the guy that runs a small business. We have got all of this water that came out. Now it has stopped. Now up come these things. What is going to happen? Last year we had more fires than we have ever had.

As one of the senior members of the Committee on National Security, I am always amazed how all these people want to buy all these old airplanes and put them back together. Guess what those fires cost us last year? $1.2 billion.

When you talk to the firefighters they say, but there are no roads to get in and out of there. It cost $500 an hour. Jump out of those things and get yourself killed. That is all right.

Are we worried about those people? I sure am. I think they are very important. I worry a lot about the people who run stock in that area. I worry about the people, the young people of America.

I built the house I lived in in 1968. I paid 83 cents for a 2-by-4. Now they are around $4 an apiece. Let us see what that means to the price.

So in a way, if you are a fiscal conservative, you will vote against the Kennedy bill and you will vote for the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks], my good friend, on this particular bill.

Carrying that on, if you want to see the cost of this thing go up, if you want a tax increase, vote for Porter-Kennedy. You will get a tax increase, I will package that with it.

If you want to hold taxes down, do not do it. These folks in a way are saying, let us give a tax increase to America. Let us burn the West, and that is
Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment to promote fiscal responsibility and protect our natural resources. I think it is clear that the American people want us to get our fiscal house in order in order to protect the environment. The Porter-Kennedy amendment accomplishes both of these goals by eliminating an unwise Federal subsidy which benefits large corporations and harms our national forests. I oppose the public lands. I understand the importance of accessibility to timber sales. But we already have 380,000 miles of roads in our national forests. That is eight times the size of our interstate highway system. And most of those roads can be used only by timber companies and are not suited for recreational use. It is time that American citizens stopped subsidizing the construction of more logging roads.

It is important to note that this amendment does not affect, let me stress, this amendment does not affect the funding of the Forest Service for the maintenance of existing roads, nor does it hamper the construction of recreational or general purpose roads. It simply says that if a timber company needs to build another road to reach another timber sale, the company, not the American taxpayer, should pay for it. It that makes perfect sense. So, too, do the Citizens Against Government Waste. So, too, do the Taxpayers for Common Sense and the Wilderness Society and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group. The list goes on and on.

Support U.S. taxpayers and the environment. Support the Kennedy-Porter amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

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

To my good friends from Illinois and Massachusetts sponsoring this amendment, I think it is well-intentioned, but they do not know the difference between a skidder and a knuckle boom.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

My colleagues, for all those who want to move towards a balanced budget, I urge support of this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, this debate is not about corporate welfare and it is not about the Federal budget. It is about proper land management of our forests, our land. If you owned a piece of land, would you let someone else come in and build a road on your piece of land and let them control where that road was, what the quality of the road was going to be, and whether or not the road was going to be permanent or temporary and receded? Absolutely not. That is what this debate is about. It is not about corporate welfare. It is about who manages that decision.

The timber companies do not keep the roads. We keep the roads. Recreationalists use the roads. And our professional forest managers need to design these roads to protect the quality of the road and whether it is a permanent or a temporary road. It is not also about the environment. If we allow the timber companies to build the road with their own money, they will bulldoze the cheapest, quickest road they can get in and do as much environmental damage as may happen. If we design the road through the purchase credit program, then we can protect the environment also.

This is a debate full of red herrings. It is a debate that misses the point. The fundamental issue here is that the Forest Service should be designing these roads and we should be forcing timber companies to pay for them. The current Forest Service credit program does that. If we abandon this program, the timber companies will bid, will estimate the cost of the roads at the highest possible figure. They will reduce their lumber by that amount of money. The net effect will be less money to the Federal Treasury. It is not about reducing a corporate subsidy because there is no corporate subsidy.

The fact is right now the bid price includes the cost of building the road. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment to promote fiscal responsibility and protect our natural resources. I think it is clear that the American people want us to get our fiscal house in order in order to protect the environment. The Porter-Kennedy amendment accomplishes both of these goals by eliminating an unwise Federal subsidy which benefits large corporations and harms our national forests. I oppose the public lands. I understand the importance of accessibility to timber sales. But we already have 380,000 miles of roads in our national forests. That is eight times the size of our interstate highway system. And most of those roads can be used only by timber companies and are not suited for recreational use.

It is time that American citizens stopped subsidizing the construction of more logging roads.

It is important to note that this amendment does not affect, let me stress, this amendment does not affect the funding of the Forest Service for the maintenance of existing roads, nor does it hamper the construction of recreational or general purpose roads.

It simply says that if a timber company needs to build another road to reach another timber sale, the company, not the American taxpayer, should pay for it. It that makes perfect sense. So, too, do the Citizens Against Government Waste. So, too, do the Taxpayers for Common Sense and the Wilderness Society and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group. The list goes on and on.

Support U.S. taxpayers and the environment. Support the Kennedy-Porter amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

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

To my good friends from Illinois and Massachusetts sponsoring this amendment, I think it is well-intentioned, but they do not know the difference between a skidder and a knuckle boom.

I must tell my colleagues that I do not care for the Dicks amendment a whole lot. I am going to support it simply because it is better than the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because this gentleman’s amendment is devastating.

We do not have to have roads in national forests. All we have to do is allow people an easement to go in, cut the timber and come out. I would agree that it would be a subsidy if that logging company or that logger took the road with him. But that does not keep the road. It leaves it there for the Federal Government to have.

I must tell my colleagues that that road is not just any road. In the private
sector they go in and they build temporary roads. And those temporary roads, they do not last. They are temporary. But I must also tell my colleagues that the roads that the Federal Government requires, the Forest Service must build, are built to the same specifications. They are interstates without blacktop. They have got drainage, concrete, culverts. Everything we would ever want on a road, they have it.

Why would we ever expect a timber company to build a road to go in on that property and build to the specifications that the Federal Government demanded and then turn around and say, “By the way, you have invested in that; you cannot take any credit whatsoever.” It is ludicrous.

There is one other point that is even more ludicrous. My home county, Franklin County, MS, Meadville, 490 people, all good people, 70 percent of the county is national forest. Homochitto National Forest. They tell me in my home county that, if the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts passes, that we are going to cut revenue in timber sales by 40 percent. What does that do?

In my opinion, the purpose of this amendment, I would like to find out from them, what will they say to the schoolchildren that will be devastated by the loss of revenue that we use to educate those children. The money that the Federal Government is going to keep them from having because the county is owned basically by the Federal Government. What will we do?

It is a sad representation that this amendment will do anything good for our economy.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to show the gentleman from Mississippi his idea of an interstate highway. This is in fact the real truth about what happens on these logging roads.

These logging roads are built by the American taxpayer. The companies, in fact, get a huge subsidy from the American taxpayer. And the American taxpayer is then forced to maintain these roads. It is a terrible subsidy. It should stop. And we are talking about 8 miles worth of roads in this amendment. Eight miles.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment because eliminating the logging road subsidy will stop those sales that lose the most money and are the most environmentally harmful.

Logging road construction, particularly on steep, unstable slopes, dramatically increases the risk of landslides and siltation into streams. And this picture demonstrates what I am talking about. After the winter storms in the last 2 years in the Pacific Northwest, the Forest Service found in Idaho that 70 percent of the 422 landslides were associated with these Forest Service logging roads.

Over two-thirds of the roads built in our national forests are logging roads constructed primarily to access timber sales. And when the Forest Service should be in the business of constructing these roads on behalf of the timber companies. The Forest Service should follow the lead of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management and require that these roads be built by the timber companies at their own cost.

These companies can figure out where it is economical to build a road and make a timber sale and where it is not. By building these roads for these companies, the Forest Service facilitates logging in many areas that would not otherwise be profitable. Last year 87 percent of the logging operations in our national forests lost money for the Forest Service. Why? Because we are building roads for timber companies to log in areas that should never have been logged and are not economical.

As a result of this backward policy, making our national forests into a logging highway, we now have 578,000 miles of road. In 1965 we had 342 miles of road. That is triple the area under non-Forest Service land.

This amendment is not going to stop roads from being built in our national forests, but it will stop taxpayers from footing the bill for timber roads. Support the amendment.

Mr. REGULA, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Porter amendment and in favor of the Dicks substitute. I want to talk on a couple of points I have heard here today. The first one is that there is no subsidy for the timber roads in this legislation. As the gentlewoman from Ohio told us earlier, according to a recent economic analysis released by Price Waterhouse: “The forest roads program does not contain a subsidy for timber purchases; it provides an efficient and effective mechanism for financing road construction and reconstruction.”

These roads are primarily used in the national forest system for recreation. Mr. Chairman. Ninety-seven percent of the road system in any given national forest is used for recreational purposes by the public. I do not think that the public is getting a good deal and reason why is subsidy. They are used by folks who want to go up and see the wildlifer, or by the disabled, for years by my family when we did hiking in the North Cascades and never would have gotten into that territory without access to these timber roads.

Second, Mr. Chairman, it is very important that we consider the rural counties that are located next to these national forests. They receive 25 percent of the gross receipts from timber sales in lieu of property taxes on Federal lands. They cannot tax Federal land property, so it is important for us to be supported by the Government in our rural school districts.

In my State, loss of funding would place an unbearable burden on rural school districts because of the number of acres of Federal land in our State that cannot be taxed. We are talking $28.2 million for schools and roads, 76 percent of the timber receipts in my State, because of the impact of Federal regulation.

I stand in opposition, Mr. Chairman, and urge my colleagues to vote against the Porter-Kennedy and in favor of the Dicks amendment.

Mr. DICKS, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, my perspective on this is a little different from most of these folks that have been up here tonight. I come from the Southeast, but my district is the second largest timber producing district in the country. And whether one is in the Southeast or the Northwest, the issue is the same when it comes to proper forest management. In order to have proper forest management, we have to have control of burning and we have to have the removal of dead and diseased trees.

In order to get those dead and diseased trees and to control burning, we have to have access to those forests. Without the construction of roads, we do not have that access. It is a very, very simple issue.

Once those roads are constructed, they are not only used for removal of these trees and controlled burning, they are used by hikers, bikers, by bird watchers, by hunters, by fishermen; all folks ought to have access to public lands.

If this amendment passes, every single Member of this House will have constituents that are negatively affected. I urge a no vote on the Kennedy-Porter amendment.

Mr. PORTER, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to give my strong support to the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

It is really a win-win situation. First of all, the Forest Service will save over half the amount it actually spends on the construction and reconstruction of roads. It will spend $41.5 million instead of $89.5 million.

Second, almost no timber industry jobs will be lost, since only 4 percent of all timber comes from our national forests. Many of these workers will still be hired if the logging company wants to build a road.

And the riparian ecology would be left unchanged for future generations.
Of course, I believe that environmental concerns are of paramount importance, and this amendment preserves the environment. However, economics makes passage of this amendment essential.

I believe that Paul Roberts summarized the economic impact in his sober Harper's magazine article, "The Federal Chainsaw Massacre," when he wrote, "According to government and independent auditors, once realistic accounting methods are applied, most Federal timber sales actually lose money."

Why then do Members continue to hear from timber interests in support of this Federal subsidy? Well, it seems to me there is a simple explanation. Would we not want to have government pay if it is willing to do so?

What we need to ask is, is this subsidy beneficial to the public? Is it profitable? Do we believe that it is the duty of government? To all of these I think the answer is no.

I do not oppose logging but I do oppose unnecessary and wasteful subsidies. Timber users should pay the same fair costs for their product as they would in the 96 percent of private lands available for logging.

In my district I found that, while timber sales in our national forests returned $302 million to the Treasury, taxpayers spent $1.298 billion in administrative costs; a net loss of $995 million.

This amendment will also reduce the number of timber sales that lose money. It is highly unlikely that a logging company would be willing to accept the risk of constructing a road for sale where it is going to cost more to access, log and transport the trees than would be recouped at current free market timber values.

I hope this House will join me in supporting this very reasonable and important amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I join with many of my colleagues who tonight have spoken in opposition to the Kennedy-Porter amendment.

This is not an issue of corporate subsidy or corporate welfare. As the Price Waterhouse study has shown, with or without the purchaser road credit, the net receipts to the Federal Government from the road is not change. And the administration has affirmed that.

Many of the points I wanted to make tonight have already been made, and I think it is important that someone from the Northeast have an opportunity to speak on this side who would not otherwise have an opportunity because of the limited time we have and, therefore, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bass].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Idaho.

I want to say a couple of things. First of all, from my perspective, from the perspective of a businessman, this amendment is nothing but a pig in a poke. The fact of the matter is logs do not fly. They will not sprout wings and fly out of the forests, and somebody will have to pay for these logging roads.

Now, contracts for timber are let exactly the same way a contract would be let to build a building or parking lot or anything else. There is a sale price and cost of sales, and then there is a back charge or credit the cost, especially of capital improvements, into the sale price.

These roads are going to be built, unless we plan to end timber harvest completely in this country, which would be a terrible idea. We will not end up saving money, because the bids will have to be lowered in order to cover this capital expense.

So let us defeat this amendment and get on with the business of approving this Interior appropriations.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, what is the relative time left in the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has 11 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has 10 1/2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 11 1/2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has 10 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to tell my colleagues that I think we went through this debate about a year ago, that this debate really has a deja vu view quality. To quote Yogi Berra, "It feels like deja vu all over again."

We seem to talk right past one another on this one particular issue. There is this enormous continental divide that somehow separates us from ever reaching any kind of middle ground on this particular issue. I just find it fascinating and, yes, distressing that people, representatives, well-intentioned in this body, who represent largely urban districts, whether they be in Massachusetts, Illinois, New York, Florida, Northern Virginia, Maryland, wherever it might be, apparently have no understanding nor any appreciation for the concerns of us that represent these districts that are home to timber-dependent communities.

Now, make no mistake about it, this is bad policy. These are public roads that provide public access to Federal forest lands for a variety of purposes. And I thought we wanted to encourage the idea of multiple use of Federal forest lands. It is going to further reduce PILT payments, payments in lieu of taxes, to local communities and local schools. It is going to worsen forest health and exacerbate the fire damage on Federal forest lands.

I would just quote to my colleagues from a letter from the 225,000 members of the International Association of Fire Fighters, who say that "the forest roads program and the purchaser road credit program are essential to providing safe passage for fire fighters and protecting our national forests and surrounding communities from catastrophic wildfires." We urge our colleagues to oppose the Kennedy amendment and any other efforts to reduce funding for forest roads construction and maintenance.

The International Association of Fire Fighters are joined by several other important national labor organizations in opposing this amendment, including the United Paperworkers International Union, the Association of Western Pulp and Paperworkers, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

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

I rise in opposition to the Kennedy-Porter amendment. This amendment would have a devastating impact on the health and well-being of our national forests, jobs, small businesses, recreation, education, local government.

In a letter from the Society of American Foresters, one of the oldest conservation organizations in the world and which is widely respected as the leader in forestry science, they state that the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a negative impact on forest health. The letter states, and I quote: Forest roads are the single most important infrastructure component that supports natural resources professionals in the maintenance of healthy forest ecosystems.

In addition, the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a devastating impact on jobs and small businesses across the country. According to the Forest Service, timber harvesting annually supports over 64,000 jobs, which results in over $337 million in Federal income tax revenues. Small businesses purchase two-thirds of the timber harvested in national forests.

Contrary to what supporters say of the Kennedy-Porter amendment or as they have tried to portray, 97 percent of forest roads are open for recreational use. That means for everyone and which is widely respected as the leader in forestry science, they state that the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a negative impact on forest health. The letter states, and I quote: Forest roads are the single most important infrastructure component that supports natural resources professionals in the maintenance of healthy forest ecosystems.

In addition, the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a devastating impact on jobs and small businesses across the country. According to the Forest Service, timber harvesting annually supports over 64,000 jobs, which results in over $337 million in Federal income tax revenues. Small businesses purchase two-thirds of the timber harvested in national forests.

Finally, supporters claim that this forest program is a subsidy. This is blatantly false. As has been repeatedly said tonight, the Price Waterhouse report concludes that the road program is not a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, the Kennedy-Porter amendment is well intended but completely advisable. We will have to pay for these logging roads.

Mr. Chairman, from a letter from the 225,000 members of the International Association of Fire Fighters, who say that "the forest roads program and the purchaser road credit program are essential to providing safe passage for fire fighters and protecting our national forests and surrounding communities from catastrophic wildfires." We urge our colleagues to oppose the Kennedy amendment and any other efforts to reduce funding for forest roads construction and maintenance.

The International Association of Fire Fighters are joined by several other important national labor organizations in opposing this amendment, including the United Paperworkers International Union, the Association of Western Pulp and Paperworkers, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

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

I rise in opposition to the Kennedy-Porter amendment. This amendment would have a devastating impact on the health and well-being of our national forests, jobs, small businesses, recreation, education, local government.

In a letter from the Society of American Foresters, one of the oldest conservation organizations in the world and which is widely respected as the leader in forestry science, they state that the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a negative impact on forest health. The letter states, and I quote: Forest roads are the single most important infrastructure component that supports natural resources professionals in the maintenance of healthy forest ecosystems.

In addition, the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a devastating impact on jobs and small businesses across the country. According to the Forest Service, timber harvesting annually supports over 64,000 jobs, which results in over $337 million in Federal income tax revenues. Small businesses purchase two-thirds of the timber harvested in national forests.

Contrary to what supporters say of the Kennedy-Porter amendment or as they have tried to portray, 97 percent of forest roads are open for recreational use. That means for everyone and which is widely respected as the leader in forestry science, they state that the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a negative impact on forest health. The letter states, and I quote: Forest roads are the single most important infrastructure component that supports natural resources professionals in the maintenance of healthy forest ecosystems.

In addition, the Kennedy-Porter amendment would have a devastating impact on jobs and small businesses across the country. According to the Forest Service, timber harvesting annually supports over 64,000 jobs, which results in over $337 million in Federal income tax revenues. Small businesses purchase two-thirds of the timber harvested in national forests.

Finally, supporters claim that this forest program is a subsidy. This is blatantly false. As has been repeatedly said tonight, the Price Waterhouse report concludes that the road program is not a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, the Kennedy-Porter amendment is well intended but completely advisable. We will have to pay for these logging roads.

Mr. Chairman, from a letter from the 225,000 members of the International Association of Fire Fighters, who say that "the forest roads program and the purchaser road credit program are essential to providing safe passage for fire fighters and protecting our national forests and surrounding communities from catastrophic wildfires." We urge our colleagues to oppose the Kennedy amendment and any other efforts to reduce funding for forest roads construction and maintenance.

The International Association of Fire Fighters are joined by several other important national labor organizations in opposing this amendment, including the United Paperworkers International Union, the Association of Western Pulp and Paperworkers, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.
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government, forest health, small businesses, recreation, education and jobs.
Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk a little bit about some of the things I have heard today. I am a sponsor of this amendment and, obviously, I rise in strong support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment. It would end taxpayer subsidies for the construction of logging roads in our national forests. People said it is not a subsidy? USA Today says it is a subsidy. The Washington Post says it is a subsidy. I have heard a great amount of talk about the recreational needs and how people who are recreating would use these roads and why they would oppose this amendment. However, I wanted to point out who does support this amendment. Trout Unlimited. They support the amendment. Steelhead Committee of the Federation of Fly Fishers; the Northwest Sports Fishing Association; the Association of Northwest Steelheaders; Idaho Rivers United; Puget Sound Gill Netters; Washington Trout. They support this amendment because they know that this amendment is good for recreational use.
My region has been plagued by catastrophic floods that triggered hundreds of mud slides. Study after study found that the majority of these slides were associated with logging roads and the clear cuts they accessed. Mud slides also cause job loss. They destroy the habitat of our imperiled salmon runs. These fisheries once provided more than 60,000 jobs and revenues to my region annually. But the runs have gone belly up because, amongst other things, we have very destructive road-building activity.
According to the National Marine Fisheries, and I quote, "Road construction has been a primary source of salmonid habitat decline." And the American Fisheries Society, the professional society of fishery scientists reports, "Only rarely can roads be built that have no negative effects on streams." So that is why the sports and commercial fishery interests support this amendment, the same groups that I have spoken of before, the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations. That is the largest group of commercial fishermen in the West. Again, let us look at recreational use of roads. Seventy percent of logging roads are closed to vehicles that are not high vehicles, 70 percent, so the recreational use is not there. It is limited to hiking.
This amendment allows logging roads to be built. Want to repeat that. This amendment allows logging roads to be built. What it does not allow is for the taxpayer to pay so that a company can go in, take public timber, take the profit, and we pay for the roads. Do we pay just once? No. The taxpayer pays three times for these roads. One for the road, one for the subsidy. The taxpayer pays to maintain the road, another subsidy. And then the taxpayer comes along and pays for the flood damage. Do the timber companies pay for the flood damage? No, they do not. The taxpayer pays for the flood damage. We already have 380,000 miles of road in our national forests.
I say that for the sake of fishers, for the sake of the fish, for the sake of the taxpayer, for the sake of the environment, I say it is time to stop the subsidy.
And I would like to comment, at the end, by telling my colleagues that I am in an area which has lots of timber companies. I have heard from not one timber company that has said they cannot afford to build a road. If they are not telling us that, if they are willing to go in and build a road, it is the cost of doing business. We do not build roads and charge for them. "Gee, the roads are closed to vehicles that are not high vehicles," they say. "In order for you to do business, we are going to build you a road within your company headquarters."
So let us stop the subsidy. Let us listen to the recreational users. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the recreational users. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "Gee, we are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them." Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "We are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them." Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "Gee, we are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them."
So let us stop the subsidy. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "Gee, we are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them." Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "Gee, we are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them." Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. Let us listen to the user groups. "Gee, we are sick of paying subsidies to companies who can well afford to pay them."
Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.
The real problem here is that the Federal Government owns an awful lot of land. All of us conservatives and those who have kind of a libertarian perspective on government need to deal with that. The real issue is that the Government owns so much land. Now we are not going to resolve that debate here tonight. But given the fact that the Federal Government owns so much land, they have the obligation to manage it well, since we are part of that Government, since we are, in fact, Members of Congress who preside over that body, that entity, how do we manage properly the land that we own? Those issues are not big issues for private land owners. They manage their forests properly. In my county back in Colorado, the county I live in, 70 percent of the land in my county is owned by the Government. Seventy percent. These are critical issues for us.
Now think about that. I think those of my colleagues who are proposing this amendment might really understand this if the Federal Government thought about taking over and occupying more of their State. But this seems to be an issue that is of great concern out in the West.
What about those forest areas and those lands where the timber sale may not cover the cost of roads? Those are rare occasions, but they do occur. But I would submit that we still need to be concerned about logging those areas where the timber industry and timber harvest is an integral part to sound forest management.
Let me show my colleagues what happens when you do not properly manage a forest. Now the gentleman over here showed a black-and-white picture of something he believed to be a hazard. This is a color picture. This picture is in color. It just looks black-and-white because there is no life left here. Everything is dead. This is what happens when you do not get in and thin a forest. The trees get crowded. They compete with one another for water. They get stressed. Bacteria and disease move in. The trees die. They become brittle. They will catch on fire, and it burns to the ground and there is nothing left there for anybody, no wildlife, no valuable timber, no recreation, nothing. It is going to rain here and all of it is going to wash into the river and kill the fish.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have, please?
Mr. PORTER. The Chairman. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has 9% minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has 7% minutes, The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has 7 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 9% minutes.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. This amendment would help protect the last frontier of our national forest. The United States does not need this wood. In fact, in 1995 timber companies exported the equivalent of 500,000 logs, that is 500,000 logs, a truck load each day. These companies were bypassing American jobs by exporting the wood raw.
Our national forests represent a major portion of the last remaining untouched forest in this country. If we cannot completely protect this small remaining percentage of our forests from the chain saws, the least we can do is prevent the American taxpayers from having to pay some of the bills for logging.
Let us remember that these American treasures belong to all the American people, not the timber industry or...
foreign countries. End this wasteful handout.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation, a noted expert on these matters.

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

I rise in opposition to the Porter amendment and in support of the Dicks amendment, and might add that my colleague from across the water in northern Wisconsin [Mr. Obey] joins me in that position.

We sure heard a lot of hyperbole and imagery tonight. Paul Bunyan, you left out his ox Babe, and corporate giants. Let me introduce my colleagues to Tony Vukelich, logger from northern Minnesota, 3 or 4 pulp cutters, maybe 10 or 15 in his little sawmill. Let me introduce my colleagues to Howard Hedstrom up in the Gunflint Trail up in northern Minnesota in a small sawmill, and about 10 or 15 loggers. Let me introduce my colleagues to Toivo Maki, a Finnish pulp cutter from northern Minnesota. I do not think their income, their gross revenue, is $100,000.

We are talking about small operators, heart and soul of northern Minnesota, the heart and soul of rural America, people who try to make an honest living in the woods.

A logger has to bid on those sales that are offered by the U.S. Forest Service and has to include in the bid the price of the road that he has to build. That road is there available for snowmobilers in the wintertime and for the hikers and the campers and for the people going out fishing, all sorts of recreational uses on that road. They do not get charged for it. But it is there for everybody's use. We used to call them tote roads in northern Minnesota.

The annual allowable cut in our two forests of the Chippewa and the Superior is way down to about half of what it was. Yet we are still cutting timber that was harvested on sales that was harvested first in the 1930's and then in the 1960's and now it is being harvested in the 1990's. This is a renewable resource. This is not an issue between corporate giants and little guys. This is silk stocking urban environmentalists against us rural hicks from the sticks, and I am fed up with it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Peterson].

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I find it very frustrating this evening, it is the first time I have heard this debate personally. I come from the Allegheny National Forest in my district, 520,000 acres. I happen to know the person that runs the forest, manages the forest. He talked this morning with the man that does the contracts, I know the design engineer that designs the roads, I understand how the system works. The gentlemen may not like the system, but what they are doing is advocating for the public interest.

The Porter-Kennedy amendment is like an MX missile on rural Pennsylvania's economy and our rural road system. It is devastating. It will harm parts, and even more so in the west, what has 15 or 20 percent unemployment. We have a group of urban legislators who in my view of listening to all of their testimony know very little about this issue and how it really works. I mean that sincerely.

We are really cutting $91 million out of rural road maintenance, $41 million out of the credit program and $41 million out of the maintenance program because that is what the majority of it is used for. We are trying to change policy through the appropriations process.

It is understandable that we have an urban group who does not understand the rural economy and are trying to devastate it in behalf of the people who do not want to cut timber in this country. It is not a fiscal issue. If it was a fiscal issue, we would be talking about cutting Amtrak, which has $783 million. That is a subsidy. We would be talking about $4.3 billion that we spend for mass transit. That is a subsidy. And $91 million, if you want to call it a subsidy, it is for rural America. It is for roads that campers use, that tourists use, the hikers use, the fishermen use.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Blumenauer].

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman for the patience that he and his staff have demonstrated in helping work through some of these issues, Mr. Chairman, are complex. I think the American people who have listened to the debate so far this evening may be a little confused. Earlier in the evening I had one of my new found friends, who was confused and in fact last year I confessed that since there were two votes, I actually ended up voting on both sides of this issue. I voted because I was attempting to determine what was in fact in the best interest of the people that I represent but, most importantly, what would make the most difference in terms of the environment of our forests.

I hope that this debate will spark a serious analysis and real action on the problems related to roads in our national forests. For people who care deeply about the environment and look beyond the rhetoric, it is sometimes hard to know the best way to protect that environment.

In part, this confusion evidenced this evening shows why we should not attempt to legislate or set policy via the appropriations process. It is the blunt instrument that people have referenced. While the passage of this amendment may in fact slow or stop some roadwork, it will not achieve what the advocates claim, it will not stop logging roads, and it is not clear how much, if any, money this will save.

What we need to do is focus on policy solutions that make sense for the environment and the economy. We need, in fact, additional protections for roadless areas. We do need to use our resources more carefully. We do need to reduce the number of road miles and their impact on our national forests while we adequately maintain roads to avoid degradation of stream and wildlife habitat. We need to take this opportunity to bring the Forest Service, the administration, the industry and environmental advocates together to develop an approach that meets everybody's needs. This vote is a signal for Congress to provide the leadership and guidance to provide a road policy.

Congress needs to provide leadership and guidance through the legislative process. I would like to work with my colleagues involved in this debate to help move that effort forward to create sound road policy in the next year—a policy that improves the environment and saves money—a policy that can be understood—and, importantly, a policy that allows us to monitor our progress toward an environmentally sound National Forest System.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].
I guess I am really concerned about this debate, because I think it misses the point altogether, that in rural areas this is not a subsidy, it is a way of life. It is an important way for our economies to grow and that indeed there are many, many small businesses indeed across the country, indeed millions of people derive benefit from these roads that never have anything to do with logging.

I would urge the House to accept the Dicks amendment and to reject a perhaps 5% cut but ill-founded Kennedy-Porter amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. HOOLEY].

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my views on the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

I have come to Congress to find solutions, to find ways to use the legislative process to help us resolve our different issues. What I find most troubling is that the forest service funds go to flood repair in damaged areas and roads that are badly in need of maintenance.

I plan to do everything I can in the coming days to make sure our existing roads are safe and I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee on resources and a cosponsor of this amendment, I am pleased that tonight in a single vote this Congress can both protect the taxpayers pocketbook and do something to enhance our precious natural resources. With this bipartisan amendment, we seek to end yet another form of corporate welfare, in this case essentially food stamps for timber companies.

The roads that are being constructed at public expense in our national forests are of course too rough for most people to drive a car over, but in many ways they are very similar to tollways near you. Tolls are charged for these timber roads across our forests. It is just that the taxpayer is the one who pays while corporate timber interests get a free ride at taxpayer expense. As we continue to try to balance the Federal budget, this is exactly the kind of corporate welfare we need to get rid of.

I voted last year to end certain types of welfare to individuals, and it is time to apply the same reasoning to corporate interests. Groups as diverse as the Sierra Club and the National Taxpayers Union agree that this is the type of taxpayer financed corporate freebie that we need to eliminate.

This amendment does not prevent private logging companies from building roads at their own expense. If a company is allowed to log, they can build whatever roads they need. The only difference would be that the timber companies, the people who benefit from the roads, will pay for it, not the taxpayer. If these roads do not make economic sense for the timber companies, then why in the world should the taxpayers of America be asked to pay for them?

We have over 379,000 miles of roads in our national forests, almost 9 times the mileage of the national highway system. Timber companies are allowed to build roads at public expense in our national forests. According to the U.S. Forest Service, this Nation has a forest road backlog of $440 million. In my district alone, it is a $20 million backlog.

I support the Porter amendment because it is the ultimate solution to our forest road dilemmas. I am supportive of the amendment’s emphasis on not spending Federal Government moneys on new road construction. I think that eliminating purchaser road credits is a move in the right direction.

The Bureau of Land Management timber purchasers have never used the purchaser road credits in this manner. They are not able to build roads and access timber in an affordable and efficient manner. Forest Service purchasers should do the same. However, I find it disturbing that this amendment takes funding away from forest road reconstruction. In the forests in my districts, reconstruction funds go to flood repair in damaged areas and roads that are badly in need of maintenance.

While I commend this amendment for defunding new roads, I think that the amendment does not take, as broad a view of the problems confronting our forests as it should.

What we really need is comprehensive forest legislation which takes funds earmarked for new road construction and puts that money into road maintenance. We have over 379,000 miles of roads in our national forests, almost 9 times the mileage of the national highway system. Timber companies are allowed to build roads, but they are paying it in a different government pocket.

The taxpayer is supposed to feel good about this amendment. I think the only people who benefit from this, it looks like to me, are the only ones who are going to come out ahead in this are the special interests who are trying to kill the logging industry.

I think that we need to defeat the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Klug], one the sponsors of this amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding this time to me.

Let me just ask one simple question in this room. If there is no subsidy involved in this program, why are special interests fighting so hard to preserve it? And if there is no implication whatsoever if we eliminate it, they should not be fighting to eliminate it? That is the bottom line in this whole debate. And let us make the very point that the Dicks amendment, which is before us as well, essentially cuts the savings in the Porter amendment in half.

So, if one person is trying to save double and we cut it in half, then obviously there is somehow money involved in this program. They really are fighting for something. The whole question is do we want to cut something? And if there is no implication whatsoever if we eliminate it, then they should not be fighting to eliminate it. That is the simple mistake.

Now my friend from South Dakota made the point to say that essentially the mission of many of us who are in support of the Porter amendment is to eliminate timber sales in national forests. That is simply not true. My fundamental point of view is not to eliminate timber sales, but it is to make money on timber sales in national forests, which it seems to me a very fundamental Republican principle.

Mr. Chairman, there are 380,000 miles of roads in the national forest system, and three-quarters of them are closed to the American public at large. Three-
quarters of them are essentially exclusively for the use of the timber industry.

Again, I have got no objections if the timber industry harvests in those forests, I have no objections if the timber industry builds more roads. There is nothing in this amendment that says they cannot build as many roads as they want. What it simply says is the roads will not be built with a subsidy in for the taxpayers.

I understand the timber dollars they are getting; instead they are getting trees. But trees have value; when they sell them they make money on them. So it is a barter system which is, frankly, even older than money.

And finally let me make the point again we have been criticized continually this evening, saying, “If you eliminate this, there won’t be money left for a number of Forest Service opportunities and programs that would be needed.” That is not true. There is money still left after this recission for firefighting roads, for road maintenance, to build more roads to be available to tourism and the recreational industries. Frankly there is $19 million left in this program specifically to oversee the construction of new roads by the timber companies.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TURNER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak out tonight on behalf of the loggers and the small sawmill owners in my district in east Texas, who just about an hour ago made it back to the house and probably are on the front porch right now trying to work on their chainsaws and get ready for tomorrow. Those folks would certainly disagree with the Washington Post if the Washington Post said that the road credit is a subsidy.

The truth of the matter is that we, in order to preserve the national forests, require higher quality of roads in areas of the forest or logs than are required in the private sector; and to offset that increased cost of building the kind of roads we want in our national forests to protect the public interests, we offer a road credit. That is to say the road that is built there by the loggers is going to be a road that lasts for many, many years.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure any of my colleagues who have ever been on a track of land that was logged in the private sector that I know that the roads that are built in the private sector do not last 15 or 20 years.

So this program, it is environmentally sound, and it does not cost the taxpayer one cent because we, as taxpayers, are getting a quality road, and the taxpayers are getting every benefit that was intended for them to get in the road credit program. It is not a subsidy. It is good environmental policy, it protects the national forests, and it allows the Forest Service to control the type of road that is built.

Secondly, this Kennedy amendment is environmentally unsound because it cuts $42 million out of road maintenance in the national forest. If my colleagues believe in the environment, they want those bar ditches and those culverts to be maintained, they want those roads to be trolled. That is what the $42 million is all about; that is why it is there. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] returns this bill to the administrators’ proposal that cuts only $5.6 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Dicks amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Porter-Kennedy amendment is a commonsense amendment. Unlike the National Endowment for the Arts which benefits many—and was recklessly eliminated in this bill, this timber subsidy benefits very few. This amendment cannot even U.S. maintain the existing roads reporting in March that it had a $440 million backlog of road maintenance needs. Why should new logging roads, giving a subsidy to private companies, when there is no money available to maintain the one already needs little sense and spends taxpayers dollars foolishly without a measurable benefit.

Besides being unnecessarily expensive because of the steep slopes and rough terrain, these new logging roads will hurt our national forests which already have extensive road systems which result in road density that brings about a decline in many species in our wildlife population.

Vote Common Sense. Vote for our environment—vote for the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment to H.R. 2107, the Interior Appropriations Act of 1998. This important measure would prevent the further destruction of our Nation’s Federal forest and especially the few old growth forest which remain on public land.

The Porter-Kennedy amendment to H.R. 2107 would reduce by $42 million the Forest Service’s $160 million in the funding for reconstruction and construction. The amendment also eliminates—again—from $50 million to $1—on the Forest Service’s Purchaser Credit Program. Both changes are intended to eliminate support for the construction of new logging roads into roadless areas. Under the Purchaser Credit Program, timber companies may build roads into national forest for logging purposes, and in return, receive up to $50 million in credits against the amount they owe the Federal Government for timber sales.

The stewardship of our Nation’s Federal lands should and must be of the greatest priority in this Congress—it is a public trust we cannot fail.

This amendment would protect Federal lands from the destruction created by logging roads which harm the forest environment by degrading and polluting nearby streams, dividing wildlife habitats into small fragments, and allowing the spread of exotic plants and animal species.

A thousand communities depend on national forest watersheds for clean water supplies which are threatened by silt and runoff from logging roads. Road into national forest degrade forest even before any trees are cut. They cause erosion and sedimentation—and massive mudslides—are inescapable byproducts of roadbuilding in steep terrain. In Idaho, for example 70 percent of last year’s 422 mudslides were associated with national forest roads.

This amendment would not affect funding for building recreation and general purpose roads which are funded separately. The Porter-Kennedy amendment would allow routine road maintenance for necessary upkeep and repair of roads which includes timber, recreation and general purpose roads.

According to the Forest Service there are over 380,000 miles of forest roads in the existing road system that are in need of repair. There is a backlog of maintenance on the 232,000 miles with a cost $440 million.

The Interior appropriations bill will retain $85 million for maintenance of existing roads.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Porter-Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy-Porter amendment, in opposition to the Dicks amendment, and I do so now, because a lot of the repair and maintenance in the Dicks amendment is the result of the Porter amendment that cuts $42 million out of road maintenance. And whether or not there is, in fact, a subsidy that is being provided to the timber industry; I rise in support of this amendment because I think that if we are going to be trying to refashion government in the manner in which we are trying to operate the agencies and the others in the timber industry, that this is an approach to take.

What we are talking about now is how do we design a system so that we have more market forces coming to bear? I do not think there is going to be an overall change in the level of revenue which the Federal Government is going to achieve, because I, quite frankly, agree with some of the opponents’ amendments in that the bids that timber companies are getting to be offering for these tracts of timber are actually going to be lower. But what is going to happen is that Porter amendment is that we are no longer going to be insulating the determination in terms of what is going to be the cost for building a road from the market forces. We are no longer going to be, in effect, having a cost-based reimbursement, and that is what is important.

We are now going to be putting in place a more market-based mechanism which is going to ensure that the timber companies which are bidding on these tracts of land are going to have a financial incentive to build these roads.
in the most cost-effective manner, and that is what is in the taxpayers' interest. Unfortunately, while some of the rhetoric is based upon what is going to generate, whether or not it is a subsidy or not, my interest in supporting Kennedy-Porter amendment is that it is based upon a system which is going to ensure that the market forces are going to ensure that taxpayers are going to be getting the greatest return on their investment. And that, I think, is the most compelling reason, and why those who are most interested in ensuring that taxpayers of this country are getting the greatest return on their investment should support the Kennedy-Porter amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], one of the major sponsors of this amendment. I wish I had more time to give him.

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

As my colleagues know, in the narrow scope of an appropriation bill and the accompanying rules, the substitute that I stand in support of, works out a good compromise. No. 1, the Porter-Kennedy amendment eliminates a very important maintenance account, maintenance for fire, maintenance for recreational purposes. This restores it but does not increase it except for to the President's level, No. 1. No. 2, it puts in $25 million, reducing the amount for purchase credits by half. Now $25 million, and listen to this, listen to this very carefully, is less than the NEA allocations for California and New York. That is what it is; yes, very, very important for small timber purchases. What this money will do is if there are two roads, but they both build a third road to get to the trees, what happens is when the logger builds that road, the money also goes to the first and second road, and so three roads are maintained by, as our jobs, as are the forests. Vote for the substitute; it is a very good compromise.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled by the incredible misinformation that we are hearing this evening. I represent a district in northern California that is probably one of the most productive tree-growing areas in the world, and we have eight national forests in our district. I would like to state a few facts and compare it with policy, if I could.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] pointed out earlier, this is a 2-by-4. This very 2-by-4 we could buy for 22 cents in 1988, and this builds homes in each of our districts, those of my colleagues who have homes in the big cities that are out trying to support the Kennedy amendment now. In 1997 this same 2-by-4 sells for 44 cents, double the price. Double the price it was.

Let me make something very clear. I do support responsible logging in our national forests, but saying that does not mean I support asking the American taxpayers to spend millions and millions of dollars, so that big-profit timber companies do not have to pay for their own roads.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not affect recreation or general purpose roads for fire safety or affect jobs. But what it will do is that the American people's confidence in this Congress' ability to cut wasteful Federal spending as we work to balance the budget and make the tough decisions on which programs receive Federal funding and which should not. It makes good sense to target subsidy programs that waste taxpayer dollars and harm the environment.

I ask my colleagues to support the bipartisan timber roads amendment. Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of rhetoric that we have heard on this floor over the course of the last couple of hours. I have heard this amendment accused of fire. I have heard it accused of taxes, I have heard it accused of running up the cost of 2-by-4's, I have heard it accused of floods. The only thing left is pestilence, and I am sure in the next few minutes we will hear that, too.

But the truth of the matter is that for those that say some guy from Massachusetts does not know a lot about the forest, they may be right, but I did take the time yesterday to meet with the National Forest Service. I met with them for a couple of hours in my office to try to understand exactly what this amendment would do and exactly what the program that is in place currently does.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, this amendment in no way cuts this country's capability of fighting fires. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build recreational roads. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build trails. It in no way cuts the maintenance of existing roads. It in no way cuts roads needed for forest health.

Anyone who has stood up on the House floor in the last couple of hours and said that taxpayer dollars and harm the environment. It is such a bad deal that a unique coalition has formed in support of this amendment. Republicans and Democrats from across the entire political spectrum have joined forces in support of this reasonable amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need a subsidy, of course it does. Instead of paying them in dollars, we pay them in trees. That is what this is all about. If the program did not need a subsidy, why are we dealing with it in an appropriation bill? The saying that does not need to go build those roads and harm the environment. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build recreational roads. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build trails. It in no way cuts the maintenance of existing roads. It in no way cuts roads needed for forest health.

People that say that the purchaser credit program does not require a subsidy, of course it does. Instead of paying them in dollars, we pay them in trees. That is what this is all about. If the program did not need a subsidy, why are we dealing with it in an appropriation bill? The saying that does not need to go build those roads and harm the environment. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build recreational roads. It in no way cuts this country's ability to build trails. It in no way cuts the maintenance of existing roads. It in no way cuts roads needed for forest health.

Support the Porter-Kennedy amendment and defeat the Dicks amendment.
the road, or allow credit against the timber sale for the cost of the con-struction. Why is that not a subsidy? It is not a subsidy because the timber sale anticipates or takes into consider-ation access. Therefore, the Govern-ment uses the road credits, is given to local governments. It goes to counties and it goes to school districts. This amendment, pure and simple, will take $10 million out of the budgets of local governments. It is important to understand that in recent years there have been dramatic reduc-tions in the timber harvest on the Federal lands. The result has been large reductions in payments to these communities already. The reduction in harvest has been accompanied with plant layoffs.

So at a time when there are fewer jobs, high unemployment, considerable disruptions in these communities, the authors of this amendment want to make the problem in those communities worse by lowering the value of timber and therefore reducing the reve nues from these timber sales, they will destroy these communities. Please op-pose this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in opposi-tion to the Kennedy-Porter amendment, and ask Members to vote for the Dicks-Kingston-Hansen amendment.

Our amendment basically does this. It is a compromise. Instead of cutting $50 million out of timber purchaser credit, our amendment would only cut $25 million. Instead of cutting $41.5 million out of appropriated funds for timber roads, we would only cut $5.6 million, which takes it back to the administra-tion's budget request.

Look at what happened here in tim-ber sales in our country. In the 1980's, we were up at around 12 billion board feet. Now we are down to 3.7 billion board feet. What has that done? That has driven up the cost of timber. It has made our homes more expensive. If we are going to have access even to the 3.7 billion board feet, we are going to have to put some additional new roads. That is where the Kennedy amendment really does hurts us.

Second, recreation. Let me just read the Members what these roads are all about. Over 100 million acres, or over 300 million visitor days of recreation use a year, ac-ces to over 121,000 miles of trail, ac-ces to more than 34 million acres of designated wilderness, access to 19 na-tional recreation areas, near access to over 18,000 recreation facilities, access to about 7,000 miles of scenic byways, ac-ces to 50 major visitors centers, and major ski resorts.

So I am telling the Members that this amendment offered by the gen-tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Ken-ney] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Porter] will have a devastating effect. It will reduce the timber harvest, and it will cost $300 million, which is not a subsidy because the timber service intends to build only 8 miles of new roads in the entire 190 million acre national forest system, and just 1 mile of this is a tim-ber road. The essential point here is that most of the road construction funds pro-vided to our 122 national forests goes for re-construction of existing roads.

I would also like to address the issue of how current government policies affecting the local communities would be affected by the Kennedy-Porter amendment. Each year, 25 percent of all reve nues collected by national forests are returned to the States where those national forests are located. This is money that pays for bedrock community projects, such as public schools and county roads. In addition, counties also receive payments in lieu of taxes [PILT], which can supplement school and roads funding or go toward other important community needs. In many of the counties in my district, this can mean more than $100,000 annually. In fact, the reduction of $41 million in the Kennedy amendment would stand to lose as much as $140,000 were the Kennedy/Porter amendment to pass.

The damaging effects of this amendment are made even more evident when you con-sider the loss in jobs and economic activity. The timber industry in the State of Missouri accounts for approximately 20,000 jobs and $3 billion dollars in economic activity. These are family owned businesses, hard-working folks. Their work is an important part of our local economy and a key element in the wise management of our national forests.

Finally, let me make one more point. If Members care about people, if they care about the 76 million people that take their families to the national for-ests for recreation, if they care about their safety, if they care about the en-vironment, Members will vote for the Dicks amendment, because it does not go too far, as does the Porter amend-ment.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy-Porter amendment, which would undermine the health of our national forests and effectively shut them down to recreation, industry, and sportsmen. This amendment is completely contrary to the wise and effective manage-ment of our national forests. The International Association of Firefighters says that the pro-visions of the Kennedy-Porter amendment are "essential to providing safe passage for firefighters and protecting our national for-est and surrounding communities from cata-strophic wildfires."

One of the most misunderstood aspects of the forest roads program is how the money is actually spent. The fact of the matter is that new road construction accounts for a very small portion of the funding. In fact, the forest service intends to build only 8 miles of new roads in the entire 190 million acre national forest system, and just 1 mile of this is a timber road. The essential point here is that most of the road construction funds pro-vided to our 122 national forests goes for re-construction of existing roads.

I want to reiterate that the versión of the Kennedy amendment would cost the Forest Service $117 million. That is 37 percent of all the money available to them to spend on recreation in the entire United States. The Kennedy amendment would cost the Forest Service $41.5 million. That is 12.5 percent of all the money available to them to spend on recreation in the entire United States.

I urge Members to vote against the Kennedy amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of Chicken Little this evening, but be-lieve me, the sky is not falling. We have heard from the gentleman from Georgia and many others that we are going to be cutting out the mainte-nance of roads and the obliteration of roads. That is simply not true. We have heard that the recreation roads are going to be cut. Not true. It does not affect the control, not true. It does not affect them at all.

We have heard from the gentleman from Oregon that land management and the engineering process is going to be undermined. Not true. There is $5.9 billion remaining in the account for management and oversight by the For-est Service. We have heard that this amendment involves $89.5 million. It does not, it is $41.5 million. It is a sub-sidy. If it is not a subsidy, why are the Members worried about it? Obviously it is a subsidy.

Finally, let me say also that the question of small businesses was raised. The chairman protected this en- tire account for only small business, and a point of order was offered and sustained to put Weyerhauser and Georgia-Pacific back in the subsidy.

No, this is about subsidizing the tim-ber companies, and believe me, Mr. Chairman, it is time that they simply have a tax in a free enterpris-e society. This amendment is quintessentially Republican. Seven of the nine sponsors of the amendment are Republican. We believe in free mar-kets and competition, not in captive markets and subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Land Management does not work this way. The Bureau of Indian Affairs does not work this way. It is time we let the free market system dictate timber sales in our national forests as well. Ed and I have worked toward this, the former welfare, we have reformed agriculture in this Congress and in the previous one. Now is the time to reform and elimi-nate subsidies of this type. They are an anachronism. I urge Members to sup-port the Porter amendment and oppose the Dicks amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say to all of you, this sale by 30 down to 10. We are watching on C-SPAN and coming over here to vote, that the right vote is to vote for the amend-ment of the gentleman from Washing-ton [Mr. Dicks]. Why do I say that? Let me quote from the Secretary of Agri-culture, one of our former colleagues, who understands it, who is responsible for the management of our forests.

Secretary Glickman says in his let-ter, "However, the $41.5 million reduc-tion in the amendment that is proposed by the Porter-Kennedy amendment, "goes too far in eliminating important con-struction and reconstruction efforts that provide public safety and environ-mental benefits." It says it all. It says it all.

If Members care about people, if they care about the 76 million people that take their families to the national for-ests for recreation, if they care about their safety, if they care about the en-vironment, Members will vote for the Dicks amendment, because it does not go too far, as does the Porter amend-ment.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy-Porter amendment, which would undermine the health of our national forests.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Porter, I was not a Westerner and I have no vested interest in this issue. But, it's not just access for our wildlife fire-fighters that is important. These roads also provide important access for resource managers, foresters, hunters, fishermen, campers, hikers, and yes, even those who just want to take a walk in the woods.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to look past the political rhetoric that many groups would have you believe. If you support promoting long-term forest health and sound environmental stewardship, I urge you to support the forest roads program and defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 209, not voting 14, as follows:

[NR. NO. 262] AYES—211

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Baucus
Bingaman
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Clayton
Clayburn
Condit
Contyn
Cox
Costello
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Delums
Dixon

AYES—211

NOES—209

Aderholt
Arch
Arney
Bachus
Bailey
Baucus
Baxley
Ballenger
Barc
cBarrett (NE)
Barrett
Barth
Bass
Bederman
Bender
Bereuter
Berry

AYES—246

Riley
Rodriquez
Rogers
Ryan
Salmon
Sandlin
Schaffer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Sirks
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowberger
Solomon
Soudier
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tazun
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierian
Traficant
Turner
Wamp
Watkins
Watson (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Welker
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Mr. GREEN and Mrs. MALONEY of New York, changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CRAPO, BONILLA, and NEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I was unknowingly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. Chairman, I was unknowingly detained on rollcall vote No. 262, the Dicks amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 5, as follows:

[NR. NO. 263] AYES—246

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Baucus
Bingaman
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Clayton
Clayburn

AYES—246

Cook
Costello
Cox
Cummings
Cunningham
Cutler
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

MR. GREEN and Mrs. MALONEY of New York, changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CRAPO, BONILLA, and NEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I was unknowingly detained on rollcall vote No. 262, the Dicks amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. Chairman, I was unknowingly detained on rollcall vote No. 262, the Dicks amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 5, as follows:
Mr. SUNunu and Mr. REYES changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the Members that there will be no more votes tonight. We are going to have two more amendments, one by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] on the clean coal, and possibly another energy.

But any votes that will be called for will be rolled over until tomorrow. I would reiterate that it is our goal to finish by 2 o’clock tomorrow, and we will try to get time agreements if necessary to meet that target.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460m-1), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statute authority applicable to the Forest Service, $250,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS—SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; and the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $1,069,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums as to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 486a), to remain available until expended.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, on September 28th last year representatives of the Federal Government, representatives of the State of California government, and the Pacific Lumber Co. headquartered in Humboldt County, California, signed an agreement providing for the Federal acquisition of 75,000 acres of timberland in Humboldt County, in my congressional district.

This land includes 3,000 acres known as the Headwaters Forest, which is the largest privately-owned old-growth redwood forest in the world. This is an un-entered tract of redwood timberland that is zoned for timber production. It is the highest and the best land.

The funds for the Headwaters agreement would come from a combination of State and Federal accounts. The Federal share of the total acquisition cost is $250 million, and the Federal share as I understand the agreement, as I think the distinguished subcommittee chairman knows, between the Congress and the White House anticipates a $700 million increase in the Land and Water Conservation Fund for priority Federal land acquisitions and land exchanges.

Of this, I believe it is understood that $250 million would be earmarked for the completion of the Headwaters Forest agreement. But I have always been concerned about the impact that agreement could have on Humboldt County. My district, as the chairman probably knows, is home to all or part of four Federal forests as well as the national redwood parks and the state redwood parks. Unemployment is high and the local economy is suffering as a result of the current restrictions on timber harvesting on both private and public lands.

With the removal of the Headwaters Forest from private ownership, the transfer of the Headwaters Forest and the 7,500 acres of forest land from private ownership to public ownership, Humboldt County stands to lose potential millions of dollars in future tax revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I did submit to the committee several proposals that would let the Headwaters Forest agreement go forward, with economic mitigation for Humboldt County. I had intended to offer an amendment prohibiting the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used to acquire the Headwaters until two conditions have been met.

First, all of the terms and conditions of the Headwaters Forest agreement itself must be satisfied or fulfilled by the
parties to that agreement. Second, legislation must be enacted or an appropriation approved providing economic assistance to Humboldt County, California, to mitigate the loss of tax revenues incurred because of the Headwaters Forest management plan, and again, the transfer of this land from private to public ownership.

Mr. Chairman, section 205 of the joint House-Senate budget resolution, again negotiated between the Congress and the White House, includes the money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and, as I mentioned earlier, $250 million for the Federal Government to acquire this timberland in question.

Again, I reiterate my concerns. Mr. Chairman, about the potential impact of this agreement and this land acquisition on Humboldt County, and bring to your attention the fact that Humboldt County again stands to lose potentially millions of dollars in future tax revenues.

I am seeking your assurance, Mr. Chairman, that any money for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest agreement through the Land and Water Conservation Program or through the fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill will not be approved, will not be appropriated unless there is adequate mitigation for Humboldt County.

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

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

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

The gentleman from California has repeatedly made his concerns for Humboldt County, California, known to me. I fully understand how important an issue this is to the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] and the people of Humboldt County.

The $700 million was not included in the bill reported from the committee. However, it is possible that the Senate will include all or part of these funds. I assure the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] that I will raise his concerns for the need of economic mitigation for Humboldt County if the funds are an issue with the House-Senate conference on the interior appropriations bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the gentleman for his attention to this very important matter and point out to him that the Secretary of the Interior has asked me to work with him and the other House-Senate conferees on this particular issue, not only to secure the funding for the Headwaters Forest acquisition but also the equally important funding to provide economic assistance to Humboldt County and the state of California to compensate for the loss of future tax revenues.

Again, I appreciate the assurance of the chairman that he will work with me and my fellow House-Senate conferees to resolve this issue of economic mitigation for Humboldt County. Given that assurance, I will not offer my amendment later today or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 per cent of the cost of each of the following: 900 acres of grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the sixteen Western States, pursuant to section 403(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to prevent and control noxious weeds, which plan, after the amount expended of which shall not to exceed 6 per centum shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $82,000, to remain available until expended for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 337 of the Forest and Rangeland Research Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 1487d) unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 147b) unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service under authority of Public Law 100-203, are hereby appropriated for the purpose of disseminating program information to private and public individuals and organizations through the use of nonmonetary items of nominal value and to provide nonmonetary awards of nominal value and to incur necessary expenses for the nonmonetary recognition of private individuals and organizations that make contributions to Forest Service programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money collected, in advance or otherwise, by the Forest Service under authority of section 101 of Public Law 93-153 (30 U.S.C. 185(1)) as reimbursement of administrative and other costs incurred in processing pipeline applications, may be used for firefighting support, for costs incurred in monitoring the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of any pipeline and related facilities, and for any costs incidental to the use of the pipeline facilities. Any such money appropriated to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Mr. RIGGS. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, section 205 of the joint House-Senate budget resolution, again negotiated between the Congress and the White House, includes the money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and, as I mentioned earlier, $250 million for the Federal Government to acquire this timberland in question.

Mr. Chairman, about the potential impact of this agreement and this land acquisition on Humboldt County, and bring to your attention the fact that Humboldt County again stands to lose potentially millions of dollars in future tax revenues.

I am seeking your assurance, Mr. Chairman, that any money for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest agreement through the Land and Water Conservation Program or through the fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill will not be approved, will not be appropriated unless there is adequate mitigation for Humboldt County.

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

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

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

The gentleman from California has repeatedly made his concerns for Humboldt County, California, known to me. I fully understand how important an issue this is to the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] and the people of Humboldt County.

The $700 million was not included in the bill reported from the committee. However, it is possible that the Senate will include all or part of these funds. I assure the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] that I will raise his concerns for the need of economic mitigation for Humboldt County if the funds are an issue with the House-Senate conference on the interior appropriations bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the gentleman for his attention to this very important matter and point out to him that the Secretary of the Interior has asked me to work with him and the other House-Senate conferees on this particular issue, not only to secure the funding for the Headwaters Forest acquisition but also the equally important funding to provide economic assistance to Humboldt County and the state of California to compensate for the loss of future tax revenues.

Again, I appreciate the assurance of the chairman that he will work with me and my fellow House-Senate conferees to resolve this issue of economic mitigation for Humboldt County. Given that assurance, I will not offer my amendment later today or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 per cent of the cost of each of the following: 900 acres of grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the sixteen Western States, pursuant to section 403(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to prevent and control noxious weeds, which plan, after the amount expended of which shall not to exceed 6 per centum shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $82,000, to remain available until expended for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 337 of the Forest and Rangeland Research Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 1487d) unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 147b) unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service under authority of Public Law 100-203, are hereby appropriated for the purpose of disseminating program information to private and public individuals and organizations through the use of nonmonetary items of nominal value and to provide nonmonetary awards of nominal value and to incur necessary expenses for the nonmonetary recognition of private individuals and organizations that make contributions to Forest Service programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money collected, in advance or otherwise, by the Forest Service under authority of section 101 of Public Law 93-153 (30 U.S.C. 185(1)) as reimbursement of administrative and other costs incurred in processing pipeline applications, may be used for firefighting support, for costs incurred in monitoring the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of any pipeline and related facilities, and for any costs incidental to the use of the pipeline facilities. Any such money appropriated to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the report accompanying this bill.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Mr. RIGGS. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, section 205 of the joint House-Senate budget resolution, again negotiated between the Congress and the White House, includes the money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and, as I mentioned earlier, $250 million for the Federal Government to acquire this timberland in question.

Mr. Chairman, about the potential impact of this agreement and this land acquisition on Humboldt County, and bring to your attention the fact that Humboldt County again stands to lose potentially millions of dollars in future tax revenues.

I am seeking your assurance, Mr. Chairman, that any money for the acquisition of the Headwaters Forest agreement through the Land and Water Conservation Program or through the fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill will not be approved, will not be appropriated unless there is adequate mitigation for Humboldt County.

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

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

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

The gentleman from California has repeatedly made his concerns for Humboldt County, California, known to me. I fully understand how important an issue this is to the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] and the people of Humboldt County.

The $700 million was not included in the bill reported from the committee. However, it is possible that the Senate will include all or part of these funds. I assure the gentleman from California [Mr. Rigs] that I will raise his concerns for the need of economic mitigation for Humboldt County if the funds are an issue with the House-Senate conference on the interior appropriations bill.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the gentleman for his attention to this very important matter and point out to him that the Secretary of the Interior has asked me to work with him and the other House-Senate conferees on this particular issue, not only to secure the funding for the Headwaters Forest acquisition but also the equally important funding to provide economic assistance to Humboldt County and the state of California to compensate for the loss of future tax revenues.

Again, I appreciate the assurance of the chairman that he will work with me and my fellow House-Senate conferees to resolve this issue of economic mitigation for Humboldt County. Given that assurance, I will not offer my amendment later today or tomorrow.
Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $1,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Forest Service is authorized to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular or irregular intervals to assist in determining the need for, and in performing work occasioned by emergencies such as fires, storms, floods, earthquakes or any other unavoidable cause without regard to Sunday, Federal holidays, and the regular work week.

To the greatest extent possible, and in accordance with the Final Amendment to the Shawnee National Forest Plan, none of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $500,000, shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided, That the Forest Service may transfer Federal funds to a recipient of Federal financial assistance for a project at the same rate that the recipient has provided Federal matching funds: Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with other eligible nonprofit organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or structures owned or operated by the National Forest System: Provided, That funds for the move must come from funds otherwise available to Region 5: Provided further, That any funds provided for such purposes shall only be available upon approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with other eligible nonprofit organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or structures owned or operated by the National Forest System: Provided, That such gifts may be accepted notwithstanding the fact that a donor conducts business with the Department in any capacity.

Provisions of the Southeast Alaska Economic Disaster Fund as set forth in section 1(b) of the Southeast Alaska Economic Disaster Fund Act provided in subsection (c) shall be considered direct payments for purposes of all applicable law except that these direct grants may not be used for facilities.

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

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. Klug:

Mrs. KULG. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment.

The CHIEFAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. Klug: Page 58, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $2,000,000)."

Mr. REGULAR. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHIEFAN. The time will be 15 minutes for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULAR] and 15 minutes for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What have we before us tonight, Mr. Chair, is I think a very clear debate over the subject of corporate welfare, corporate in the sense that the money that we are明年 on this evening to do coal research benefits a number of major corporations across the country and across the world, corporations like Alcoa, worth $2.5 billion, or GE, $70 billion, and welfare in the sense that we have a funding of research for an industry to essentially make leaps forward in industrial technology since the 1930’s.

In fact, we have been funding coal programs since Franklin Roosevelt was President. We have to ask ourselves after 60 years if the program has not paid back dividends to this point, why do we have any reasonable expectation that it will pay back dividends in the future, either in the near future or in the long-term future whatsoever?

The program is fundamentally unnecessary because financial incentives already exist for the mining industry to develop cleaner burning coal technologies under the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. The 1991 General Accounting Office report concluded that the program has been plagued by chronic cost overruns and scheduling problems, it funds technologies already commercially developed, those unlikely to be used because they fail to reduce emissions as much as existing technologies and many in fact within the industry have already been developed without any help of Federal assistance or Federal financing.

In fact at this point, Mr. Chair, we have already spent $2.75 billion on clean air technology research, nearly $3 billion aimed at large multinational corporations and at this point the government has recovered only $400,000 on its investment. While recognizing the need for Federal assistance with high risk research, the Department of Energy testified before Congress that the type of demonstration projects are not the wisest use of taxpayer dollars, and I could not agree more.

The other thing, Mr. Chair, to point out is the fact that this program
has been absolutely overrun with abuses and failures since the beginning. Since the first projects were initiated 10 years ago, there were 51 initial projects included in essentially 5 rounds of proposals and competition. Fifteen have withdrawn, and the other 36 projects are still in the books, never to get to the construction stage, one of the project sponsors has already been forced into bankruptcy, and one of the projects is now on its fifth site in 10 years unable to find any kind of financial backing for technology. I think any of my colleagues who look at this objectively as well as a number of outside groups like Citizens against Government Waste, Friends of the Earth, Taxpayers for Common Sense, the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, all fundamentally recognize that this is a corporate welfare program that has to be eliminated if we are ever going to get this Nation's book in order and it is unfair to end up actually running in the black.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Brown], ranking member of the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me commend the committee for the excellent job that it has done with regard to the legislation before us. I think they have been moderate in proposing cuts in the various programs that required cuts and they have maintained those programs which have the prospect of providing lasting improvements in the efficiency of our fossil energy economy in future years. I think it is well that we should understand that despite all of the attacks made on them, that they represent corporate welfare to large corporations, is simply not the case. Most of these programs are operated by small and medium sized organizations.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. The program is working well. The committee is supervising it closely.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of points. What we have just heard is the fundamental argument we always get on any science program, that we cannot cancel it because they just started it and there might be potential, or we cannot cancel it because we have invested so much money they might as well finish the project to see if it pays dividends.

There is never an optimal point to terminate a science project according to many people in this Chamber, but I will say fundamentally that if the program is going to be terminated in the near future, we might as well save the money today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Subcommittee on Interior, it is two days since I have been in this body and it is with a certain degree of trepidation that I stand up in disagreement with my chairman. My chairman is one of the great Members of this body and it is with a certain amount of reluctance that I do that, but as someone who has been a fiscal conservative and opposed to corporate welfare since I came here, this is a classic case of corporate welfare. What we are talking about doing is saving the American people $292 million, $292 million that our taxpayers have to send to Washington for us to pay back and give to large corporations to build power plants. What this program is about, starting back in 1986, was to test the new technology on power plants. There were approximately 45 projects around the United States that received millions of dollars. In fact, over $2 billion has been spent on this program to date. What we are talking about doing is saying, wait a minute, wisely we decided to stop creating these new projects back in 1993, but there are still some projects in the design phase. We can stop them now. That is how we can save the $292 million. We do not need these programs. One of the programs that is being talked about is in bankruptcy right now. Another one is on its fifth location and cannot even find a site. Another one DOE says they may cancel because the sponsor could not guarantee the technology would survive another two years. Another program is on its second site location because the initial backers decided the technology was not economically viable. That was a $183 million program. I think our taxpayers in this country deserve to keep their own money rather than paying to clean up something and sending it back for these projects.

I support basic research as a responsibility of the Federal Government. I am a strong supporter of NIH. I think the National Science Foundation is an appropriate place for basic research. But this is applied research. This is building power plants to provide energy power. This program was created back in 1986. The Clean Air Act changed the rules back in 1990. That is another reason we do not need this right now.

This has the strong support of fiscal conservative organizations, supported by the Citizens Against Government Waste, the Taxpayers for Common Sense, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, the National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Tax Reform, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute. It has got wide support by the conservative organizations because this is an effort to save money.

It is misnamed by calling it clean coal. It is clean coal in name only because the environmental community supports this amendment, because what the environmental community is saying, coal is not the best type of energy source we have. We have organizations like the Sierra Club supporting this amendment. This is a program that I think has outlived its usefulness. We have a chance to save the American taxpayers money. It is corporate welfare, and I think it is time that we end it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Klug amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE].

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. This amendment claims to save money while helping clean up our environment. What we have in fact here, Mr. Chairman, is a case of false advertising. The purpose of this amendment is to save money. The simplistic view is yes, but the truth of the matter is that it will end up costing more than it purports to save.

The clean coal technology program is comprised of a number of cooperative agreements between government and industry. These agreements are legally binding contracts. Some Members do not understand what a contract
is, but the Federal Government is going to remain liable for its share of these agreements regardless of what action we take here in this bill. So if we pass this amendment, not only will we likely end up paying for the cost of the programs that we are going to saddle the American taxpayer with the cost of the Federal Government defending itself against litigation.

Let us look at whether this amendment really does much for environment. It is all well and good to support R&D in areas such as solar and biomass, which is something I have fought for, but it is not realistic to expect that these options will be a significant segment of our energy supply for the foreseeable future.

The Energy Information Agency in its examination of trends in the energy sector has determined that in the year 2030, 88 percent of our energy is going to come from a very narrow band of sources. It is therefore important that we take this while taking into account the likelihood that the United States is going to commit to emissions reduction targets later this year in Kyoto.

How are we going to meet these limits? This is a question. Through technological innovation in areas where emissions reductions can be realized. Since coal is our most abundant domestic resource, it makes sense to try and develop methods to burn it cleaner. The type of investments that we need to do are too risky for the private sector to assume on their own. That is why Congress came up with the Clean Coal Technology Program to meet this challenge.

The clean coal program is exploring methods that have made burning coal as clean as natural gas and are sound investments. Clean coal technologies can cut acid rain emissions by 98 percent, fly ash emissions by 99 percent and CO₂ emissions by over 40 percent. Obviously, continuing with this effort is the better environmental alternative and can be short sighted.

Let us look further at some of the arguments put forward by the proponents of this amendment. They criticize the Clean Coal Technology Program because some of the projects have failed. Of course some of the projects are going to fail. These are high risk endeavors. That is why the government is involved, to leverage an investment that the private sector would not otherwise make. If their success were guaranteed, there would be no need for government participation. Keep in mind, when a project fails, the industrial partner also does not benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

If I could for a moment quote from a study that was done by the Department of Energy in 1985 at the time this program was first being considered, it says:

Given the size and availability of U.S. coal reserves, the security of the domestic coal supply and the comparative economics of coal as a fuel, free market forces are operating to select and commercialize the most efficient and environmentally effective clean coal technologies both within and outside the coal industry.

In other words, if there are innovations to be made in the coal industry, they are more likely to be made without the Federal Government’s involvement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] to further support that point.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The clean coal technology program is unnecessary. Financial incentives already exist for private industry to develop cleaner burning technologies; the recipients of these funds represent several corporations that do have billions of dollars in revenues a year; and, lastly, even the Department of Energy has stated that demonstration projects such as those supported by the clean coal technology program have not, quote, “the proper place or certainly in these fiscally constrained times the wisest place for Federal funding.” This is from the Department of Energy.

The clean coal program has a history of waste and mismanagement. According to a General Accounting Office Report, almost half of the program’s ongoing projects have exceeded their budgets, fallen behind schedule or scaled back their scope. If the program proceeds as planned, taxpayers will hand out a total of $2.3 billion to the private coal industry and receive little in return. According to the General Accounting Office and the Department of Energy, it is unlikely that we will ever be able to recover taxpayers’ investment in clean coal projects.

I join with me and Citizens Against Government Waste in ending this unnecessary program and take a step towards balancing the budget. Vote ‘yes’ on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I would point out that the GAO report of 1994, the most recent report, and I quote, “the program has shown that the government and the private sector can work together effectively to develop and demonstrate new technologies. The lessons learned from DOE’s experience with the program should be useful for similar programs in which costs are shared.”

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply note that I am going to vote for this amendment because it does not do nothing to nobody. The outlay savings from this amendment are exactly zero. This money is never going to be spent, it is there simply as a cushion against contractual obligations, and so vote for it because this budget authority reduction will result in not one dollar of outlay savings.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

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

Mr. Chairman, I represent southern Illinois which is part of the Illinois coal basin, and it is part of the coal that we have in this country, 300 years of coal supply in this country to supply energy needs for America. The problem is much of it is high sulfur coal, we cannot sell it.

The Clean Air Act cost us nearly 15,000 jobs in the Illinois coal basin alone when it was passed, and I guess I question that my colleagues is where do we think that we are going to go in the future for supplying the energy needs of this country? We have barely 30 years of proven oil and gas reserves left in the entire world right now, we are decommissioning our nuclear power plants all over this country, and that is going to rapidly expand as their life runs out. We are kidding ourselves if we think we are going to go to solar or wind or some of the other things.

Mr. Chairman, coal is the single greatest energy supply we have, and we simply have to find a way to clean it with either pre- or post-combustion technology so that we can use it to supply the energy needs of this country, and that is what the clean coal technology program has done for us.

Already more than $9 billion in sales of advanced U.S. technology in the United States has can be traced back to the achievements of the clean coal technology program. One-quarter of the coal-fired capacity in the United States now uses technology pioneered in this program. Twenty-five percent, 25 percent of all of this coal-fired capacity, again I repeat, in this country uses technology pioneered in this program, accounting for almost $1 billion in domestic sales, and by the year 2000 this will have increased to 75 percent.

Let us vote against this amendment, keep our technology afoot, clean our coal up, save our jobs.

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

Let me point out a few facts to rebut points made by my colleague from Illinois. This is what the Congressional Budget Office has to say about this amendment:

Since the passage of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990 the private sector has faced a clear legislative mandate for lowering coal emissions. Electric utilities and large industrial users of coal now have a clear economic motive for selecting among current practices and new technologies the lowest cost option for reducing emissions.
In other words, the passage of the Clean Air Act has led ultimately to the cleanup as private industries have used their own brain power to develop innovative technologies. It is not the DOE clean coal program which that same congressional report argues has, in fact, been a waste of money because there has been very little take-back scientifically, and there has been very little payback in terms of commercial technology.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN].

Mr. HOLDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Wisconsin, Mr. KLUG, which seeks to rescind an additional $292 million from the clean coal technology program.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. This program is a success.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to close at this point in the hopes that we can get out of here a little bit earlier this evening. I want to essentially take a look at three arguments in support of continuing to fund clean coal and then three arguments that I think will in- stead argue for the continued rescission of this program and to knock it down to zero.

First of all, we heard my colleague from Illinois argue that clean coal technology was supposed to reduce acid rain. The fact is according to the Department of Energy and according to the Congressional Budget Office EPA regulations, the Clean Air Act passed by this Congress, is the primary cause of improvements in air quality and the reductions in other control emissions. We are going to set targets and let private industry reach those targets through its own set of innovations, not by technology developed by the Government and essentially set down.

Now again the idea of the clean coal technology program argument No. 2 is that it was going to result in commercial technologies. Let me reemphasize that we have invested $3.5 billion and at this point only had $400,000 come back to the Department of Energy. Any company that was running that kind of return on its investment would long ago be out of business, and frankly this program should have long ago been out of business.

The other argument is that it supports the coal industry and that somehow without this research the coal industry could not exist, and the fact of the matter is the coal industry has done very well over the years, but more and more technology, frankly, is shifting to natural gas. There is more use in natural gas, there are more applications of natural gas, it burns cleaner, it sells for cheaper prices, and when the marketplace essentially has these tar- gets, if its supposed to hit, it hits those targets, but it does through again through industry innovation as folks shift to clean, natural gas away from coal and some of the coal problems.

And again one of the fundamental arguments we have been beating on tonight, and I will say it one more time, this is corporate welfare. This money is going to Alcoa, a $25 billion company; Daimler Benz, $12 billion; GE, $70 billion. It is not clear that these corporations can afford to do it themselves. It is unlikely that this program in any form and fashion is going to be able to generate profits that are going to go back to the Federal Government or go back to the Department of Energy period.

It has not worked in terms of cleaning the air; other government programs have done that. It has not resulted in widespread commercial technologies. In fact the marketplace has already moved in other directions. And it is industry, quite frankly, and it is welfare, quite frankly, that those large multinational corporations can afford to do on their own.

I urge my colleagues when they return in the morning to vote for the Klug-Miller-Foley-Royce amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, Corporate Welfare has taken a real beating tonight, and the truth of the matter is that that term is badly abused. This is not corporate welfare, this is people welfare, quite frankly, and it is people welfare, quite frankly, that those large multinational corporations can afford to have jobs because the costs of energy will be competitive for our industries.

Does it work? It certainly does. As was pointed out earlier, one quarter of the coal fired capacity in the United States now uses technology pioneered in the clean coal program.

Do people believe in it? The private sector has committed 60 percent of the cost of this program. This says very clearly that they believe that it is an efficient and a very effective program, and there is very few programs that have a 60 percent private/40 percent public cost share of an experimental nature.

Does it help us otherwise? Sales of clean coal coal technology already exceed $9 billion both here and abroad.

What does it mean? China, as I mentioned earlier in the evening, is consuming even more coal than the United States and with the growth of their economy that will probably double. The market for clean coal technology is enormous and will help our balance of payments, it will create jobs for Americans, it will help to clean up the environment worldwide. Other nations are concerned about their emissions because they do go into the atmosphere that ultimately all of us breathe.

This program is a success.

Now we have been practical about it. In this bill we rescind $100 million of clean coal technology because a couple of programs that were on line I think decided that they did not want to go forward.

Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to manage this with good judgment in a very responsible way. But speaking of responsibility, I would point out that there are contracts pending that will
Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 181, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 3623, and Minerals and Materials Science Act of 1980, as amended), $160 million, to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE: Page 59, line 10, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by $21,000,000)"

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply cuts funding appropriated above the administration's request for five fossil energy research and development programs, programs earmarked for coal, natural gas, and the other industries, programs that have been discussed at some length tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I believe none of these programs merit Federal funding. U.S. private industry does not need these programs, period; but my amendment at least saves the American taxpayer some $21 million, about 7 percent of the total spending, for the many fossil energy research programs contained in the appropriations bill.

This amendment is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the National Taxpayers' Union, and Americans for Tax Reform, among several other organizations. Why do American corporations not need these programs? Let me refer to a report done by the Congressional Budget Office that looks at the Department of Energy's fossil fuel programs. It reports, and I quote from that report, "The major new technologies for enhanced oil recovery have come from private industry, not the Department of Energy." The Energy Department says, "There is little in the way of commercial applications to show for its investment."

The fact that technological innovation and new commercial applications is found in the private sector, not the government, is no surprise. A Brookings Institute study found that Federal energy R&D has been an abject failure. It reported, "The overriding lesson is that the goal of economic efficiency is so severely constrained by political forces that an effective, coherent national commercial R&D program has never been put in place."

As we have heard tonight, the 1997 budget resolution reached a similar finding about DOE R&D programs. No, these corporate research subsidies, and subsidies is what they are, going to large corporations, some of the largest multinationals in the world, as a matter of fact, is not the direction we should be going.

We praise the American economy for being the most productive economy in the world. I will tell Members one thing, our economy was not built on government subsidies like the one this amendment provides, and those economies in the world that are built on subsidies, think of the European countries, those are economies that are hurting.

Mr. Chairman, let me close with this argument. I want to make the point that tonight we have heard a lot about the importance of research to our economy. We have heard a lot about the importance of energy to our economy. No one doubts that, but that does not mean that every DOE research program deserves immunity. These five programs certainly do not.

I ask Members to consider that these five programs targeted by this amendment are the Department of Energy's. That alone should give Members of this body pause. We have been hearing about waste and inefficiency in the DOE for years now. Many Members in this body as well as former Energy secretaries have supported abolishing the Energy Department.

They are right, the Department of Energy was founded in 1976 on a dubious idea; that this country needs a national energy policy coordinated by Washington. It has since grown into a multi-billion dollar bureaucracy with numerous wasteful missions. We do not have a national energy policy today, thankfully. By the way, the price of gas at the pump is at an historic low. This is due to market forces, not government research programs. But we are stuck with the DOE and its many wasteful programs.

The Department of Energy itself has not asked us to spend this money. It does not request these funds. Yet, we are going to go ahead and spend it anyway? What kind of sense does that make? There is no reason to plus up these subsidies. I urge my colleagues, even those who support government supported fossil fuel programs, to support this fiscally responsible amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have been responsible. We have reduced the research programs by 30 percent over the past few years, but we have tried to keep the good ones. Does anyone believe we would send soldiers to Saudi Arabia and Desert Storm to protect an energy source that is overseas? Of course we did. We spent billions of dollars doing it.

That illustrates how important fossil fuel research and development is. That makes a very powerful case to continue research programs that will do a number of things; that will allow us to use fossil fuels in a more efficient way, to get more BTUs that are useful in the energy stream of this Nation. Fossil fuel is going to be the choice that we have to depend on for many, many years to come. These programs are designed to make our use of fossil sources more efficient.

Obviously, the private sector believes in them because they put up a good part of the money to do the research. As I said earlier, we do not fund commercialization. We have carefully guarded against any programs that get beyond the development of technology. But we think it is very important for the future of this Nation to ensure that we have adequate energy sources from fossil sources, that we use these energy sources in an effective way so we do not deprive future generations of the same quality of life we have today, and to use these sources in a way that will keep us competitive in the world marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, I think at this point it would be a serious mistake to violate contracts that are already in place, to stop programs that are shown to have potential in midstream, and to cut at this juncture would not be a good management on the part of our fossil program.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say to all of the Members that we as a committee have been very careful in determining what programs work and what do not, and to make sure that we manage the
taxpayers' money efficiently on behalf of their future in the fossil energy resource programs. I strongly urge a no vote on this amendment. Let us keep these programs going so we can ensure that we have energy independence as a Nation in the future, and we can ensure that those who follow us will have the same quality of life and opportunities that result from having an adequate supply of fossil-generated energy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE]. This is one of many amendments that foolishly looks for savings in energy security, an area of great importance to our national security.

Our economic well-being depends on a secure and reliable energy supply. The Energy Information Agency has predicted that for the foreseeable future, we will be getting over 85 percent of our energy from fossil sources. So if Members are looking to adjust the Federal investment in R&D in this area, then Members had better understand the ramifications of what they are trying to do.

The Royce amendment is a textbook example of how not to interfere with a program. After hearing hours and hours in the Senate on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations decided to alter the administration's budget. Some programs were increased in order to more effectively meet their missions. In order to pay for these increases, the Committee on the Interior has acted responsibly by finding offsets for these cuts.

The Royce amendment takes a simplistic approach to deficit reduction. It simply looks at any line item which the Committee on Interior increased, ignores the fact that the plus-ups were offset, and eliminates the increase. So the point of this amendment is to cut any program that the committee determined to be of the highest priority.

Let me tell you how the programs it cuts: The low emission boiler system, a cleaner-burning, high-efficiency technology that is moving into its final stage of development. This is exactly the type of technology our country is going to need to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and international emission reduction requirements.

This stage requires the construction of an actual plant, an undertaking that requires funding that did not exist in the planning and design phase of earlier years. The committee recognized this, found an offset, and provided the necessary funding.

The Royce amendment also cuts research on particulate matter monitoring. Any Member who is concerned about the Clean Air Act compliance should care about this. Our current monitoring capability is insufficient, and an effective understanding of our air quality situation requires an improved monitoring expertise.

The committee recognized this as a high priority area, but once again, this amendment seeks to ignore the priorities of those who best understand these programs. Mr. Chairman, in this era, where we must emphasize domestic solutions to the challenge of meeting our ever-increasing energy needs, the Royce amendment is a decisive step backward.

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

Mr. Chairman, briefly, I rise in support of the Royce amendment. Let me, for the record, say that I agree with this gentleman. Again, we hear from opponents of the amendment that sense that somehow if we go back to the levels originally requested by the administration, that energy research in this country stops in its tracks. But the Department of Energy spends $32 billion a year on a variety of applied and basic research projects. This amendment simply says, in 5 areas where we have done fossil research for 60 years, and again, we have told welfare recipients they have to be cut. I think the whole point is the DOE, and it is not the DOE. These research programs can go on for 60 years, and in five very specific programs we simply roll back $21 million back to what the administration requested. I think it is very clear the Department of Energy still has a lot of money to spend on programs it wants to fund, but I think we ought to let the Department of Energy, the experts, set the parameters.

I think, first and foremost, we need to keep in mind in this entire debate that private industry is much better, much better suited to identify and target technologies that are commercially viable than DOE. According to our own Congressional Budget Office, listen to this, "The major new technologies for advanced oil recovery, for example, have come from private industry, not from DOE. In other instances, DOE continues to develop technologies in which the market clearly has no interest."

So the bottom line is we have thousands of dollars in excess government subsidies flowing to programs that have delivered very little results; frankly, in this case, in the Committee on Appropriations, more money than the Department of Energy wants to fund technology that, frankly, has already been the subject of billions of dollars in Federal grants.

I urge my colleagues to support the Royce amendment, and to put an end to corporate welfare as we know it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Royce amendment. We can be only $21 million, every million dollars count. What we are only talking about is going back to what the Department of Energy requested in this particular appropriation process.

Mr. Chairman, I first got elected and campaigned back in 1992. I had a basic question I kept saying, and I have been asking it every year for the past 4 years I have been here. It is, is this a Federal responsibility? Do we really have to have the Federal Government doing this program?

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there are several aspects of this debate which trouble me a little bit. I think we have all paid tribute to the work that the Committee on Appropriations has done in examining these programs and making recommendations which will protect the public interest and give us the most value for the taxpayers' dollars that are being spent here.

I am also informed that we are not above the President's request in these items, that we are below the President's request so we are not loading this up excessively.

But the thing that really troubles me is that the subject matter of this debate has been before the committee, which I have the pleasure to serve on, the Committee on Science, the authorizing committee, over the years. We have conducted extensive research on these programs. We have tried to monitor the Defense Department. We have not found any department, including the Energy Department, we have not found any department, including energy, which is free from mistakes. And we make an honest effort to correct those wherever it is possible to do so. We think we have a sound program here which is in the best interest of this country.

I have a sense, however, that those who are arguing against these programs have certain fundamental ideological objections to the government participating in these. They do not like the idea that this country can benefit from a partnership between the government and the business community of this country.

This for a long time produced an atmosphere in which the government and industry were fighting each other. We have worked very hard to overcome
that, to find ways in which government could play a role, the private sector could play a role, appropriate to each, and in most cases this means that we cooperate in developing the basic research.

The private sector then carries that research on through applications and commercialization. This is what we are trying to achieve. It is a delicate balance. We admit that it is a delicate balance. But there are some Members who persist in insisting that this is government over the private sector. I see some nods coming from my good friend on the other side. I deny that this is the case.

Those countries which pose the greatest threat to our economy are those which have achieved the most effective balance and cooperation between government and industry. There is nothing perfect in these arrangements. They have to be constantly scrutinized. There has to be a sense of reality that in the best interest of people who have an understanding of the problems that face the Nation and the problems that face the private sector in achieving solutions to those problems.

I guarantee Members that there is not a corporation in this country that will invest money in a program in which there is no payoff for 10 years. There is just no incentive for them to do so. They would prefer to muck up the environment or do whatever else is necessary to avoid spending money that does not have a payoff within 10 years.

This is that area in which cooperation is essential. We have to leverage the interest of the private sector. We have to provide an incentive for them to spend their money in the hopes of making a profit and moving forward into a commercially viable activity. That is the whole thrust of this program.

There are those here on this floor who deny that that is a proper role for government. I think we need to face this realistically. We can nitpick the particular projects. We can do anything we want. It will be easy to find cases in which we misjudge, both the industry and the government misjudged what the results might be. But in the long run, what we are doing is basically aimed at preserving our energy independence for this country, producing a viable, growing, healthy economy and providing for the welfare of our children and our children's children and the future. I think that after the scrutiny that we have given these programs over the years, we are approaching an understanding of what that proper balance is.

I think it is contained, as closely as we can get, in the report that the subcommittee has made here. I commend the chairman and the members of that committee for the hard work and the analysis that they have put into this.

I can assure my colleagues that we have done the same thing in the Committee on Science for a large number of years, and it is my fundamental belief that this is the only way this country is going to succeed in maintaining its economic priority in the world before us.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in total support of the Royce amendment to bring some sanity to the spending of taxpayer dollars when it comes to shelling out taxpayers' dollars to huge corporations that make billions of dollars worth of profit.

I would, first of all, like to say that I have deep admiration for the speaker who just presented his case before us. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] had been the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science for many years. He is the ranking member now. But over the years he was fair to every Republican that ever served on Science, and he is an honest and fair man. And what we have here is an honest and fair disagreement as to a basic philosophy of what government should do and what government should not do.

What we have is the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] who stands for a philosophy, a more conservative free enterprise philosophy, versus the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] who has presented more of a philosophy of government intervention in the name of benefit to the community and to the country as a whole.

I think this is an honest disagreement. I think it is. I respect the opinion of the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown], and I respect his motivation.

Let me say I believe that he is wrong. I believe the philosophy that he is talking about has been an utter failure over and over and over again. The partnership between government and powerful interest groups like big business and big labor has never worked for the benefit of the average person. Instead these partnerships have tended to freeze out the little guy, have tended to use the taxpayers' money for the benefit wealthy interests and the taxpayers end up footing the bill for all of this.

This is no different. What we are arguing about tonight is a $21 million add-on that goes beyond what the Department of Energy has requested from the Congress. That is $21 million extra from what has been requested from the Department of Energy. I even question some of the projects the Department of Energy has proposed.

But here we are just talking about, should the Federal Government rush into relationships with companies that they themselves can afford the research and development of the new products or of the new technologies that are being discussed?

My friend from Pennsylvania discussed boiler technology. Why should we, for example, support millions of dollars for boiler technology so that some company can make a big profit on it? Why should we do that, when other companies and other people in our society are investing in wind technology for energy, they are investing in solar technology.

I just had a conversation with a company that has invested, unlike what the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has suggested, invested millions of dollars over two decades, not just one decade but two decades, to come up with new ideas. We are undercutting the entrepreneurs in our society who know best by shoveling government money, scarce government money to people who we, as politicians, think they should succeed as compared to other people in the private sector who are investing their own money, other people who may have just as good a chance of succeeding in developing technology.

Quite often we know that the money is going for people who are developing technology who have special connections politically. My friend from Pennsylvania comes from a coal-burning State or a coal-producing State. Is there any question he is looking out for his constituents? He should. But this is not the way to make decisions that will be in the best interest of the people in the long run, especially of the people of the United States of America.

In France they have tried this, where you have a partnership between big business and big government. What they have is they have massive unemployment in France that would never be acceptable in the United States. In Japan, Japan has gone through an economic catastrophe in the last few years. Why is that? It is because you have government planning the economy so when things go wrong, it is not just one company that has miscalculated, it is an entire industrial plan that has gone wrong.

We should run away as far as possible from this idea that there should be a partnership between government and the private sector. Although I will say that it is motivated, those who advocate this plan, they have the best of motivations, the best of motivations. They want what is right for America.

I do not think it is going to take us in the right direction. It has not taken France in the right direction, did not take Japan in the right direction. I will tell my colleagues, it certainly did not take the socialist countries in the right direction. The socialist countries that were all basically big industrial plans failed in a big way.

So I would ask support of the Royce amendment and a tough stand for the taxpayers.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I just had a conversation with a company that has invested...
The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the votes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] will be postponed.

The Chair will read.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 76, line 7, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There is no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 76, line 7 is as follows:

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Monies received as investment income on the principal amount in the Great Plains Project Trust at the Norwest Bank of North Dakota, in such sums as are earned as of October 31, 1998, shall be offset against the outstanding principal amount of the Great Plains Gasification Fund and shall be immediately transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury. Monies received as revenue sharing from operation of the Great Plains Gasification Panel shall be immediately transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For necessary expenses in carrying out naval petroleum and oil shale resource activities, $155,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $123,000,000 shall be used to offset the costs of operating Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 between May 16, 1998, and September 30, 1998, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, revenues received from use and operation of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 in excess of $163,000,000 shall be used to offset the costs of operating Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 between May 16, 1998, and September 30, 1998: Provided further, That the proceeds from the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Provided further, That the proceeds from the sale of crude oil from Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3 (Elk Hills) may be retained by the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided further, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 6200(h) the United States share of crude oil in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3 (Elk Hills) may be retained by the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided, That the proceeds from the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Provided, That not withstanding section 101 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, that any contract, agreement, or other instrument or arrangement entered into in connection with the sale of products in connection with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Provided, That the proceeds from the sale of crude oil from Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3 (Elk Hills) shall be used to implement or finance authorized by the use of privately financed, energy saving performance contracts and other private financing mechanisms. The funds may be provided after agencies begin to realize energy cost savings by means of privately financed mechanisms, including energy savings performance contracts. Any such privately financed contracts will meet the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102-496 (42 U.S.C. 238).
expanded tribal contracts, compacts, grants or cooperative agreements with the Indian Health Service under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act: Provided further, and subject to charges, and the proceeds to be available for the construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health facilities and equipment, and the proceeds to be retained by the Indian Health Service; $257,310,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, or renovation of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribe may only be used for the purchase of land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase or rental of land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-351, $18,345,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to apprapproach and adopt contract qualifications for tribes or other entities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered Indian Health Service facilities; expenditures for the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facility improvement as authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Service, or otherwise as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are called for the consideration of functions of the Office for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to approach and adopt contract qualifications for tribes or other entities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered Indian Health Service facilities; expenditures for the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facility improvement as authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Service, or otherwise as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are called for the consideration of functions of the Office for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to approach and adopt contract qualifications for tribes or other entities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to approach and adopt contract qualifications for tribes or other entities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to approach and adopt contract qualifications for tribes or other entities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved construction, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.
TAX CUTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very disingenuous when our friends from the other side of the aisle say they want tax cuts. First of all, I think Republicans are making a mistake because what is happening now is the liberals spend 10 percent effort on developing policy and 90 percent on spinning it. Republicans spend 90 percent on developing policy but only spend 10 percent on spinning it. So there is a great deal of misunderstanding out there.

Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks Jim Glassman’s article in yesterday’s Washington Post that spells out some of the differences between the Republicans and the Democrats.

I would like to simply conclude that we have a tax system that punishes our businesses and our workers to the extent that they have to move out of this country. The cost of labor is 10 to 12 percent of the cost of producing an item. The taxes run up to 30 percent in this country. We need to be looking at the kind of tax policy that is going to expand the economy.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and rehabilitation of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill from pages 59, line 14, through page 76, line 77?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, 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. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.
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Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.