

when it conducted atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons in the Pacific and the people of the Marshall Islands are still suffering from the aftermath of those tests. We have a moral obligation to provide this food assistance, and much more, for the damage we did to their country with our atmospheric tests. As this is the same provision which passed the Senate as section 1 of S. 210, I am glad to see we are considering at least this small portion of that legislation, so these Pacific islanders can continue to receive this necessary assistance.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1460, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1460, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2107, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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 Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Yates moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to agree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 120, 121, and 122.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to instruct the conferees on the Interior appropriations bill, to accept the provisions of the Senate bill improving funding for the National Endowment of the Arts.

The House, my colleagues will recall, provided no funds for the National Endowment of the Arts because it was said it was unauthorized. And yet, Mr. Speaker, 14 other agencies in the House bill which were unauthorized received waivers from the Committee on Rules in order to permit them to receive money for their operations.

NEA was the only unauthorized agency that did not receive a waiver of the Committee on Rules. And therefore, it was subject to being stricken by the bill on a point of order. That is why we attacked the rule, Mr. Speaker. We sought to vote down the previous question to correct the discriminatory treatment accorded to the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, we lost by one vote. One vote, Mr. Speaker. And NEA was stricken from the bill on a point of order when the bill came to the floor. That strong showing, Mr. Speaker, indicates to me that there is strong support for the NEA in the House, and that is why I believe the House is ready and willing to join the Senate in providing the fund for NEA, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I have filed this motion to agree with the Senate.

I urge support for my motion.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have not had any requests for time at this point on this motion to instruct. I reserve the balance of my time if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] would go forward.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I supported it in the House when we first brought this issue up. But of course, it was eliminated, as the gentleman stated, really on a parliamentary maneuver, not only the lack of a waiver but the parliamentary maneuver to defeat the rule.

I am afraid that a lot of people were opposing it because they thought it was reducing the budget deficit, and I do not believe that had validity. But more importantly, there was a parliamentary maneuver that denied us the vote, not only denied us the vote,

but really gave some people the opportunity to dodge the issue instead of confronting it directly. I am afraid that it put the House on record as being part of a dumbing down of America. I hate to say that, but I regretfully must admit that is the way the people across the country interpreted that vote. And in my opinion, it will be part of a "dumbing down" and denying Americans and the children especially the benefits of cultural and educational programming.

Fortunately, the Senate had the wisdom to include the funding. And indeed, I want to remind my colleagues, as they are aware from their own situations in their own communities, this is not just something that is good for urban communities; it supplements in urban, suburban, and rural areas alike improve the educational and the cultural qualities, whether we are talking about community orchestras or dance companies or the numbers of other children's programs that are supported by the NEA.

I want to tell my colleagues also, from my own experience as a member of the authorizing committee and for those that are fearful that there are some violations of community ethical and cultural standards and some that are still operating under the assumption that there is somehow a pornographic or indecent material here, I want to speak now as one of those who worked with our late departed colleague Paul Henry in 1990 to put the reforms in place.

This statement and debate was not permitted because we were denied, under the previous rule, the opportunity to debate this issue under the rules. The law as it now exists as to how the community standards must be met and it is precise as to how those selections are made. There is no longer any reason to look askance at the NEA as violating community standards of decency or projects that have questionable background.

So I guess in summary I want to say, for those who are concerned that we are violating community standards under this proposal, that is a thing of the past. Our committee put in good operational standards as long ago as 1990. This is no longer valid as an argument against the NEA. But to those who were taken in by the parliamentary maneuver so that some dodged the issue as to whether they stood squarely for continuing support for the National Endowment for the Arts, I want to say, this is a straight up-or-down vote. We are agreeing or disagreeing directly with the funding and authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts and following the wisdom of the Senate.

I know that all those letters and telephone calls that my colleagues had those editorials, commentary that was highly critical of us in the House, we now have a way, a direct up-or-down vote, to correct that problem that we created for ourselves under the parliamentary procedure and to correct it

and follow the lead that the Senate has given us and bring all those orchestras and those community activities and those children's educational programs back to our communities across this Nation.

I urge support of the motion to instruct the conferees.

□ 1800

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for the House to do the right thing. I know in my heart that the chairman as well as the ranking Democrat on this subcommittee know that the National Endowment for the Arts deserves funding. I think that most people that have looked into what the National Endowment for the Arts has done over the last several years, particularly since Jane Alexander took over, recognize that all the projects are scrutinized, that the ones that have been used for rhetorical purposes are all past history. They were marginal projects, anyway. They certainly do not define what the National Endowment for the Arts is all about.

What defines what the National Endowment for the Arts is all about is a young woman that grew up just a few blocks from the Kennedy Center but never could afford to go to the Kennedy Center. When she was a teenager, she attended a National Endowment for the Arts opera recital and realized she wanted to sing opera. Now she is an internationally acclaimed star because the National Endowment for the Arts gave the kind of inspiration to Denyce Graves as it has to many thousands of artists around the country and to communities that wanted their people to be able to appreciate what this country's artists have to offer. These are not grants that go to the well-funded cities. These are grants that go out into communities that appreciate the arts but lack the funding to offer them to their citizens.

We heard from the chairman of CBS last week. The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] sponsored the breakfast. He stood up, and said he represented corporate America. He told us that when the NEA gives its endorsement to a project, they know that it is worth investing in. They want to invest in the arts. They know it is in the best interests of their employees, that it is in the best interest of America.

But if we were to give it to the States or to otherwise eviscerate what the NEA stands for, then we will not have that kind of credibility, that the projects that need funding will not get funding. It is only the projects who have the contacts, who know the wealthy people, who know the right people who will get funded. Thousands of other projects around the country will not get funded because they do not have a National Endowment for the Arts ready, willing, and able to fund the most meritorious artists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of this House to do the right thing, support NEA, and follow the lead of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], our ranking Democrat, in instructing the conferees to restore its funding.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this motion very strongly to instruct the conferees to include the Senate level of \$100 million in this conference report. This is absolutely essential for us, Mr. Speaker, as part of the most important link that we have in the United States to humanize and to give the opportunity for every child in this country to participate in arts programs.

We hear all the time, the debate always centers around where all these grants go. Oh, they say they go to New York City, to Chicago, and to Los Angeles. Yes, a lot of them do. Why do they do that? What do they do with the money in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles? They send out troupes of artists, of dancers, of musicians, of teachers to every nook and cranny of the United States.

That really is what our obligation is here. Those famous and wonderful institutions that have art museums throughout the country will probably survive without the NEA, but I can guarantee Members that those programs that reach into the smallest of schools, to the most deprived of areas in the United States, those will not survive, and they will die.

Will it matter? You bet it matters. What do we do with children who have arts programs in school? In the first place, they are going to tell us that these are kids who never drop out, and on art day all those children are going to be there. Absenteeism is cut down. But one of the most important things is that, according to the college board in the United States, students with 4 years of art, they score 59 points higher on their verbal scores on the SAT's and 44 points higher on math portions than kids with no arts classes. There is nothing else that we do for education that gives us back that return.

Newsweek recently highlighted a school in Raleigh, NC, that used art to transform what was a troubled elementary school with below-average test scores to a school where the kids are excited about learning and the scores have gone up. University of California at Irvine researchers found that music training, specifically piano instruction, is far superior to computer instruction, dramatically enhancing the children's abstract reasoning skills necessary for learning math and science. A study in Florida shows there is a connection between arts education and dropout prevention. This is the best thing we do for children at risk.

Can we afford not to do that? Can we afford to not do these small programs, the small investment that we make to

make sure as we are here on the cusp of the next century that every child in the public school system in the United States has that opportunity to expand its brainpower and its own ability, its verbal scores, and do better on the SAT's? How foolish for us not to do that.

The NEA's budget is less than 0.01 percent of the Federal budget. What does it do? It returns \$3.4 billion to the Treasury. I promise my colleagues that we make no other investment in the Congress of the United States that brings that kind of return. It supports 1.3 million jobs and generates \$36.8 billion annually. In addition, the arts produce \$790 million in local government revenue and \$1.2 billion in State government revenue.

Let me just close with something that is very important. Recently the New York Times ran the words of Harold Holzer, the Metropolitan Museum of Art's vice president. He said that in the fiscal year which ended June 30, the Metropolitan Museum of Art had greater attendance, 5.5 million persons, than the New York Mets, the Yankees, the Rangers, and the Knicks combined. That certainly says to us that people in this country are hungry to have art, hungry to hear music, anxious to dance, want their children to have the opportunity to expand their brains, to be everything they can be, to help us be ready to go into the next century with our children prepared.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this motion to restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts. I am grateful that the other body has more clearly understood the value of the NEA and has in its wisdom not only rejected efforts to eliminate the agency, but has also rejected efforts that would have dramatically altered the fundamental structure and mission of the NEA.

The NEA has a proven track record of supporting the creation of excellent art and facilitating Americans' access to it. For 30 years the NEA has helped bring art and culture to those who otherwise would be without it.

The NEA is sometimes accused of being elitist, but just the opposite is the case. Before the NEA, there were 38 orchestras in the country just 30 years ago. Today there are more than 1,000. Before the NEA, there were 37 professional dance companies. Now there are 300. Before the NEA, 30 years ago, only 1 million people attended theater each year. Today more than 55 million attend. All of this because of the NEA.

The NEA plays a crucial role in the nonprofit arts industry, which supports 1.3 million jobs and generates more than \$3.4 billion in Federal income taxes. We cannot afford either culturally or economically to eliminate the NEA.

I am especially pleased that the House of Representatives will now finally be allowed to vote on whether or

not to fund the NEA. Earlier this year the leadership of this House took extraordinary steps to prevent the House from even considering funding the NEA. On the controversial vote on the rule, several Members of Congress who have supported the arts in the past and had pledged to support the NEA failed to do so at that critical moment. I hope that these Members in particular will seize this opportunity to demonstrate their support for the NEA by voting for this motion to instruct conferees. I urge all of my colleagues to support the National Endowment for the Arts and to vote to accept the Senate funding level of \$100 million for the NEA.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are a few persons in politics who will use the fact that an occasional fool has misused NEA funding to produce decadent and objectionable pieces of art under endowment funding, but I would simply point out one thing. Even Babe Ruth struck out 1,300 times, and no sane manager would have benched Babe Ruth. I do not think we should bench the National Endowment for the Arts.

I would say that for every occasional grant that any Member of this body can find that has funded a piece of so-called art that we would find objectionable or outrageous, there are literally tens of thousands of grants that are provided that raise people's spirits, that open the eyes of young people to their greater and finer possibilities. And I would just suggest that it is not the urban centers of this country who would be the great losers if the Endowment were to die, it would be the thousands of small communities across this country who need the seed money that the Endowment provides in order to enrich the cultural lives of their children in many areas where they would otherwise not have the opportunity to see some of the grand things that funding under the Endowment can provide.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge that we support this motion of the gentleman from Illinois. I also want to take this opportunity to say about the gentleman that I do not think there is a finer human being who has ever served in this House than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. He has devoted a great portion of his energies and his passions to improving the lives of many people in material ways as well as spiritual ways. I think this endowment is just one of the ways that he has tried to do that. On behalf of every person who cares about this program all across the country, I would like to personally thank him for the efforts he has shown. I think he does the House proud when he takes the positions that he has. We are, I think, all very happy to stand with him today in this effort to make the Congress finally do what is right on this issue.

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

thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind remarks.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Is it my understanding that this motion to instruct would in no way bind the conferees in terms of conditions that would be put on the grant? I know that the gentleman from Illinois has suggested we have six Members, three from the House and three from the Senate, on the NEA Board so that we have continuing input. There has been some talk about limiting the percentage that any State could receive and also no individual grants even for literature. Is my understanding correct that those types of conditions could be imposed by the conferees, and that this motion would in no way restrict our ability to do so?

Mr. YATES. That was my understanding as well. I subscribe to that.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. REGULA,
MCDADE,
KOLBE,
SKEEN,
TAYLOR of North Carolina,
NETHERCUTT,
MILLER of Florida,
WAMP,
LIVINGSTON,
YATES,
MURTHA,
DICKS,
SKAGGS,
MORAN of Virginia,
and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1815

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2264, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human

Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2264, be instructed to insist on the Senate position to provide \$368,716,000 for congregate meals for the elderly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take very much time. This amendment simply would raise by \$4.1 million above the House figure the amount that we would support for congregate meals for the elderly. The Senate is \$4 million higher than the House bill is. This would simply instruct the conferees to move to the Senate position.

This program reaches our most vulnerable senior citizens, and I would think and hope that it would have broad support within the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we accept the gentleman's motion.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].