United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 13, 1999 No. 98

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes. But in no event shall the debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

SUPPORT CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I am here to talk about the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act, which I will be introducing today. If this bill becomes law, it has the potential of saving thousands of lives each year.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to work with the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross on this very important measure.

Passage of this Act would go a long way towards making the goal of saving the lives of people who suffer sudden cardiac arrests possible. It would ensure that what the American Heart Association refers to as the ''cardiac chain of survival'' could go into effect.

That first chain of survival is early access, call 911, early CPR, early defibrillation, which I will go into in a moment, and early access to advanced care.

While defibrillation is the most effective mechanism to revive a heart that has stopped, it is also the least accessed tool we have available to treat victims suffering from heart attack.

Perhaps it would be helpful for those of my colleagues listening who are not well versed in the subject if I just take a moment and walk them through what we mean when we use that term ''defibrillation.''

A large number of sudden cardiac arrests are due to an electrical malfunction of the heart called ventricular fibrillation, VF. So when VF occurs, the heart's electrical signals, which normally induce a coordinated heartbeat, suddenly become chaotic, and the heart's function as a pump abruptly stops. Unless this state is reversed, then death will occur within a few minutes. The only effective treatment for this condition is defibrillation, the electrical shock to the heart.

My colleagues might be interested to know that more than 1,000 Americans each and every day suffer from cardiac arrest. Of those, more than 95 percent die. That is unacceptable in this country because we have the means, the very means at our disposal to change those statistics. That is why I have been committed to this cause.

Studies show that 250 lives can be saved each and every day from cardiac arrests by using the automatic external defibrillation, which we will call AED. Those are the kinds of statistics that nobody can argue with.

Let me show my colleagues on the next chart, did my colleagues know that for each minute of delay in returning the heart to its normal patterns of beating, it decreases the chance that that person will survive by 10 percent?

No one knows when sudden cardiac arrest might occur. According to a recent study, the top five sites where cardiac arrest occurs are at airports, county jails, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and golf courses. I believe we would all take great comfort in knowing that those who rush to our side to resuscitate us have the most up-to-date equipment available and are trained to use it.

The AEDs which are being produced today are easier to use and require minimal training to operate. They also are easier to maintain and cost less. This affords a wider range of emergency personnel to be trained and equipped.

Some of my colleagues might ask, if a majority of the States have laws authorizing nonemergency medical technician first responders to use AEDs, why do we need to pass this legislation? Good question.

This year's bill differs from previous versions I have offered, which primarily sought to encourage State action to promote public access to defibrillation. The States responded to this call, and many have passed regulation to promote training and access to AEDs.

However, this bill, Mr. Speaker, directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop recommendations to public access of defibrillation programs in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of people who suffer cardiac arrest in Federal facilities. Federal buildings throughout America will be encouraged to serve as examples of rapid response to cardiac arrest emergencies through the implementation of public access to defibrilllation programs.

The programs will include training security personnel and other expected users in the use of AEDs, notifying local emergency medical services of the placement of AEDs, and ensuring proper medical oversight and proper maintenance of the device.

In addition, this year's bill seeks to fill in the gaps with respect to States that have not acted on AED legislation by extending good samaritan liability protection to people involved in the use of the AED.

So, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the support of my colleagues. I hope that they will cosponsor this bill. It has been endorsed by the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross. I hope all of my colleagues

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

will join me by cosponsoring the bill whose stated goal is to prevent thousands and thousands of people suffering from cardiac arrest from dying by making equipment and trained personnel available at the scene of the emergency.

TOBACCO SMUGGLING ERADICATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the World Bank recently issued a report entitled, ''Curbing the Epidemic: Governments and the Economics of Tobacco Control,'' which finds disturbing trends in tobacco use around the globe. This report concludes that, in another 2 decades, tobacco will become the single biggest cause of premature death worldwide, accounting for 10 million deaths each year. That is 10 million unique human beings choking to death with emphysema, withering away with lung cancer, or perhaps feeling the sharp pain of a heart attack as a result of nicotine addiction. Half of these deaths will occur to individuals in middle age, who will each lose 20 to 25 years of their life.

Effective and aggressive action against tobacco smuggling represents one key strategy necessary in what should be a comprehensive global effort to address this pandemic, according to both the World Bank and the World Health Organization. To assure that our country is participating in such action, I am today introducing the Tobacco Smuggling Eradication Act. This measure is important in both fighting organized crime and in promoting public health.

In a statement endorsing this bill yesterday, ENACT, a coalition of 55 major national medical and public health organizations, including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, had this to say of my bill:

''Your bill would strengthen domestic antismuggling efforts and address the shameful fact that lax oversight of U.S. cigarette exports is fueling an international black market in U.S. cigarette brands. Researchers estimated that about one-third of all cigarette exports disappear into the black market. U.S. brands such as Marlboro, Camel, Winston, and Kent are the most commonly smuggled. Tobacco smuggling seriously undermines public health laws in other countries and is an embarrassment to our nation.''

Just how big an embarrassment is reflected in this national news story from the Washington Post last December, entitled, ''Tobacco affiliate pleads guilty to role in smuggling scheme.'' An affiliate of the RJ Reynolds Company, one of the tobacco giants, was caught up in illegality in participating in a scheme to avoid $2.5 million in U.S. excise taxes.

Nor is RJR the only tobacco giant caught up in such criminality. Last year, a senior judge in Hong Kong concluded that British-American Tobacco and Brown and Williamson were helping international organized crime by selling duty-free cigarettes ''worth billions and billions of dollars with the knowledge that those cigarettes would be smuggled into China and other parts of the world.''

While most of the attention with our relations with the country of Colombia focuses on the illegal drugs from there to here, a study last year found that more than four-fifths of the 5.5 billion Malboro cigarettes that are produced here by Philip Morris and sold there in Colombia are illegal smuggled goods.

Far from hurting business, tobacco companies have found that they can move their lethal products around the world by assisting smugglers. Big tobacco profits from selling cigarettes to smugglers who reduce the price for the black market and increase consumption and sales, helping them build a global market.

My bill requires that packages for export be clearly labeled for export to prevent illegal reentry into the United States. That is the scheme that the RJR affiliate used, claiming that cigarettes were reentering our country for export to Russia and Estonia when, in fact, they were going on the black market smuggled from New York into Canada.

Our bill also requires that packages of tobacco products manufactured here or imported here also be uniquely marked. Law enforcement agents have said will give the opportunity to trace the products, verify the source, and have the labeling requirements that they need for effective law enforcement.

Under this bill, retailers and wholesalers will be required to keep documents on tobacco shipments which will greatly assist law enforcement. As our Treasury Secretary Larry Summers said last year during congressional testimony, ''The Treasury Department believes that the creation of a sound regulatory system, one that will close the distribution chain for tobacco products, will ensure that the diversion and smuggling of tobacco can be effectively controlled.''

With the help of the Treasury Department, that is exactly what this bill will do. It will also assist the States in enforcing and collecting their excise taxes on all tobacco products. Recent studies have indicated that the States of Washington, Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, and California each lose $30–100 million per year in excise taxes on tobacco products because of smuggling. Last year, big tobacco spent millions to promote false claims that our Federal legislative proposals to reduce youth smoking would cause smuggling. Now is the time for big tobacco to get behind this effective law enforcement legislation or once again to reveal its hypocrisy,

Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of this bill, we hope to stop the smuggling and stop the mugging of the world's children through nicotine addiction.

FRESHMEN REPUBLICANS INITIATE BEYOND THE BELTWAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, 19 Republican freshmen stood shoulder to shoulder on the front lawn outside this very building. We did so to launch our class-wide project that we are calling Beyond the Beltway.

The Republican freshmen are a diverse group coming from diverse backgrounds and representing equally diverse parts of America. But despite that diversity, we are all excited by some of the innovative reforms that we are seeing take place in State capitals throughout the land.

Governors and legislative leaders, Republicans and Democrats from States from California to New York, are meeting their policy challenges in exciting, innovative ways. With our Beyond the Beltway project, we are hoping as freshmen to open new doors for these leaders.

We know that, for far too long, Federal rules and bureaucracies have held them back and smothered their efforts through unnecessary burdens and restrictions. Now the freshmen are reaching out to leaders like my own Governor, Governor Tommy Thompson, in an effort to help them unleash a whole new wave of creativity and innovation in State after State.

It is the freshmen who are initiating this project because, even though we are Members of Congress, we are very much still State legislators, local officials, and private sector small business persons at heart.

Here specifically is what the beyond the Beltway project will do. The freshman class, as a group, have asked our governors, legislative leaders, directly and through the various associations to help us identify some of those Federal rules and restrictions that are holding them back. We want to turn these suggestions into an ongoing action agenda. Member by member and issue by issue, we want to provide relief.

We are coming forward now with the Beyond the Beltway initiative because we have also introduced the first measure result from this new dialogue. This legislation would direct each Federal agency to develop an expedited review process for waiver requests.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, oftentimes States need Federal approval or waivers to initiate their State programs if

those plans deviate from the details of Federal programs.

□ 0915

The idea of this legislation is that where a State has been granted a waiver on a particular program, if another State seeks a similar waiver, we believe that they should only have to go through a streamlined or expedited waiver review process. We want to encourage the laboratories of democracy. We want to encourage modeling. We want to encourage benchmarking. We want to encourage borrowing of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues would join us in this expedited review bill and, more importantly, join the Republican freshmen in developing beyond-the-Beltway ideas. This is more than a short-term project. We hope it is the beginning of a new, longer, more open relationship between Congress and the States. Instead of the governors coming to us on bended knee, we are hoping to go to them for ideas and suggestions. We want to turn them loose. We believe that there is no telling how many of our major social, political challenges can be met if only we will move power and authority out of Washington and beyond the Beltway.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS BILL HAS SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS FOR ARMENIA, NAGORNO KARABAGH, AND U.S. CAUCASUS POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Appropriations is expected to mark up the fiscal year 2000 bill regarding foreign assistance and other programs vital to maintain and enhance American leadership throughout the world.

This legislation is extremely important for the Republics of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh as they emerge from the ashes of the former Soviet Union to establish democracy, market economies, and increased integration with the West. Thus, in my capacity as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me this week in urging the members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations to express our concerns on several key issues regarding Armenia, Nagorno Karabagh, and U.S. policy in the Caucasus region. This Subcommittee has many friends of Armenia, and I look forward to their support on these important issues.

First, Mr. Speaker, we will be urging that the Subcommittee earmark assistance for the Republic of Armenia at the highest level possible. The legislation that has been adopted by the other body, the Senate, last month earmarks $90 million for Armenia, with a subearmark of $15 million for the earthquake zone. We hope that the House subcommittee will consider providing a similar figure. It is important for the United States to maintain our support and partnership with Armenia as this country continues to make major strides toward democracy, most recently evidenced by the May 30 parliamentary elections. U.S. assistance also serves to offset the difficulties imposed on Armenia's people as a result of the hostile blockades maintained by their neighbors to the east, Azerbaijan, and to the west, Turkey.

I would also like to see the subcommittee continue humanitarian aid for Nagorno Karabagh, an historically Armenian-populated region that has proclaimed its independence and exercises democratic self-government but whose territory is still claimed by the neighboring country of Azerbaijan. The subcommittee took an historic step in the fiscal year 1998 bill by providing for the first time humanitarian assistance to Nagorno Karabagh. Unfortunately, much of that American assistance has not yet been obligated. I hope that the subcommittee, in the fiscal year 2000 bill, will make efforts to ensure that this assistance be fully obligated for the people of Nagorno Karabagh by directing the Agency for International Development to expedite delivery of this assistance.

Mr. Speaker, another key priority is to maintain Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which restricts certain direct government-to-government assistance to Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. Last year, the full House voted to strip a provision from the fiscal year 1999 bill that would have repealed Section 907, and last month the other body defeated a provision to waive Section 907. Clearly, there is a bipartisan consensus in both Houses that the conditions for lifting Section 907 have not been met.

Another way in which the Foreign Ops bill can make a big difference is by encouraging progress on the Nagorno Karabagh Peace Process. The U.S. has been one of the countries taking the lead in the peace process, as a co-chair of the Minsk Group under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Late last year, the U.S. and our negotiating partners put forward a compromise peace plan, known as the ''Common State'' proposal, as a basis for moving the negotiations forward. Despite some serious reservations, the elected governments of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh have accepted this proposal in a spirit of good faith to get the negotiations moving forward, while Azerbaijan summarily rejected it. I hope the subcommittee would include language urging the administration to stay the course on the compromise peace proposal and to use all appropriate diplomatic means to persuade Azerbaijan to support it.

To further promote the peace process, we would ask that the subcommittee consider language calling on the State Department to work with the parties to the conflict to initiate confidence-building measures. These measures should be geared both towards a reaching of a negotiated settlement, such as strengthening the current cease-fire, as well as for establishing a framework for better integration following a negotiated settlement, such as transportation routes and other infrastructure, trade, and increased people-to-people contacts.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the members of this subcommittee are grappling with many competing demands in a complicated world with limited budgets. The fiscal year 2000 Foreign Ops Appropriations bill provides us with a chance to shape U.S. foreign policy for a new century and a new millennium. Armenia is a nation that measures its history in millennia, yet the Republics of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh are very young democracies that embrace many of the same values that Americans cherish.

I hope that the legislation that the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations adopts this week will make a priority of supporting both Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

PROMOTING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Michael Pollan in the New York Times Magazine article this weekend, ''The Land of the Free Market and Livability,'' is certainly correct that government can and should be thinking of ways to align our polices for the types of communities that our hearts desire.

What I find disappointing is the assumption somehow that the choices consumers are making now based on their pocketbook are somehow solely the result of benign, inevitable market demands.

Having worked my entire career on the promotion of livable communities, I am struck by how the increasingly dysfunctional communities that are facing Americans across the country are a result of direct government interference in the marketplace. Consumers are behaving rationally by investing in ways where their incentives are skewed by government.

The most dramatic example is to be found in our treatment of the automobile. Seventy-five years ago, communities all across the country had profitable, private transit streetcar systems privately owned and profitable. Massive government spending, literally trillions of dollars, were used to promote automobile traffic, while at the same time there was no support given to transit; and indeed in many communities government contributed

directly to the decline of transit and in some communities its demise by refusing to allow fares to increase with inflation and for capital investments to keep the systems healthy.

While the money from the road funds is perhaps the most visible, there were also huge subsidies for overseas defense to protect oil supplies and public ownership of oil and gas supplies. There were dramatic subsidies for public safety, for policing related to the automobile, and the removal of huge tracts of land in the tax rolls and for roads and road right-of-way and, of course, parking and tax subsidies. All of these combined to tip the playing field in favor of the automobile. Consumers responded rationally for themselves but in ways that very much skewed the pattern of transportation development.

Now, these clear transportation subsidies are but a small portion of the overall government interference in the market system. Our investments in public housing concentrated poor minority populations in central cities. We dramatically subsidized utility rates and sewer and water expansion that routinely hid the profits, from providing service to local inner cities, from increased costs associated with expansion into suburbs and greenfields. It resulted in many central city residents paying more for their own utilities and subsidizing lower rates for people outside the cities.

The most direct and obvious interference in the market was the emergence of single-use zoning in metropolitan areas where we made it illegal for the family owning, say, a restaurant or a drugstore from living or having their clerks live above that activity. People were zoned out of mixed-use neighborhoods and literally forced into their cars since the drastic separation of uses forced many Americans to rely increasingly on automobiles, and again that was very rational behavior.

The list goes on and on: flood insurance, water supply, brownfields programs, the Federal Government's own policy of locating facilities out further and further from concentrated uses, or the post office refusing to obey local land use laws and zoning codes. These are all examples of the government's own activities to destabilize neighborhoods in our central cities and our older suburbs.

It is hard for me to imagine any rational observer being able to characterize what has transpired in American communities over the last three-quarters of a century as benign, neutral, inevitable market forces. The challenge today for those who would have livable communities is not to overcome market forces but allow the market forces to work. This is an appropriate use of the political process. It is not a trivial point, as critics attempt to paint efforts for promoting livable communities on the part of the administration, those of us in Congress, or the vast grassroots efforts around the country as somehow social engineering or forcing people to do what they do not want to do.

It is essential to give legitimacy to the aspirations of thousands of activists in hundreds of communities across the country that are trying to promote livable communities. Just as we have established a pattern of unplanned growth for dysfunctional communities and regions, we can level the playing field to promote livable communities. I look forward to this Congress and this administration taking steps to be partners to promote these more livable communities.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind us, O gracious God, that we are to be doing the works of justice and mercy in our communities and in our world. And as we seek to do the works of justice remind us again that we are not the message, but we are the messengers of reconciliation and peace and righteousness. We admit that we can become so involved in what we do that we promote ourselves and we become the focus instead of pointing to the way of truth and promoting the good works of justice for every person.

May Your blessing, O God, that is new every morning be with us until the last moments of the day, abide with us this day now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent Resolution urging the United States Government and the United Nations to undertake urgent and strenuous efforts to secure the release of Branko Jelen, Steve Pratt, and Peter Wallace, 3 humanitarian workers employed in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by CARE International, who are being unjustly held as prisoners by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

THE VALUE AND NECESSITY OF A STRONG MINING INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, over the next few weeks I will be bringing to our colleagues and the Chair's attention the value and necessity of a strong mining industry in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, nearly everything we eat, touch, wear, use, or even live in is made possible by the mining industry. Minerals comprise the basic necessities of life. Mineral-based fertilizers make possible the food we eat and the natural fibers in our clothes. From the concrete foundation, to the wallboard, pipes, and wiring, all the way up to the shingles on the roof, the construction industry utilizes minerals for building our homes.

Mr. Speaker, minerals, made possible through the mining industry, are essential for agriculture, construction, and manufacturing. The United States is one of the world's leaders in the production of important metals and minerals, and it is imperative that we maintain a strong mining industry, and remain competitive with other nations for scarce investment of capital.

Many investors have already left the United States for Latin America and Asia, where they are not faced with endless delays regarding Federal proposals, permits, expensive fees, and all sorts of other bureaucratic red tape.

Mr. Speaker, it is in our Nation's best interests to keep our mining industry strong.

OUR COUNTRY'S UNBELIEVABLE POLICY ON STEEL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, after World War II we gave tours of our steel mills to Japan and Germany. We let them take pictures. We gave them blueprints. We even gave them foreign aid so they could build their own steel mills.

Today Japan and Germany have steel mills. America has photographs. If that

is not enough to tarnish our stainless, Japan and Europe at this very moment keep dumping illegal steel into America while in Pittsburgh, the once steel capital of the world, they just demolished another steel mill.

Beam me up. This policy on steel is not only unbelievable, it is stupid. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we could do with less think tanks and styrofoam and a few more factories and steel.

THOSE PAYING 96 PERCENT OF TAXES SHOULD GET TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, here is a fun trick we can play on our liberal friends, especially the ones who never tire of saying that the rich do not pay their fair share.

In fact, this is a fun trick that we can play on most Democrats, with few exceptions. Ask them how much the rich pay in Federal income taxes. After they begin to look pale and ask, what do you mean, ask them what percentage of Federal income taxes are paid by the top 50 percent of income earners and what percentage of the taxes are paid by the bottom half.

Our liberal friends will not answer that question. Of course, they do not have any idea what the answer to the question is, and of course, even if they did, they would never tell us. They would be very embarrassed to have to admit that the top 50 percent of income earners pay 96 percent of all taxes, 96 percent. The bottom 50 percent pay a whopping 4 percent.

Those same liberals then will rant and rave and feign moral indignation that those paying 96 percent of the taxes, those who are carrying almost the entire load, should get any tax relief at all.

THE DEBATE OVER TAXES IS A DEBATE ABOUT FREEDOM

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of speeches this week, countless speeches, in fact, about taxes. We will hear that the debate over taxes is about fairness, about special interests, about the struggles of the middle class, about the American dream, about compassion, and about justice.

Yes, this debate is about all of those things, but principally the debate about taxes is about freedom. It is not a difficult concept. It is not an idea that requires advanced degrees or lengthy training. It is simply this, that if we let people keep more of their own money, people will have more freedom to live their lives as they see fit, not as the government sees fit.

Letting people keep more of what they earn will allow Americans to save more, build a better future for themselves and their families, and realize their dreams. So this week let us have a true discussion. Let us talk about finally cutting taxes in this country.

RETAIL RESPONSIBILITY—WAL-MART

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I learned recently that two large retail chains in middle America can truly make a difference when it comes to keeping violence and filth out of our young kids' minds.

I think both Wal-Mart and K-Mart should be commended for their recent stance on culture within the marketplace. These superstores may not be perfect, but they are taking an active role in not selling some of the extraordinarily violent and offensive music that could be lining their shelves and raking in the cash.

Some of the music they chose not to carry is climbing up the charts, but since so many parents have objected to its profanity and reference to suicide, these stores have pulled some albums from the shelves.

Mr. Speaker, do not get me wrong, these are mega-marts, not mega-moms or mega-dads, but they are proving that taking a small stand in the marketplace against the increasingly corrupt culture can be done, even if it means foregoing an influx of cash.

WE NEED POLICY INSTEAD OF PREENING, POSTURING, AND POLITICS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting when we return from district work periods where we have heard the wisdom of the people. Lincoln said, the American people, once fully informed, will make the correct decision.

I heard some very interesting things from my constituents this week. I would refer this House, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the President of the United States and one of the more senior Members of this institution from Massachusetts.

The President of the United States earlier this year in Buffalo, New York, said, ''We could give it, the budget surplus, all back to you and hope you spend it right, but,'' ''but.'' Mr. Speaker, that speaks volumes, because given a choice, our president, sadly, believes that Washington bureaucrats need our hard-earned money more than we do.

Then, a senior Member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), yesterday said, speaking of the liberals, ''It is not our responsibility to legislate anymore. It does not make sense for us to compromise.''

Mr. Speaker, a legislator refusing to legislate? I hope we do not see a lot of preening and posturing and politics instead of policy.

TAX CUTS ARE AN ISSUE OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have to really hand it to the Democrats. They already have their line memorized and ready to repeat over and over again.

Republicans propose tax relief that largely excludes upper income people from benefiting; again, tax relief for everyone except the rich. And what are the Democrats saying about it already? Yes, ''Tax cuts for the wealthy.''

Any tax relief, tax relief at all, is immediately labeled by the other side as tax cuts for the wealthy. It is an insult to the millions of middle class taxpayers who would benefit from tax relief to be demonized by liberals who oppose tax relief everywhere and anywhere.

Of course, it is an insult to those who are carrying most of the load, the people who are paying the most in taxes.

In America, the issue is not whether upper income people need a tax cut. Of course they do not. But in America, it is an issue of freedom. It is their money. It does not belong to the government, and it does not belong to liberal politicians in Washington who want to spend it on more wasteful government programs.

DEMOCRATS HAVE NO INTENTION OF WORKING WITH THE REPUBLIC MAJORITY

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, just listen to this quote taken from yesterday's Washington Post: ''It is not our responsibility to legislate anymore. It doesn't make sense for us to compromise.''

''It doesn't make sense for us to compromise?'' These words come from a leader of the Democrat party, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

It appears that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has let the cat out of the bag. The Democrats had no intention of working with the Republican majority. They will block all legislative efforts, and then turn around and blame Republicans, attacking the do-nothing Congress.

But the always fair and balanced media of course will help them in that effort. Then they will attack Republicans for Republican extremism, a charge we heard thousands and thousands of times since 1995 when Republicans took over the majority in the Congress.

Once again, the media will help them fix the image in the public's mind, but the truth is now there for all to see. We thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are overtaxed. They pay too much income tax, they pay too much sales tax, they pay taxes on their savings, they pay taxes on their investments, and they pay taxes when they die.

In fact, Federal taxes consume about 21 percent of national income, the highest proportion since World War II. But Mr. Speaker, help is on the way. In the coming days, the House will pass a tax bill that says to America, we think you deserve a long overdue refund for the surplus you created.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, our first priority is to save social security and Medicare for future generations of seniors. In fact, for every dollar of the surplus that we use for tax relief, there are $2 set aside for social security and Medicare.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that just yesterday at the White House the President agreed with the Republicans in the House and Senate that we ought to lock up that Medicare and social security surplus first. That is what we intend to do.

When Members hear the talk about how our tax cuts are taking money away from social security and Medicare, remember this, Mr. and Mrs. America, we will lock up our social security and Medicare, our retirement security fund, first, $2 for every $1 we will subsequently give in tax relief.

We will give tax relief if people are taxed for getting married, we will give tax relief if people are taxed for trying to go to school, we will give tax relief if they are taxed for getting buried, and we will give tax relief if people just have a general income and need some across-the-board relief.

In fact, the benefits here will go to the American people in better jobs, better economic growth, better employment opportunities, and more take-home pay, and that, Mr. Speaker, is what freedom is all about.

□ 1015

TITLE IX MEANS OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN ATHLETES

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the World Cup Soccer champions, I want to present this soccer ball to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), my colleague, and to former Member, Edith Green. In 1972, they offered and enacted the landmark Title IX legislation, the Bill of Rights for women in education and sports.

It said that any university that secured Federal funds must open up all programs on an equal basis. Prior to enactment of Title IX, female athletes had very little and limited opportunity to compete. I know that when I was in school, there were no women's sports programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Statue of Liberty has become a symbol of freedom to the world. Now when a woman or anyone holds up a soccer ball, this has become a symbol of opportunity, of equality in sports, and really the opportunity for women to achieve great things. Thank you, Title IX. Thank you to the women and men in this body that enacted it.

THE B.E.S.T. AGENDA FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, back in January when this Congress convened, I told my constituents that I thought we ought to pursue what I called the B.E.S.T. agenda. B-E-S-T. B for balancing the budget; E for educational reforms that focus on giving local school districts and parents more flexibility in dealing with education issues; S for saving Social Security, something that is important to all of us but particularly to those of us who are baby boomers who were born after World War II; and T for tax relief and reform.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we are pursuing this agenda and we are making tremendous progress. Our budget resolution calls for not only a balanced budget this year, but for the first time actually securing every penny of Social Security taxes only for Social Security.

Our educational reform, Ed-Flex, has already passed and is on its way to the States. Now we focus on tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has put down his marker. Mr. ROTH has put down his marker. The President is coming up with his own tax plan. But I hope at the end of the day there will be real tax relief for working families, and I hope we would focus first and foremost on eliminating the marriage penalty tax.

LIBERAL INSIDERS WARN AGAINST TAX CUTS

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorialized yet again against Republican tax cuts and our proposal. Hardly a week goes by without the Washington elite and other liberal insiders warning against the idea of letting Americans keep more of their own money.

To me that is a pretty good indication that that is exactly what we need to do.

And of course the same crowd also called Ronald Reagan's tax cuts dangerous, foolish, and irresponsible. They are now singing the same tune today.

They are also the same people who 2 years ago said that we could not cut taxes and balance the budget at the same time. And of course they are the same crowd that could not praise President Clinton enough for raising taxes by a record amount.

See, there are lots of people in this town who really do believe government can spend their money better than Americans can, and they really hate the idea that people should be able to keep the fruits of their labor and reap the benefits of saving, sacrificing, and realizing their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, of course they are against the tax cut.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate on House Resolution 242 or House Resolution 243.

200th ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that while we are waiting to proceed with today's agenda that here in 1999 it is the 200th year, the 200th anniversary, and it should not be a happy anniversary, but it is an anniversary of the death of George Washington.

After the constitutional convention of 1787, of course the father of our country took over the presidency in 1789. He served 8 stalwart years, during which time he established the United States presidency for what it is, an individual who will chart the course of the country without ever attaining the role of king or of tyrant or of anything but a citizen politician who would guide the ship of State, along with the two other branches of government.

George Washington established that for all time. When he retired he went back to Mt. Vernon and there, guess what? He engaged in making sure that the firefighting equipment for the entire area was intact. He pruned trees, checked the crops, made sure that the river flow was adequate for the purposes of transportation, river transportation. Did a hundred different things as an owner of property, as a farmer.

He reestablished himself as a member of the community because he attended several meetings with fellow farmers just to make sure that the local ordinances and local safety measures and police and firefighting people were set to do their duties. The kinds of things that we know are necessary in today's communities, that is what George Washington, the father of our country, did in his retirement.

Later on this year when we get closer to the anniversary of his death, I plan to take a special order to again review the life of George Washington, this being the 200th anniversary of his death in 1799, and to recall that what we are here today is largely the product of his steady hand in war and in peace.

When we call him the father of our country, that is not a euphemism. That is a reality that we must all take into consideration as we review the history of our country.

TITLE 9 TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 916) to make technical amendments to section 10 of title 9, United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 916

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

SECTION 1. VACATION OF AWARDS.

Section 10 of title 9, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by indenting the margin of paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a) 2 ems;

(2) by striking ''Where'' in such paragraphs and inserting ''where'';

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) and inserting a semicolon and by adding ''or'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(4) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(5) in paragraph (5), by striking ''Where an award'' and inserting ''If an award'', by inserting a comma after ''expired'', and by redesignating the paragraph as subsection (b).

SEC. 2. COMMUNICATIONS ASSISTANCE.

The Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001–1021) is amended—

(1) in section 102, by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The term 'installed' means equipment, facilities, or services that are operable and commercially available for use anywhere within a telecommunications carrier's network.

''(10) The term 'deployed' means equipment, facilities, or services that are commercially available anywhere within the telecommunications industry and capable of being installed or utilized in a telecommunications carrier's network, whether or not such equipment, facilities, or services were actually installed or utilized within the carrier's network.

''(11) The term 'significantly upgraded or otherwise undergoes a major modification' means a material and substantial change in the configuration of a telecommunications carrier's network, including the installation of hardware or software that fundamentally alters the equipment, facilities, or services of that network, but does not include the upgrade of switching equipment or other modifications made in the ordinary course of business or made so as to comply with Federal or State law or regulatory requirements.'';

(2) in section 107(a), by striking paragraph (3);

(3) in section 108(c)(3), by striking ''on or before January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''before June 30, 2000'';

(4) in section 109—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the heading strike ''JANUARY 1, 1995'' and inserting ''JUNE 30, 2000''; and

(ii) by striking ''January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''June 30, 2000'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the heading strike ''JANUARY 1, 1995'' and inserting ''JUNE 30, 2000''; and

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''June 30, 2000''; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''June 30, 2000''; and

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''June 30, 2000'';

(C) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the heading strike ''JANUARY 1, 1995'' and inserting ''JUNE 30, 2000''; and

(ii) by striking ''January 1, 1995'' and inserting ''June 30, 2000'';

(5) in section 110, by striking ''and 1998'' and inserting ''1998, 1999, and 2000''; and

(6) in section 111(b), by striking ''on that date that is 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''no earlier than June 30, 2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as part of the RECORD, I submit two specific letters that have to do with this legislation determining the jurisdiction for our committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 12, 1999.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: It is my understanding that you intend to bring H.R. 916, a bill to make technical corrections to section 10, of title 9, United States Code, before the House under the Suspension calendar in the near future. While H.R. 916 was not referred to the Committee on Commerce upon its introduction, it is my further understanding that you intend to bring up a manager's amendment which contains provision substantially similar to section 204 of H.R. 3303 as it passed the House in the 105th Congress (amending title I of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. §1001 et seq.)) which falls within the jurisdiction of our two committees pursuant to Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Because of the importance of this legislation, I recognize your desire to bring it before the House in an expeditious manner and will not object to its consideration under the Suspension calendar. By agreeing to permit this bill to come to the floor under these procedures, however, the Commerce committee does not waive its subject-matter jurisdiction over the aforementioned provisions. In addition, the Commerce Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 916 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the *Record* during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 13, 1999.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 916.

I agree that portions of the bill are within your committee's Rule X jurisdiction and that you would be entitled to conferees on those issues should this bill go to conference. I also agree that these letters will be placed in the record.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is exemplary of something that we lawyers have, over the centuries, complained that a misplaced comma can sometimes so alter a provision in the law that it can wreak havoc in the courts of justice and in our communities. Such a mistake of a misplaced comma was made, and it was brought to our attention through a constituent of the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who in the arbitration laws of our codes found that a misplaced comma could throw out of whack an interpretation of a particular section.

So the bill before us is simply a technical correction to make sure that that misplaced comma is placed correctly. This is not one of the most momentous bills we have ever had in front of the House of Representatives, but it does emphasize that a technical correction from time to time is absolutely necessary if we are to do business properly in the Congress of the United States.

Similarly, in the telecommunications field another technical correction is one that we require and which will be embodied in this bill. It is the enforcement act of 1994, which we call CALEA, the Communications Assistance to Law Enforcement Act, also

very important. But the grand-fathering certain provisions becomes very important as a technical correction, and we offer that along with the misplaced commas as the reason for our appearance here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 916, as amended.

As reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 916, makes purely technical revisions to section 10 of title 9 of the United States Code, that correct some typographical flaws that has long evaded detection. Section 10 enumerates several grounds for vacating an arbitrator's award, but the fifth clause is obviously not a ground for vacating an award, but rather the beginning of a new sentence. The bill simply corrects this error. H.R. 916 also revises some compliance dates and related provisions in the Communications Assistance to Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (''CALEA''), Public Law 103–414.

CALEA was enacted to preserve the government's ability, pursuant to court order or other lawful authorization, to intercept communications involving advanced technologies (such as digital or wireless transmissions) and services (such as call forwarding, speed dialing, and conference calling). It is also intended to protect the privacy of communications and without impeding the introduction of new technologies, features, and services.

In the constantly evolving environment of digital telecommunications, the need for law enforcement to retain it ability to use court authorized electronic intercepts is even greater. Nevertheless, it appears that the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the telecommunications industry have been unable after several years of discussions and negotiations to resolve certain differences regarding compliance with CALEA. As a result, implementation of the act has been delayed.

This delay accordingly necessitates these revisions. They chiefly consist of replacing H.R. 916's effective date with one that takes into account this delay in CALEA's implementation. The act's grandfather provisions are likewise revised. Further, the bill defines certain terms that the Act failed to include and, hopefully, with their addition, will assist the parties involved in the implementation of CALEA.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and concur with the description of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) of its purpose and effect. This misplaced comma was actually brought to our attention by a State Supreme Court justice of the New York State Supreme Court in my district who pointed out the obvious intent of Congress was very clear, but the comma and the paragraph were in the wrong place, and so this changes that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the courts have misinterpreted the law, but why tempt them to do so by not correcting this comma?

In addition, the technical change to the CALEA bill that is in this bill, the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act, is also a technical change that extends several effective dates until the FCC and the FBI can work out certain technical standards that they are working out; and the minority has been consulted on this, and we certainly have no objection to it. It is a technical extension. We are in support of it.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the H.R. 916. During the 105th Congress I introduced as the original author the Communications Assistance to Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) Implementation Amendment of 1998 (H.R. 3321). Section 2, of H.R. 916 embodies the principles of this legislation I introduced in 1998.

Last year, the House of Representatives passed the Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, 2000, and 2001, which included language to deal with this important issue. However, the United States Senate did not act on this legislation.

I believe it is incumbent on us in Congress to recognize the delays that have occurred in the implementation of CALEA, passed by Congress and signed into law in 1994, by extending the time for compliance, and to clarify the ''grandfathered'' status of existing telecommunication network equipment, facilities, and services during the time period the CALEA-compliant technology is developed.

Fundamentally, the purpose of CALEA is to preserve the federal government's ability, pursuant to a court order or other lawful authorization, to intercept communications involving advanced telecommunication technologies, while protecting the privacy of communications; and without impeding the introduction of new technologies, features, and services. CALEA further defined the telecommunication industry's duty to cooperate in the conduct of electronic surveillance, and to establish procedures based on public accountability and industry standard setting.

CALEA necessarily involved a balancing of interests of the telecommunications industry, law enforcement, and privacy groups. The law allowed the telecommunication industry to develop standards to implement the requirements of CALEA, and establish a process for the U.S. Attorney General to identify capacity requirements of electronic surveillance. The law required the federal government to reimburse carriers their just and reasonable costs incurred in modifying existing equipment, services or features deemed necessary to comply with the assistance capability requirements of the law. The CALEA law also required the federal government pay for delays in the implementation of the law that have prevented the telecommunication industry and law enforcement from complying with its provisions.

The development and adoption of industry technical standards have been much delayed, and these standards are now being challenged before the Federal Communications Commission by both law enforcement and privacy groups. The release of the federal government's capacity notice for electronic surveillance needs was over two and a half years late. It is clear from telecommunications equipment manufacturers, that no CALEA-compliant technology will be available for purchase and implementation by telecommunication carriers by the effective date. Further, since the enactment of CALEA, substantial changes have occurred in the telecommunication industry, such as the enactment of the Telecommunication Reform Act of 1996, which resulted in many new entrants in the industry and other changes in the competitive marketplace. Finally, during the four year, ''transition period'' initially contemplated by Congress for the implementation of CALEA, the telecommunication industry has installed, and continues to deploy, technology and equipment which is not compliant with assistance capacity requirements of CALEA, since ''CALEA technology'' has not been fully developed or designed into such equipment.

Mr. Speaker, House of Representatives Report No. 103–827 makes it clear the federal government intended to bear the costs CALEA implementation during the four-year transition period between enactment and effective dates. Congress recognized it was much more economical to design new telecommunications switching equipment, features, services the necessary assistance capability requirements, rather than to retrofit existing equipment, features, and services. Congress recognized some retrofitting would nonetheless be necessary, provided that carriers would be in compliance with CALEA, absent a commitment by law enforcement to reimburse the full and reasonable costs of carriers for such modifications to their existing equipment.

The Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act for 1999 recognizes during the four year, CALEA transition, virtually no federal government funds have been expended to reimburse the telecommunication industry for its implementation costs of CALEA. During the first year transition period, virtually all telecommunications carrier equipment which had been installed or deployed, is based on pre-CALEA technology and does not include those features necessary to implement the assistance capacity requirements of CALEA.

It is therefore necessary to extend the time of compliance. This step is absolutely essential, to enable the industry to complete the standard-setting and development processes required to implement CALEA in an economical, efficient and reasonable fashion. This approval also recognizes existing telecommunications equipment, features, and services should be grandfathered during the interim.

On the completion of the development of CALEA compliant-technology, the federal government can then decide which carrier equipment it chooses to retrofit at federal government expense, and the manufacturers can then design CALEA capabilities and services to be deployed in carrier networks in the future.

Thus, it is necessary to move both the effective and the ''grandfather'' dates of CALEA to recognize the delays in CALEA implementation and to ensure its implementation continues as intended by Congress five years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is also necessary to clarify the meaning of several terms in the cost reimbursement provisions of CALEA. The use of the terms 'installed' and 'deployed' in CALEA, are intended to make clear Congress intended separate and distinct meanings for these terms as they are used in CALEA. The term, ''installed,'' refers to equipment actually in place and operable to the network of carriers.

The term ''deployed,'' relates to equipment, facilities or services that are commercially available within the telecommunication industry, to be utilized by a carrier whether or not equipment, facilities or services were actually installed or utilized within the network of the carrier. The term, 'deployed,' is also intended to refer to technology available to the industry.

The use of these terms recognizes Congress clearly intended to reimburse the telecommunications carriers with federal government expenses, or grandfather the existing networks of carriers to the extent they were installed or deployed prior to the development of CALEA-compliant technology. This decision was based on industry standards developed to meet assistance capacity requirements of CALEA terms, ''significantly upgraded'' or ''otherwise undergoes major modifications.'' These terms were intended to mean the carriers' obligations to assume the costs of implementing CALEA technology in a particular network switch, is not triggered until a particular network switch is fundamentally altered, such as by upgrading or replacing it with a new fundamentally altered switch technology. For example, changing from digital to asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) switching technology.

Thus, once CALEA-compliant technology is developed and can be designed into, or deployed in, carrier networks, the costs of such deployment shift to the industry. Prior to that time, however, existing carrier networks are ''grandfathered'' unless retrofitted at federal government expense as intended by Congress. In addition, switch upgrades or modifications performed by carriers to meet federal or state regulatory mandates or other requirements, such as number portability requirements, are not to be considered a ''significant upgrade'' or a ''major modification'' for purposes of CALEA.

Mr. Speaker, these provisions should make clear that existing carrier networks are grandfathered, unless retrofitted at federal government expense. The effective date for compliance with CALEA has been extended for approximately two years to provide additional time for industry development of CALEA-compliant technology, in response to industry technical standards to meet the assistance capacity requirements of CALEA.

I support this important legislation and ask my colleagues to support H.R. 916.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New York and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 916, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to make technical amendments to section 10 of title 9, United States Code, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE WITH REGARD TO THE UNITED STATES WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM AND ITS WINNING PERFORMANCE IN THE 1999 WOMEN'S WORLD CUP TOURNAMENT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 244) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to the United States Women's Soccer Team and its winning performance in the 1999 Women's World Cup.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 244

Whereas each of the athletes on the United States Women's Soccer Team has honored the Nation through her dedication to excellence;

Whereas the United States Women's Soccer Team has raised the level of awareness and appreciation for women's sports throughout the United States;

Whereas the members of the United States Women's Soccer Team have become positive role models for American youth aspiring to participate in national and international level sports; and

Whereas the United States Women's Soccer Team has qualified for the 2000 summer Olympic games: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the United States Women's Soccer Team on its winning championship performance in the World Cup tournament;

(2) recognizes the important contribution each individual team member has made to the United States and to the advancement of women's sports; and

(3) invites the members of the United States Women's Soccer Team to the United States Capitol to be honored and recognized by the House of Representatives for their achievements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 244.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 244 honoring the U.S. Women's Soccer Team and its winning performance in the 1999 women's world cup tournament.

For the past 3 weeks, no household in America has been immune to the fever that has swept our Nation during the 32 games of the women's world cup soccer series. When the series began, total attendance was set on the high side. Crowds of up to 350,000 were expected to extend the games in seven cities throughout the country. By Sunday when the series ended at the Rose Bowl in Pasadena, more than 660,000 fans had attended including 90,000 people for the final. Another 40 million tuned in to watch the match on television.

What we saw in that final matchup of the series pitting China against Team USA was a battle of titans. For a grueling 120 minutes of play neither side budged, neither side blinked, and neither side gave up a goal. What we saw was an American dream come true. For generations little boys have grown up wishing to become another Babe Ruth, Mickey Mantle, Gale Sayers or Michael Jordan. But it is only recently that little girls have anywhere near the same dream, to one day be the next Billie Jean King, Martina Navratilova, or Jackie Joyner Kersee.

Now little girls have the dream. They have the women of Team USA. they have Briana Scurry, Carla Overbeck, Kate Sobrero, and Brandi Chastain.

□ 1130

They have Joy Fawcett and Julie Foudy, Michelle Akers and Kristine Lilley. They have Mia Hamm. They have Cindy Parlow, Tiffany Milbrett, Sara Whalen, Shannon MacMillan, and Tisha Venturini. They have Lorrie Fair, Christie Pearce, Tiffany Roberts, Danielle Fotopoulos, Saska Webber and Tracy Ducar.

The women of team U.S. won the World Cup series, but they also won the respect and admiration and the hearts of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to rise in strong support of House Resolution 241, expressing the sense of the House regarding the United States Women's Soccer Team in its World Cup victory last Saturday afternoon and inviting that team to come to the House and be recognized.

It is a victory not simply for the United States but for the game of soccer, for women's athletics, and for all of us who have become jaded by the egotism and commercialism of professional sports. It is a huge win for teamwork and the pure joy of competing. To me, that makes the players of Team USA not just champions but heroes, heroes willing to accept the challenge and be role models for young people.

Few of us imagined when we passed Title IX back in 1972 that a women's final sporting event this year would have 90,000 attendees or over 40 million people watching it on TV. Impressive. Very impressive.

One of the hallmarks of this success has been a group that is headquartered in my district called the American Youth Soccer Organization. This group was founded before Title IX. It started in 1964. It started in Torrance. There were 125 children, ages 4 to 18, boys and girls, and their parents who thought there were four things important. One

was that they are going to play well-balanced teams. Everyone is going to play. They are going to have the parents involved. They are going to have positive coaching.

That is now one of the most successful youth programs in America. There are hundreds of thousands of young people. It has taken us a generation, 35 years, to bring that to fruition and see it exemplified in this World Cup win.

Eight years ago, the United States women won the first World Cup in 1991. In 1991, we played in China. In 1991, hardly anybody in America knew we played. Yet, the women were dominant then. A young lady from my district at that time was the most valuable player of the World Cup. Her name was Karen Gabara. She is now the coach of the United States Navy team.

This group of women have made a mark on the country, and I think it is important that the country recognize their achievement, because their achievement is far more than athletic prowess.

It is not often that a group of people gather our heart, they put their arms around us. We want to put our arms around them. They are a wonderful group of examples for young people in this country, men or women, to look at. They play for the pride of being successful. They play because they enjoy it. They play because they know there is an example to be set. They obviously play with national pride, the United States national pride.

We are a great Nation. We are measured by many things. But, in this case, we are measured by the success of a young team of soccer players. I urge my colleagues all to support this.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for introducing this resolution and share in the excitement I think all of America feels today as we congratulate the U.S. Woman's National Soccer Team on their 1999 World Cup.

As we look back in the history of sports, certain moments transcend the arena and represent something larger than a single victory. The woman's World Cup final, which became the biggest woman's sporting event in history, is a testament to the respect and devotion that these champions have earned.

This achievement will be remembered with the awe of Jesse Owens competing in Nazi Germany or the 1980 U.S. Olympic Hockey Team defeating the Soviet Union.

These athletes represent the American dream, the ability of any person to become a teacher, an astronaut, or a World Cup champion.

The women's national team played with dedication, sportsmanship, and heart. I think one of the things that I found most telling was the team themselves and the members who participated actually functioned as a team. Maybe all of us in America can reflect on that for a moment and take the word ''I'' out of our vocabulary and use the world ''we,'' because we the people and we as a people can achieve great things if we work as a team.

I watched the young ladies on the Today Show being interviewed by Katie Couric and Matt Lauer, and each one of them went on to praise the other in even more glowing terms about how they helped succeed and how they helped the team.

So I hope as we reflect upon this wonderful victory that these ladies have celebrated and we think about the uplifting it brings to America and hopefully in the new century, as we approach the millennium, that all of us share in the spirit of pride of this country, of pride of individual abilities, of pride of collective victories, but, more importantly, as, working together, we can achieve the greatest things before us.

So, again, I commend the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team and to people everywhere as the role models they are and will be for future generations of America. They are a team that America can truly be proud of. I again thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for introducing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is my pleasure to be a cosponsor of this legislation. This past Saturday, the United States Women's World Cup Soccer Team put on a performance that will not soon be forgotten. The extraordinary game that was played in Pasadena, California, was not only a testament to the United States team's hard work but to what can happen when individuals are given an equal opportunity. That is why I am so pleased to cosponsor this legislation.

The educator, the professor from Yale, Dr. James Comer, said something that really applies to this situation. He said that a person can have all the genetic ability they want and they can have all the will they want, but if they do not have the opportunity, it is almost impossible for them to achieve their goals. Here we have a situation where these great, great young ladies were given an opportunity, and they certainly showed what they could accomplish.

Saturday's game was a competition against the Chinese National Team that involved strength, skill, endurance, and guts. The game remained tied through 90 exhausting minutes of regulation play and two 15-minute sudden death overtime periods. It then went into a shoot-out in which the United States women outshot the Chinese women five to four in order to capture the well-deserved title of world champions.

This victory is more than just one team coming out ahead of the other. It is a victory for the United States, for the sport of soccer as a whole and, most importantly, for women of all ages who aspire to be or already are athletes.

It makes me proud when I think about the possibilities. I told my daughter the other day as she graduated from high school, I said, ''I am excited about your possibilities.'' And as a father of two daughters, it makes me excited about the possibilities of all women who want to be involved in sports.

The women of this World Cup team have proven that they cannot be taken lightly. The ever-popular saying, ''you throw a ball like a girl'' is quickly becoming outdated.

The over 90 million exuberant fans that attended the championship game made it the most highly attended women's sporting event in history. That certainly does not include the many, many fans, like myself, who Saturday were glued to the television set watching this exciting play.

Over 400,000 fans attended the games in which the United States competed, and approximately 650,000 fans attended the tournament overall. That says something. The world was certainly watching.

Since its conception in 1985, the United States Women's World Cup Team has proudly boasted a record of 144 wins, 12 ties, and only 31 losses. They defeated China in the very first Women's World Cup in 1991; and, in 1995, they finished third behind Norway and Germany.

The history of this team has been showered with success after success. However, this success has not come without hard work and an incredible attitude. Without a professional program for women, the national team has had to rely mostly on college teams to provide players with skills necessary for their success. In turn, the success of college programs is in a large part due to Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972.

With the passage of Title IX, schools were forced to fund women's athletic programs at the same level men's athletic programs were being funded. Schools still have the flexibility to choose sports based on student body interests, geographic influence, budget constraints, and gender ratio. Yet, there must be gender equity. That is so very important, gender equity. Women must have an opportunity to play and compete in the world of sports. Women have shown us just what they can do, given the opportunity.

I think that one of the things that we do not realize is, when we see young women performing, other young women watch them. Not only are they excited about soccer, but it also says that they can achieve other things, too, and that they are excited about the excellence that our team showed. It says to them that we will also compete in the legal world, we will also compete in the field of medicine and what have you.

So not only does it affect the soccer world, not only does it affect athletics,

but it affects all of the young ladies, no matter where they are and no matter what status of life they are in.

The Women's National World Cup team are the pioneers for their sport and for women athletes all over the world. They have gladly assumed the status of role model and truly deserve it. Young girls all over the country adore them and look upon them as heroes or, as some would say, sheroes. But not only are young girls looking at them, men, young men, old men, all kinds of men are looking at them, too, because they see what they have been able to accomplish when given that opportunity.

Although women have been playing soccer for a long time, this World Cup team has opened the eyes of billions. I believe there is an exciting future ahead, and I will look forward to watching it unfold.

I am proud to support and be a cosponsor of this resolution honoring the 1999 Women's World Cup team. They have certainly given us a lot to be proud of.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for introducing this very important legislation upon which there is certainly bipartisan support.

I want to add my cheers for the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team and 1999 Women's World Cup champions. These dedicated, determined and accomplished young women make me so proud to be associated with the cause of getting more girls and women involved with sports and fitness.

When I was growing up, girls did not play soccer. When we played basketball, it was only on half of the court. Women's choices in sports were relegated to cheerleading and getting a good seat as a spectator in the stands. That was before Title IX.

Title IX and the U.S. National Women's Soccer Team have changed the playing field for girls and women in athletics. Mia Hamm, Carla Overbeck, Julie Foudy, Tiffany Milbrett, Brianna Scurry, Brandi Chastain, and the whole U.S. team are all long distance runners in the challenge and the struggle to raise the status of women's sports to the same level as that of men's athletics.

They are heroes and healthy role models for our sisters, daughters, granddaughters that want to participate in sports. I have a number of granddaughters who are participating in soccer and other sports. They speak to the importance of the sports experience in building self-confidence, perseverance and the competitive edge.

□ 1045

Young women who participate in sports are more likely to finish school and less likely to have an unwanted pregnancy. The availability of athletic scholarships has enabled more women to pursue a college education and opened opportunities for women at dozens of colleges.

My praises to the Women's World Cup President Marla Messing, and World Cup Chair Donna de Verona, who had the vision and the dedication to focus the attention of a whole Nation on the Women's World Cup Championship. No longer is it an insult to tell someone, ''You play like a girl.'' Now, indeed, it is a compliment.

Like the passage of Title IX in 1972, the 1999 Women's World Cup Championship will go down in history as the milestone, the turning point in elevating women's sports to the gold medal platform where it belongs.

I urge the House to vote unanimously for this resolution.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), one of the many world cup women we have in the House who is truly a role model for the world, just as these young ladies are with regard to the soccer world.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for yielding me this time and for his work on this resolution, as well as my colleagues who are cosponsors of this resolution. I cannot think of a time coming to this floor since I was elected to the House that I skipped over with glee to come to the floor to salute the women of this championship team.

I am not really someone that can give my colleagues very many statistics about sports, and I think that that was shaped from my childhood because we were really not encouraged to be participants on the playing field of sports. My father taught me how to swim very well and also how to water ski, but when it came to the other sports, we were not encouraged; the teams were not there in the schools that we went to. But this weekend that all changed when billions of people around the world were glued to their TV sets to watch the American team do something that really raised up the whole issue of women in sports and how we can compete and be world champions.

Our American flag that is behind you, Mr. Speaker, was carried throughout the stands in the Rose Bowl in California, my home State, and I think that the message that went around the world is that America can compete; that we all have a share in the opportunity in this country, which is really what the idea of America is all about.

So I salute each woman that brought this victory home, to each of them that wove together this exceptional team, and I say bravo, bravo, bravo, and especially as a woman Member of the Congress of the United States I could not be prouder of them. They have made history, they have raised up the hopes and the aspirations of every girl and young woman in our Nation and sent out the message around the world that America is a can-do country and that women indeed are part of the championship of this idea of America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON), another one of our world cup legislators.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I thank him for his leadership and the leadership of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) as well for this timely and wonderful resolution.

I want to say up front, though, that now that we have our own women's world cup team, which has found a home in the hearts of their countrymen and countrywomen, that I hope, as the Member who represents the Nation's Capitol that women will find a home right here for a team from the yet-to-come but sure-to-come women's soccer league. We have in this town a men's soccer league championship team, D.C. United, which has won back-to-back championships. All we need now is a women's team to match our male champions.

I am awfully proud of the Congress' well, because the Congress had a lot to do with the victory that was achieved last week. Congress helped bring this victory when more than 25 years ago, we passed Title IX. Thus Congress was on the field when Briana Scurry, the goalie, blocked the Chinese penalty kick to set up Brandi Chastain, who of course, did the winning kick. When 90,000 people in the Rose Bowl cheered, they were also cheering for what Congress did when it enacted Title IX.

Title IX, each of these women has said when interviewed, made them the best in the world, because Title IX gave them the opportunity that bore fruit on the soccer field this past week. Title IX has done the same for women's basketball, and Title IX is doing the same for women's sports all across this land where women and girls have discovered that sports is for them, too.

Let the victory on the soccer field settle the controversy over the division of funds by colleges and universities between men and women's teams. Equality on the field.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia talked about opening the doors and what Title 9 has done, is one who is constantly doing everything in her power to open doors for all people.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for yielding me this time, and I rise in wholehearted enthusiastic support of this bipartisan resolution, House Resolution 244, congratulating our U.S. Women's Soccer Team.

I am doing so today on behalf of the young women in my district in Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties, girls for whom soccer is more than a sport, it is a passion; soccer and all of the other sports that are claiming increasing amounts of their time and enthusiasm. This is undeniably due to Title 9 and the fundamental principle that all programs deserve equal funding, and I thank those in this House that were instrumental in passing that landmark initiative.

I also commend this U.S. Women's Soccer Team for their extraordinary hard work and determination and their enthusiasm, which was so contagious. It was beautiful to watch them play. Not only did they give us the incredibly entertaining and most attended women's sports event in history, they are also now giving to young women all over the country remarkable role models to look up to.

Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the chairs of the Women's Caucus, I recently invited the Women's Soccer Team to celebrate their success on Capitol Hill. We look forward to welcoming these American heroines to the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds 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. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and I congratulate all the ladies and offer my great congratulations to the soccer team. When women play, women win; and thank God for Title IX.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the looks on the faces of the little girls looking up with hero worship to the women's soccer players made an awful lot of struggles that we have gone through worthwhile. When Title IX was first written and passed in the Congress, there was a great furor about it. The idea of making athletics open to women was almost anathema. We have seen now what a wonderful opportunity we have given; that girls in school know that they too can achieve in sports and that they too can be part of that wonderful experience.

It helps us to reduce the inequality and the differences in Americans and says to everybody, ''You too can be a winner.''

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has 6¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment first of all to thank Leah Phillips, one of our interns who was very helpful to us, who also happens to play soccer at Mary Washington College, and I want to thank her for all her efforts and our entire staff for what they have done with regard to this very, very important resolution.

I want to send a message out to our U.S. Women's Soccer Team. We want you to understand, soccer team, that you have made us very, very proud. The fact that you took advantage of an opportunity and turned it into something very, very, very significant is so important to all of us.

So often in the past women have not had the opportunities that you have had. So often when we stand on the floor of this House and we speak, and so often when we push the button, green or red, we do not know exactly what impact we are having. But when the House of Representatives of the United States of America, as our Members watched you, we were reminded that the things we do here today do affect your lives.

But understand that you have affected so many people. There were little girls sitting around television sets watching you, watching your every move, and they see you as role models. By not only were the little girls watching you, there were little boys, too, and they were watching and they were excited and they saw all of those fans in the stands. And now when they go back to their fields this evening and tomorrow evening and they play the soccer games, they will be reminded of the greatness that you have brought to their living rooms and to their lives.

So, to you, some may say that sports does not mean a lot. Well, I happen to differ in that opinion. Sports mean a lot. It means a lot when one takes the opportunity and gives their blood, sweat and tears and gives it everything they have to be the best that they can be. All of us, as Americans, are very, very proud of you. Not only are we proud of you, we are proud of all that you stand for, all that is good in America; for it was your efforts, it is what you did, that said not only to America but to the world that we are, indeed, the greatest.

It was something called Title IX that opened up so many, many doors. Going back to what I said a little earlier, we realize that you have the genetic ability, we realize that you have the will, but what you have been given is the opportunity to make a difference, and you have. And so we say, we are proud of you, we wish you Godspeed, and may God bless.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United States Women's Soccer Team for their spectacular efforts in the 1999 Women's World Cup. For the last 3 weeks the entire country has been consumed by soccer fever. Mr. Speaker, this is not only an achievement for the women on the team but an achievement for our Nation.

In a time when the most exciting part of the Superbowl seems to be watching to see the million-dollar commercials, this tournament was one of the most captivating athletic events of the year. Six hundred fifty thousand tickets were sold for the 32 matches and for the 90,000 spectators at the final game between the United States and China. They definitely got their money's worth.

After 90 minutes of regulation play and two 50-minute periods of sudden death overtime, the team moved to a penalty kick series where the U.S. women scored five goals to defeat China.

Mr. Speaker, this was the game of a lifetime. No one could imagine a more exciting end to this sensational run for these athletes. Many of these athletes have been playing soccer since they were 5 and 6 years old, and this achievement is the pinnacle of their athletic career. For the girls of this country, this event gave them the role models that they so often lack. But, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, this team and this championship season has given our Nation a great sense of pride.

I commend all the players on this 1999 Women's Soccer Team and all of those women and who inspired them to be the players that they are today.

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

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague across the aisle, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for his remarks and the remarks on that side of the aisle and all my esteemed colleagues on this side of the aisle.

I would especially like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for offering this resolution and giving me the opportunity to handle the resolution on the floor.

Looking back on my own childhood, really, the sports that we had were ballet and music lessons. So soccer is a relatively new sport for Americans but especially for American girls. Of my three daughters, only the youngest, Adrienne, had the opportunity to play soccer from kindergarten on through college.

As the assistant soccer coach for her team in the mid and late 1980s, I can well remember the excitement of the

girls and their parents when girls soccer first became a recognized team sport in our high school. That meant that Adrienne, just like my son Rody before her, would have the opportunity to play a sport that she loved throughout her years in school.

Thanks to the passage of Title IX in 1972, my daughter Adrienne, along with the women of Team USA and young women and young girls throughout America, has come to benefit from the opportunity enjoyed for so long by young men and boys throughout America. Title IX has enabled young women to participate in school sports, to learn the value of teamwork and competition, and to gain the self-confidence and skills that are so valuable in business and in other future careers.

Mr. Speaker, the women of Team USA have shown teamwork, dedication and a complete commitment to excellence in their field. They also showed a love for the sport and for those who will follow them. They are mentors, role models and an inspiration for all of us, regardless of age or gender.

Following their victory and visit to Disneyland on Sunday, the women of Team USA boarded a plane and flew east overnight, landing at Newark Airport at 4:30 in the morning. Here is how team member Brandy Chastain described their arrival. ''There were 10 little girls waiting in the airport,'' Chastain said. They were wearing World Cup and Soccer USA stuff. They were all so excited. They had slept there. They were jumping around and asking for autographs. We all obliged. They deserved it.''

Mr. Speaker, the women of Team USA deserve the recognition today. I urge my colleagues to show their support for this tremendous accomplishment by supporting the resolution of the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that the distinguished congresswoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) had a similar resolution and she worked very hard on that, and I just wanted to express the fact that she, too, is very concerned about this. It is very important to her. I want to thank my colleagues on the other side for the resolution.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, as a parent and former coach, I rise in strong support of this Resolution to celebrate the many contributions the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team has given to the American people.

These young women have illustrated the American spirit on a global stage. They have shown young and old alike that teamwork still works. They have also demonstrated that it's not always about winning, but how you perform on and off the field. These are all positive life lessons that everyone around the globe can take to heart—especially our children, the next generation of leaders.

As one who has worked for a long time to improve the athletic opportunities for women and men, I am particularly heartened to see the success of our World Cup Champions. We must be ever vigilant in our quest to open more doors so those who want to participate in extracurricular activities can do so. I have seen first-hand how sports and team play have molded young kids into future leaders. We need more of that in today's society.

In closing, congratulations to Coach Tony DiCicco, his assistants, and the U.S. National Women who brought home the World Cup. I would hope that as they make their way around the country on their well-deserved victory tour they'll make a stop in Washington so all Americans can celebrate their accomplishments through a National Pep Rally at the U.S. Capitol.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 244, congratulating the U.S. women's national soccer team for winning the 1999 Women's World Cup. Their achievement is something in which all Americans can take pride.

On July 10, the U.S. women's national soccer team played the Chinese national women's soccer team to a scoreless draw after 90 minutes of regulation and 30 minutes of overtime. The match pitted two extremely well-balanced and talented teams against each other and while both teams' defenses held the other scoreless, all spectators were treated to a fast-paced and exciting match.

The success of the U.S. team is the clear result of Title IX, the 1972 law banning sex discrimination in schools, including discrimination in athletics. All of the players on the U.S. team are the children of Title IX and now all Americans can enjoy their success and the success of that landmark legislation.

I am proud to live in a country that has given women the ability to play in an event that has become the most successful women's sporting event in history. Over 90,000 fans attended the final, the largest attendance ever for a women's sporting event and the game received a 13.3 rating, a national record for a soccer match. In addition, the nearly month-long event sold over 650,000 tickets, far exceeding organizer's initial expectations.

As one of the host cities, San Francisco and its citizens participated in the excitement surrounding the 1999 Women's World Cup. I join the citizens of San Francisco in congratulating the U.S. women's national soccer team on attaining their second World Cup and wish them success in the Sydney Olympics in 2000.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month few people knew that the United States had a Women's World Cup Soccer team but today there is talk of starting a professional women's soccer league. The women's world cup tournament, a one month long tournament that features the sixteen strongest teams in the world, has created a sort of ''soccer frenzy.'' All of the credit for starting this new craze should be given to the women of the United States World Cup team. Girls, boys, men and women alike tuned in to watch the games of this tournament. People who had never before this tournament watched a soccer game in its entirety are now caught up in the craze.

This past Saturday these women played their hearts out to beat the National team of China. They never gave up and they worked—literally for Michelle Akers—to the point of exhaustion. They are heroes for millions of people not only because of their raw talent, but also because of their dedication and inspirational attitudes. They played for themselves, for the sport, and for everyone who supported them throughout the tournament.

I don't need to prove to you how likable these women are, how enjoyable they are to watch, or how successful they have been. Their numbers are the proof.

An overwhelming 90,000 fans attended their final game at the Rose Bowl in Pasadena this past Saturday and that 90,000 does not even come close to including the millions of people who tuned in to watch from around the world.

The women's national team, coached by Tony Dicicco, worked together in a way that should be inspiring for us all. Not only did they work together but they played together and celebrated together. They have displayed an amazing dedication to their fellow teammates and to their country that has made us all proud.

I fully support the passage of this resolution that is meant to honor these women for their hard work and dedication.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, Brandi Chastain of my hometown of San Jose, California did the nation proud on Saturday when she scored the final goal to win the World Cup for her team, country, and women everywhere.

When the game came down to the high-pressure penalty goal finale, Brandi stood before a crowd of 90,000, and without hesitation or even looking into the eyes of her only opponent, Chinese goalie Gao, pounded the soccer ball into the net and victory.

Brandi did for young women what Michael Jordan, Willie Mays, and Steve Young did for young men: She gave them a role model.

Brandi, a native of San Jose, has played for the U.S. National team since 1988. She announced her presence in 1991 with five goals in one game against Mexico. But this was no surprise to people at home who had seen her lead her high school, Archbishop Middy, to three straight state championships. She went on to be named All-American while playing for my alma mater Santa Clara University leading the Broncos to two final four appearances. Now she gives back to her sport as an assistant coach at Santa Clara University.

Brandi is a heroine, not only to the soccer players and fans in San Jose, but also to women throughout the world. She, along with her teammates, tirelessly fought to attain their goal of winning the World Cup. They prove that women can achieve the same high level of athleticism as their male counterparts. Most importantly, they showed that teamwork and dedication can make an entire country proud.

It is a great honor to stand up and commend Brandi Chastain and her teammates today for the hope and joy they have given young girls everywhere.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States Women's Soccer Team deserves our nation's highest congratulations on their success in the World Cup. In particular, I would like to praise Briana Scurry, the goalkeeper for the team. Originally from Dayton, Minnesota, Ms. Scurry graduated from Anoka High School in my district in 1990. It was her speed and agility that allowed her to block the critical Chinese penalty kick and secure a victory for the U.S. team. Perhaps it is no surprise, then, that

her teammates refer to her as ''The Rock''. Anoka High School, the State of Minnesota and the entire Nation are very proud of Ms. Scurry and all of the U.S. Women's Soccer Team. They are wonderful role models for the girls and women of America and the world. They have contributed immensely to women's sports, and we owe them a debt of gratitude.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 241 and offer my hearty congratulations to the United States Women's Soccer Team. Their perseverance and grace on the field was a testament to the spirit of the American women. The crowd they drew to the Rose Bowl—more than 90,000 people, the largest ever to watch a women's sporting event—shows how far women's professional sports have come.

Among that crowd and in the vast international television audience were thousands of young girls, who play in local soccer leagues and on school teams. The U.S. Women's Team could not have provided better role models and I commend them for the contribution they have made to those young lives.

I hope these ladies will accept our invitation, so that we may give them our thanks in-person.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the U.S. Women's Soccer Team. Once again, they have proven to be the world's best by winning the 1999 Women's World Cup tournament.

Last Saturday, 90,185 spectators in the Rose Bowl and millions of Americans via-television watched the U.S. women's soccer team defeat the People's Republic of China to earn the Women's World Cup title. Their victory has captured the hearts of our nation and helped raise awareness of women's sports nationwide. As role models to millions of young women across America, the U.S. Women's Soccer Team members stress teamwork and commitment and are true American sports heroes.

I want to personally congratulate my 51st District constituent, Shannon MacMillan of Escondido, Calif. Shannon plays forward and has been an integral part of the winning U.S. team. Her career highlights, which I have attached below, reminds us of her many accomplishments with the U.S. National team and her heroics in the 1996 Olympics.

To Shannon and all of the women of the 1999 Women's World Cup championship team, I say congratulations for a job well done.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS OF SHANNON ANN MAC MILLAN

U.S. SOCCER FEDERATION

U.S. Team: A member of the U.S. gold medal winning team at both the 1998 Goodwill Games and 1996 Olympics * * *

Led the Olympic Team with three goals in their five matches, including the match-winners against Sweden and Norway * * *

Her ''Golden Goal'' against Norway was one of the most important in U.S. Soccer history, putting the USA into the Olympic final and avenging the loss at the 1995 FIFA Women's World Cup * * *

Appeared on the cover of Sport Illustrated's daily Olympic issue after her goal against Norway * * *

Originally left off the roster for residential training camp leading up to the Olympics, she battled her way back onto the team and into the starting lineup * * *

The youngest member of the U.S. Women's National Team that won the silver medal at the 1993 World University Games in Buffalo, N.Y., where she made her debut with the U.S. team * * *

Member of the U.S. Women's Under-20 National Team from 1993–94, winning the International Women's Tournament in Montricoux, France in 1993.

College: Winner of the 1995 Missouri Athletic Club Award and the 1995 Hermann Award as college soccer's top player * * *

The 1995 Soccer America Player of the Year * * *

Won the 1995 Bill Hayward Award as Oregon's Top Female Amateur Athlete * * *

Finalist for the MAC Award and Hermann Trophy in 1993–94 * * *

All four-time All-American, All-Far West Region First Team and West Coast Conference selection from 1992–95 at the University of Portland * * *

Second on the team in goals scored with 22 in 1994 behind U.S. teammate Tiffeny Milbrett * * *

Missed four games in 1994 due to a broken bone in her left foot, had a pin inserted into the foot and returned to the starting line-up 13 days later * * *

The 1993 and 1995 University of Portland Female Athlete of the Year * * *

Completed her sophomore season in 1993 as the women's NCAA Division I scoring leader with 23 goals and 12 assists while starting all 21 games * * *

She finished her freshman year in 1992 as the highest scoring freshman in the nation and fourth leading scorer overall with 19 goals * * *

The WCC Freshman of the Year, she was Second-Team NSCAA All-American and was voted to Soccer America's All-Freshman Team.

Miscellaneous: Attended San Pasqual High School in Escondido, Calif., where she was a three-year letterwinner * * *

Named as the honorary captain of the San Diego Union-Tribune All-Academic team * * *

Played club soccer for La Jolla Nomads, which won the state club championship two consecutive years, 1991 and 1992, winning the Western Regionals in 1991 before going on to finish second at the national championships * * *

Played 1996 and '97 seasons in the Japanese women's professional league with Shiroki Serena alongside college and national team teammate Tiffeny Milbrett * * *

Majored in social work at Portland * * *

Currently an assistant women's soccer coach at Portland, helping the team to the NCAA Final Four in 1998, her first year on the bench.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a great victory not only for the U.S. Women's Soccer Team, which has just won its second World Cup, but for girls and women throughout our Nation.

The Women's World Cup finals, held this past Saturday, July 10, 1999, in Los Angeles, drew more than 90,000 spectators in the stands and some 40 million television viewers—the largest audience ever for a women-only sporting event!

The 20 members of the U.S. Women's Soccer Team have won passionate fans not just among the 2.5 million girls playing soccer in the United States but among all Americans. These healthy, strong, disciplined, and exciting athletes are wonderful role models for our nation's girls and young women, and I know they will inspire many more to experience the joy, benefits, and opportunities that sports bring. Participation in soccer by women and girls increased by almost 24 percent between 1987 and 1998—I predict that this percentage will rise significantly over the next year.

I send my aloha and heartfelt congratulations to each and every one of the team members. Michele Akers, Brandi Chastain, Joy Fawcett, Julie Foudy, Mia Hamm, Kristine Lilly, and Carla Overbeck deserve special mention as they are all veterans of the 1991 Women's World Cup victory—a victory that was largely overlooked by the media and public. This team also won a gold medal at the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta, where they were again virtually ignored by the media.

But all of that has changed. Women's soccer is here to stay and the number of players and fans will continue to grow. We can all look forward to seeing this championship team again at the 2000 Olympics in Sydney, where the media will no longer dare to ignore women's soccer.

This is also a victory for Congress and a testament for the power of this institution to change our nation for the better. Mia Hamm, one of women's soccer's brightest stars, was born in 1972—the same year Title IX became law. Without Title IX, she and many of the other team members who brought such pride to all Americans might never have had the opportunity to develop their talent for and love of the sport.

When Edith Green and I drafted the original language for Title IX some 28 years ago, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs receiving federal financial assistance, we dreamed that someday girls would enjoy equal access to academic and athletic opportunities in our schools. We are not there yet, but the achievements of and excitement generated by the U.S. Women's Soccer Team shows that we are on our way. No longer can anyone say that girls don't deserve equal opportunity in athletics because they don't have the interest or aptitude.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 244, to honor and congratulate our United States Women's Soccer Team. The hard work, strength, determination and talent exhibited by these women captures the American spirit. It is this type of spirit that inspires us all to never give up on our dreams. In a sport that is not traditionally an American strong suit, these women worked tirelessly to attain a dream and awoke to 90,000 cheering fans helping make that dream a reality.

As a Southern Californian, I am particularly pleased that the Pasadena Rose Bowl played host to the World Cup finals. I was also honored to have the U.S. women's team grace the field of Pomona-Pitzer College in my congressional district to practice their talents. These women demonstrated ''grace under fire'' and were ''class acts'' in their representation of the United States. They set an example that all U.S. teams and Americans should aspire to emulate. I look forward to cheering these women on in Sydney next summer as the United States defends its gold medal. I am confident that these women will, once again, make America proud.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs.

BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 244.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2465, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 242 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 242

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2465) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a 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 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee 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 on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 2465, the Fiscal Year 2000 Military Construction Appropriations Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2 of House rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, against provisions in the bill.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States' military is clearly the best in the world. The young men and women in our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are thoroughly dedicated and patriotic professionals, the best our Nation has to offer.

So how do we reward them? We pay them with wages so low that many military families are forced to eat with food stamps, and we lodge them in substandard World War II era housing.

These, among other reasons, are why we are losing good men and women who stop serving their country because the hardships on their families are so great. This is inexcusable, and Congress has been working hard to do something about it. This year we have passed a 4.8 percent military pay raise, and with this bill we will improve military housing.

H.R. 2465 provides $747 million for new housing construction and $2.8 billion for the operation and improvement of existing housing. The bill also provides $964 million for barracks and medical facilities for troops and their families.

Finally, because of an increase in two-income and single-parent families, the bill provides $21 million for child development centers.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 242 is an open rule for a good, noncontroversial bill. In addition to taking care of our military personnel, this bill is good for the environment. It includes $69 million for environmental compliance programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It will allow for consideration of H.R. 2465, which is a bill that makes appropriations for military construction worldwide.

As my colleague from North Carolina has explained, this rule will provide for debate to be controlled and directed and divided by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Appropriations. Under this rule, germane amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House.

All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer amendments. This bill funds a range of construction projects on military bases, including barracks, housing for military families, hospitals, training facilities, and other buildings that support the missions of our armed services. The bill also funds activities necessary to carry out the last two rounds of base closings and realignments.

Modern facilities are necessary to maintain our national defense. New buildings can increase efficiency and improve morale. The money spent in this bill is a long-term investment in our defense capabilities.

The bill contains $39 billion for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partially in my district and partially in the 7th District that is held by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Two of the Wright-Patterson projects funded in the bill are much-needed laboratories that will develop new technology for the weapons systems of the 21st century. The work in these buildings will continue a long tradition of military aviation research in the Miami Valley, Ohio, going back to the days of the Wright brothers.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking minority member, for their work in crafting the bill and bringing it to the floor.

The bill was approved by the Committee on Appropriations on a voice vote. It has support on both sides of the aisle. It is an open rule. It was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee on Rules.

I support the rule and the bill and urge its adoption.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in very strong support of this open rule, yet another open rule, from the Committee on Rules under the leadership of the

gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER).

While the Military Construction Appropriations Bill is obviously one of the least controversial bills this House takes up every year in appropriations, it is critically important for our men and women in uniform and their families.

Quality-of-life issues are always important for every American, but for these people in the military, these quality-of-life issues have become even more problematical in recent years because the Clinton administration has asked our troops to do much more with much less. In some cases, our troops and their families are simply not being properly provided for. This is no secret, but it is a shame, and it is time we did something about it.

I was, therefore, disappointed with the Clinton/Gore administration budget request for military construction. It is yet another example of the neglect of our Armed Forces under this administration at the same time the administration misuses those forces to bail out their misguided policies.

□ 1115

I am pleased that the bill before us corrects several shortcomings in the administration's request. For example, it provides $1.6 billion more than the administration's request for military construction and a half billion more than the administration's request for family housing. That is, the spouses and children. I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its work and encourage my colleagues to support this rule, another fair, open rule and a good appropriations bill.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2466, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 243

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 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 or 401 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 37, line 23, through the closing quotation mark on page 38, line 13; beginning with ''*Provided*'' on page 59, line 13, through 22; beginning with ''and such new'' on page 76, line 16, through 22; and page 80, line 11, through ''funding agreements'' on line 23. Where points 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 such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against that amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a 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 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee 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 on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 243 would grant H.R. 2466, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2000, an open rule waiving points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with sections 306 or 401 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, against provisions in the bill except as otherwise specified in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also makes in order the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report.

The rule further waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation, against amendments offered during consideration of the bill.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It also allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2466 would provide regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior and for other related agencies, including the Forest Service, the Department of Energy, the Indian Health Service, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities.

The Subcommittee on Interior was originally allocated $11.3 billion, a 19 percent decrease in funding from last year. Last week, the subcommittee received a $2.7 billion increase in funding over this mark made possible by selling the electromagnetic spectrum sooner than was expected.

The bill provides $14.1 billion in budgetary authority for fiscal year 2000, $200 million below last year's level and $1.1 billion below the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, every year millions of Americans enjoy the world renowned parks, forests, wildlife refuges and other facilities funded in this bill. In addition, H.R. 2466 would do much to enhance, develop and protect our Nation's abundant natural resources in an environmentally responsible way and do so while staying within the overall discretionary spending caps.

The Committee on Rules was pleased to grant the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for an open rule which will make it possible for Members seeking to improve this bill the fullest opportunity to offer their amendments during House consideration of H.R. 2466. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support both H. Res. 243 and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule providing for consideration of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. This bill helps the people of this Nation and the world to enjoy some of the most spectacular natural beauty that Mother Nature has to offer. It also helps us to be wise stewards of those natural resources. The bill also provides important assistance for Native Americans in health care and education. And the bill funds two of the most valuable and unusual Federal agencies that produce revenue for the United States instead of just taking it and have been proven to enhance and improve education and the SAT scores for students. We know now that any child who studies art for 4 years in high school, that their SAT scores go up around 59 points. That is cheap at the price, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts. As the chairwoman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I have spent a great deal of time and effort encouraging my colleagues to adequately fund these important agencies which give us back so much.

The arts and humanities tell us who we were and who we are and who we hope to be. They help us to understand an increasingly complex world and help our children and youth express their hopes and dreams through creative expression. Most importantly, they get our youth ready for what we want, the smartest and brightest students in the next century. Exposure to modern dance increases their math scores, and the way to best learn about computers is to learn to play piano. These are not wild notions but are well-proven facts. I expect to offer an amendment to help these important agencies continue their vital mission, bringing artistic expression and an understanding of the human condition to the villages and cities and nooks and crannies of this Nation from sea to shining sea, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington for his typical superb job in managing this rule. It is a very fair, balanced and open rule. It is nice to see that, because as my good friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) knows, in years past we have had slightly controversial rules as we have dealt with this very important Interior appropriations bill.

I want to say that every year, millions of Americans and foreign tourists as well come and enjoy our renowned park system. In my important talking points here, the Florida Everglades are mentioned out of respect to my friend from Sanibel, FL (Mr. GOSS) the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. And also the Angeles National Forest which according to the gentleman from Ohio is in fact the most utilized of our National Forest Service system. That is why this bill itself is very, very important.

One of the other things that I think we need to touch on that is key is the focus on dealing with fires which has been a real issue for us in the Angeles National Forest. Obviously the funding that has been placed into this bill by the gentleman from Ohio is going to be helpful in dealing with that.

I want to raise one other issue that I discussed with the gentleman from Ohio when he testified yesterday afternoon before the Committee on Rules. That has to do with the issue of the adventure pass. There has been a lot of concern raised in the San Gabriel Valley in eastern Los Angeles County about the adventure pass. As the gentleman from Ohio appropriately pointed out yesterday, it is a pilot program that is under way right now. But the concern that has been raised by a number of my constituents has been the fact that they have not yet been able to see tangible evidence that the resources that have come in from the use of that adventure pass have in fact gone towards improvement or dealing with the Angeles National Forest itself. And so I want to take a very close look at this program. We know that it is well-intentioned and the idea of having a user fee rather than taxing people who do not in any way utilize some kind of service is again laudable but we want to make sure that that fee that is there in fact does go to address the needs of those who are in fact paying for that pass. And so I want to see us move ahead.

There are a number of, I think, very important questions that need to be raised, but I do want to congratulate again the gentleman from Ohio and all of our colleagues who have worked long and hard on this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and to alert my colleagues to an amendment that I will be offering later today. Along with the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), I will be proposing to provide a very modest $30 million to the stateside program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The stateside program has broad bipartisan support but unfortunately it receives no funding under the Interior appropriations bill before us today. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Governors Association, and regional governors associations from across the country support stateside funding.

In addition, groups as wide ranging as the National Association of Realtors and the Wilderness Society are strongly supporting our amendment. The League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club and the Appalachian Mountain Club have expressed their strong support. The time to act is now. We have an opportunity to make a very clear statement in this House today that States and local communities deserve the land and water conservation funding that they are owed. They deserve the support of this Congress.

□ 1130

As my colleagues know, there has been a lot of talk on both sides of the aisle about livable communities and ways to protect open space for future generations. Today Members of Congress will have the opportunity to put those words into action. I look forward to the debate on this issue when we consider the bill, and again I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for having yielded this time to me, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the Land and Water Conservation Fund amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues that even though we are $200 million under the enacted number for fiscal year 1999, we are adding 99 million additional dollars over last year for the parks, $200 million for Indian education and health programs, $205 million for high priority land acquisition, $33 million for national wildlife refuges, $114 million for Everglade restoration, and we have tried hard to have a bill that is balanced, it is nonpartisan, it is fair, and it recognizes the fact that the public lands, which are about 30 percent of the United States that we provide the funding in this bill, are being dealt with in a responsible way.

In light of the comments by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I

thought it was interesting: Our subcommittee visited last week Olympic National Forest and park areas, and they have signs up for the various projects. It said, this project up on the Hurricane Ridge where they are redoing the center for the visitors, ''This project being financed by your fees,'' and I think it is a very good way to tell the story of how the fees are being used, which was our intent to enhance the visitors' experience. And I thought it was also interesting that they had a little can there that people can put in some extra money, and it was getting filled up also. So it says the people, in addition to paying fees, are so happy with what is being done that they wanted to contribute some additional money.

The other subject that he mentioned, and appropriately so, was the fire issue. We have $561 million in here for wildfire fighting. But I think a program we have innovated that I like, and that is we get the local fire departments, the adjacent cities and villages to participate by providing a training program, $29 million to train these local firefighters how to deal with forest fires, and they can be on call to provide assistance, if necessary, to the firefighters that are part of the agency itself. It is working out very well. And, of course, it is important because fires in a forest or a park for that matter can spread beyond the borders. We have seen that a lot in California. And by getting the local fire fighting agencies as part of a cooperative agreement we really maximize the forces and the ability to deal with what is a serious threat, and it enables the agencies to not commit quite as much of their funds.

So, on balance, I hope my colleagues will look at the issues in this bill and judge it for what it is, which is a very good bill, very responsible and very fair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my able friend from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, who does such a good job with yet another fair and open rule. The interior appropriations bill is an important bill, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) just said. It provides funding for the agencies involved in protecting our national resources for future generations for our children, as it were.

I am pleased that even though this bill frugally spends several billion less than last year it still provides adequate funding for the national parks, national forest system and the national wildlife refuges, which is the purpose of it. The Interior bill is especially important for my home State of Florida, which is why I take this time. It is the vehicle for the crucial Everglades restoration funds to meet the Federal commitment of our ongoing effort to restore and preserve for future generations the unique River of Grass we know and love.

The bill provides $114 million for the Everglades, which includes land acquisition, improved water delivery and Everglades park management. Under the leadership of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the House has consistently led the charge on restoring the Everglades, and I am proud of that, and this year is no different.

I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his attention to this unique national treasure and his personal visits to the area to understand it, and I note the irony that almost as we are speaking today President Clinton is in Florida at a very exclusive high roller fund-raising event that is held by one of the special interest groups that has not been enthusiastic about our efforts to deal with the Everglades, as we propose to do in this legislation.

So this bill comes at a very good time.

Also, vital to Florida's economy and our national commitment to wise stewardship of natural resources is the annual outer continental shelf oil and gas exploration moratorium, which protects our fragile coastline. Again, Florida takes great pride in its coastline, and we are very concerned about oil slicks and pollution. Each year for the last 13 years Congress has passed this moratorium. I am very pleased that this year's bill continues that effort.

And I must note the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), started this process many years ago, and it has been ably picked up by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). We believe this is a good temporary solution, but we think we can find a more precise and permanent solution to the question of oil drilling off Florida's coast.

I have introduced H.R. 33 which would create a Federal State task force to review the relevant scientific and environmental data and then make a recommendation to the Secretary of Interior for permanent policy. I believe this approach offers a number of benefits, including making Florida a key player in the decision that will have great impact on our State, relying on scientific data rather than rhetoric and affording us the opportunity to institute a more precise policy than our current moratorium year to year.

The House Committee on Resources is scheduled to have a hearing on this bill the first week in August, and I remain hopeful we can move forward on this critically important issue to our State. Of course, there are some issues in the Interior bill that remain controversial, and that will certainly be the subject of some debate later this afternoon.

I look forward to the opportunity to resolve some of those controversies and move forward on this important legislation. I applaud the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and Members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work at this point.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and just wanted to reemphasize on the Everglades that we have put a condition in here to ensure that in the long haul that the water will be available to protect the Everglades because that is the primary responsibility of the American taxpayer, and the reason they are going to spend 7 to $10 billion of taxpayers' money from all across the country is to ensure the protection of the Everglades, and we tried do that with the language in the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, part of my applause for the chairman's efforts is his understanding of all the intricate issues and complexities that are involved. I think he has handled them well. I congratulate him on that, and I know that under his leadership we are going to keep this on course.

I urge support of the rule, and I urge support of the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise support of this rule, and I wish to particularly commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my good friend, the Subcommittee on Interior chairman, as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member. These gentleman have had to wrestle hard with severe caps and meeting their responsibilities; and to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) in particular I say I am indebted to him on behalf of the coalfield residents throughout this country for the $11 million increase in Abandoned Mine Land funding.

And I also want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that many of us appreciate his support for the Heritage Area program, citizens working together from the grassroots to celebrate and promote their heritage. I am indebted to the gentleman from Ohio for funding this worthy program as well.

In conclusion, I like to draw attention to three amendments that will be offered to the bill today. One seeks to strike the funding limitation it carries for the American Heritage Rivers program. One of these heritage rivers flows through my congressional district, the New River. I cannot tell my colleagues how much excitement this designation has generated from local

citizens, community leaders and chambers of commerce. I urge support of this amendment.

Another amendment to be offered by myself, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) seeks to maintain some semblance of sanity in the mining law program. It is my hope that perhaps the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will be kind to us when this amendment is offered.

And the third amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and myself and a cast of thousands seeks to bolster funding for the low income weatherization program. This is so critically important to so many people who are struggling to improve their lot in our society. I urge adoption of the rule, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1434

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1691, RELIGIOUS LIBERTY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–229) on the resolution (H. Res. 245) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1691) to protect religious liberty, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 2465) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 242 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2465.

□ 1435

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2465) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman in Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present the House recommendation for the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000.

Let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), my ranking member, and all the members of our subcommittee for their assistance and interest in putting together this year's bill.

The bill presented to the House today totals $8.5 billion, the same as last year's enacted level, and it is $141 million below this year's House passed authorization bill.

The bill is within the 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays, and it is in contrast to the administration's split funding budget request, which proposed spreading $8.6 billion over two fiscal years.

Considering the budget constraints we worked under, the recommendations before the House are solid and fully fund priority projects for the services and our troops.

Within the $8.5 billion provided, we have been able to address the true needs of our troops by supporting projects that improve their quality of life as they serve to protect our country. These priorities include $800 million for troop housing, $21 million for child development centers, $165 million for hospital and medical facilities, $69 million for environmental compliance, $747 million for new family housing units and for improvements to existing units, and $2.8 billion for operation and maintenance of existing family housing units. We believe that these priorities reflect the need to provide our military with quality housing, health care, and work facilities.

Also, by targeting adequate resources for new child development centers, we are recognizing the changing makeup of our military force, with the rising number of single military parents and military personnel with working spouses.

If we want to keep top-notch people in our military, then we have a reasonable obligation to meet the needs of our troops.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and all the members of our subcommittee for their hard work and effort on this bill.

In closing, I want to point out that we have put together an $8.5 billion MILCON bill that is 3 percent of the total defense budget and equal to last year's enacted level. Most importantly, this $8.5 billion directly supports the men and women in our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following material for the RECORD:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2465)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Military construction, Army	865,726	656,003	1,223,405	+357,679	+567,402
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	118,000			-118,000	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		659,536			-659,536
Total	983,726	1,315,539	1,223,405	+239,679	-92,134
Military construction, Navy	602,593	319,786	968,862	+366,269	+649,076
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	5,860			-5,860	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		502,812			-502,812
Total	608,453	822,598	968,862	+360,409	+146,264
Military construction, Air Force	612,809	179,479	752,367	+139,558	+572,888
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	29,200			-29,200	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		379,867			-379,867
Total	642,009	559,346	752,367	+110,358	+193,021
Military construction, Defense-wide	551,114	193,005	755,718	+204,604	+562,713
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		337,900			-337,900
Total	551,114	530,905	755,718	+204,604	+224,813
Total, Active components	2,785,302	3,228,388	3,700,352	+915,050	+471,964
Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund:					
Rescission (FY 1997, P.L. 104-196)	-5,000			+5,000	
Military construction, Army National Guard	148,803	16,045	135,129	-13,674	+119,084
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	2,500			-2,500	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		41,357			-41,357
Total	151,303	57,402	135,129	-16,174	+77,727
Military construction, Air National Guard	169,801	21,319	180,870	+11,069	+159,551
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	15,900			-15,900	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		51,981			-51,981
Total	185,701	73,300	180,870	-4,831	+107,570
Military construction, Army Reserve	102,119	23,120	92,515	-9,604	+69,395
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		54,506			-54,506
Total	102,119	77,626	92,515	-9,604	+14,889
Military construction, Naval Reserve	31,621	4,933	21,574	-10,047	+16,641
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		10,020			-10,020
Total	31,621	14,953	21,574	-10,047	+6,621
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	34,371	12,155	66,549	+32,178	+54,394
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		15,165			-15,165
Total	34,371	27,320	66,549	+32,178	+39,229
Total, Reserve components	505,115	250,601	496,637	-8,478	+246,036
Military contruction transfer fund (emergency appropriations) (P.L. 106-31)	475,000			-475,000	
Total, Military construction	3,760,417	3,478,989	4,196,989	+436,572	+718,000
Appropriations	(3,118,957)	(1,425,845)	(4,196,989)	(+1,078,032)	(+2,771,144)
Rescissions	(-5,000)			(+5,000)	
Emergency appropriations	(646,460)			(-646,460)	
Advance appropriations		(2,053,144)			(-2,053,144)
NATO Security Investment Program	155,000	191,000	81,000	-74,000	-110,000
Revised economic assumptions	-1,000			+1,000	
Total, NATO	154,000	191,000	81,000	-73,000	-110,000
Family housing, Army:					
New construction	107,100	4,400	49,500	-57,600	+45,100
Construction improvements	48,479	5,303	35,400	-13,079	+30,097
Planning and design	6,350	4,300	4,300	-2,050	
General reduction	-2,639			+2,639	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		43,991			-43,991
Subtotal, construction	159,290	57,994	89,200	-70,090	+31,206
Operation and maintenance	1,087,697	1,098,080	1,089,812	+2,115	-8,268
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	5,200			-5,200	
Total, Family housing, Army	1,252,187	1,156,074	1,179,012	-73,175	+22,938
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
New construction	58,504	15,182	118,174	+59,670	+102,992
Construction improvements	227,791	31,708	176,670	-51,121	+144,962
Planning and design	15,618	17,715	17,715	+2,097	
General reduction and revised economic assumptions	-7,323			+7,323	
Advance appropriations, FY 2001		171,167			-171,167
Subtotal, construction	294,590	235,772	312,559	+17,969	+76,787
Operation and maintenance	910,293	895,070	895,070	-15,223	
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	10,599			-10,599	
Total, Family housing, Navy	1,215,482	1,130,842	1,207,629	-7,853	+76,787

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2465)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Family housing, Air Force:					
New construction	175,099	50,418	203,411	+28,312	+152,993
Construction improvements	104,108	34,280	124,492	+20,384	+90,212
Planning and design	11,342	17,093	17,093	+5,751	.....
General reduction and revised economic assumptions	-10,584	.....	.....	+10,584	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	215,222	.....	.....	-215,222
Subtotal, construction	279,965	317,013	344,996	+65,031	+27,983
Operation and maintenance	780,204	821,892	821,892	+41,688	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	22,233	.....	.....	-22,233	.....
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,082,402	1,138,905	1,166,888	+84,486	+27,983
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction improvements	345	50	50	-295	.....
Operation and maintenance	36,899	41,440	41,440	+4,541	.....
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide	37,244	41,490	41,490	+4,246	.....
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,000	78,756	2,000	.....	-76,756
Total, Family housing	3,589,315	3,546,067	3,597,019	+7,704	+50,952
New construction	(340,703)	(70,000)	(371,085)	(+30,382)	(+301,085)
Construction improvements	(380,723)	(71,341)	(336,612)	(-44,111)	(+265,271)
Planning and design	(33,310)	(39,108)	(39,108)	(+5,798)	.....
General reduction	(-20,546)	.....	.....	(+20,546)	.....
Operation and maintenance	(2,815,093)	(2,856,482)	(2,848,214)	(+33,121)	(-8,268)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	(2,000)	(78,756)	(2,000)	.....	(-76,756)
Emergency appropriations	(38,032)	.....	.....	(-38,032)	.....
Advance appropriations	.....	(430,380)	.....	.....	(-430,380)
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part III	427,164	.....	.....	-427,164	.....
Part IV	1,197,338	705,911	705,911	-491,427	.....
Advance appropriations, FY 2001	.....	577,306	.....	.....	-577,306
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	1,624,502	1,283,217	705,911	-918,591	-577,306
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (FY99 Sec. 125)	6,000	.....	.....	-6,000	.....
General Provisions					
Contingency reduction (sec. 125)	.....	.....	-131,177	-131,177	-131,177
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	9,134,234	8,499,273	8,449,742	-684,492	-49,531
Appropriations	(8,454,742)	(5,438,443)	(8,449,742)	(-5,000)	(+3,011,299)
Rescissions	(-5,000)	.....	.....	(+5,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(684,492)	.....	.....	(-684,492)	.....
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,060,830)	.....	.....	(-3,060,830)

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) has put a great deal of effort and leadership into this bill, and I thank him.

I have also come to appreciate the tremendous job of the staff on both sides for the majority and the minority, the tremendous job and the hours that they put in as a staff, and I want to thank them, as well, but particularly our clerk on the majority side, Liz Dawson, and her assistants, and on the minority side Tom Forhan for the minority side of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. It has not been easy balancing the dollars available against the priority needs for the men and women who serve our Nation, and they have served this subcommittee and this Congress as a total well in their effort.

This is a good bill and deserves our support. The military construction bill serves as the guardian of the quality of life of men and women who serve America in the military and their families whose lives are caught up in their breadwinners' service to the country.

This bill provides $8.5 billion to address some of the most pressing needs for better workplaces and housing for these men and women in uniform. I wish that we could do more. We have a huge backlog with respect to operational and training facilities, the barracks for the single military personnel, the family housing, the daycare centers, the health facilities. But we find ourselves at the same spending level as last year; in other words, a frozen budget at exactly the same level as the previous year. Still, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) has done an excellent and fair-minded job.

In the area of housing, for instance, we all agree that our military families deserve decent housing. The President's budget request put a lot of reliance on the recent family housing privatization program, but that pilot program has had significant problems. Some people see privatization as a quick fix to address the unmet need for quality housing. But there have been false starts, and it is not at all clear that all the specific privatization proposals make long-term fiscal and budgetary sense for us.

In the short term, these problems with the privatization program have held up money appropriated for housing; and the delays have really hurt the families that the program is supposed to help. The chairman very deliberately tackled these problems head-on, and I am happy that several projects are now going forward while we take a harder look at the whole program.

At the same time, the bill before us here today also includes traditional MILCON housing and I believe keeps the housing program appropriately balanced, as it needs to be.

Let me conclude by simply saying that this is a solid bipartisan bill that deserves full support of the members of the committee as a whole and the Congress as a whole.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill that has been brought by the chairman and ranking member. I want to commend them for the great work that they have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by applauding the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Military Construction Subcommittee for what they have done to ensure our military personnel live and work in safe and quality facilities. H.R. 2465 provides $4.2 billion for military construction projects and $3.6 million for family housing. This is $3 billion more than the President had requested. I want to commend the Chairman for his tremendous efforts.

I also want to highlight an issue of great importance to Lancaster—a major city in my district—and the military personnel in the state of California. In the last five years the California National Guard has lost the leases on five armories in the Los Angeles basin. This has led to severe overcrowding at the remaining armories. After examining 38 sites, the California National Guard chose the Antelope Valley Fairgrounds in the city of Lancaster as the site for a new armory.

Congress directed the Secretary of the Army to submit a plan and schedule for the consolidation and replacement of existing armories by January 15, 1999. In order to meet this schedule, the design and construction of the armory must take place in FY 2000. The City of Lancaster recently learned that it secured $1 million in state funds for this project, and now it needs the federal matching funds of $500,000 in FY 2000 and $2.5 million in FY 2001 to ensure that the project is kept within the time frame of the consolidation plan.

I would be extremely grateful if the Subcommittee would work with me to ensure this project can be completed on time.

Once again, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his efforts in drafting this important piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who is a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I primarily want to rise to congratulate the leadership of this committee and the professional staff for putting together a quality product.

If I have any disappointment in this bill, it is simply that the American people will see nothing of this debate and will not hear about this process on the evening news. Because it seems that, with the national press, if it is not conflict, it is simply not news. Well, my message to the American people is, if they watch this military construction appropriations process, this is the way government should work.

The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking minority member, have put the interest of our military families, the interest of a strong national defense, the interest of our Nation above the interest of any partisanship. Because of that, there will not be great debate on this floor and, consequently, many Americans will not know about the quality product. But, most importantly, the people who will find out about it, the men and women who are willing to put their lives on the line defending our country in uniform, in combat, they will be the winners from this legislation.

I think it is especially interesting to note, if we look at the supplemental appropriations legislation that passed this House several months ago, along with this legislation, the end product is that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) working together have helped renew a real commitment for quality-of-life programs for our military families both here and abroad.

□ 1445

I want to once again commend them for taking an interest in an issue that does not have any political payoff back home or in their districts, the interest of providing better quality housing for our men and women serving in uniform overseas.

I think the important message to come out of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that wars are not won by technology alone. That is an important message that we must remind ourselves and the American people. To win them, wars require quality, well-motivated people. When we consider the number of people in our military that are married today, these quality of life issues, while they may not have defense subcontractor lobbyists from 40 States lobbying in their behalf, are at the heart and soul of our building and strengthening our national defense structure in America. The credit for that goes to the chairman and the ranking member and the professional staff for the great work they have done. I commend them for their work. I just wish the American people could turn on the television tonight and see Congress working on a bipartisan basis putting the interest of our country ahead of partisanship. Congratulations.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I could stand here and talk to my colleagues about the numbers that are included in

this bill. But instead I want to tell them about that mother of three who will be able to come home to an apartment where the appliances work. She was in an apartment that was too expensive, it was drafty, it was not safe for her kids to play, but now she can come home to an apartment where they are safe.

I want to tell them about that Marine corporal, Corporal Mollet, who is stationed in Iceland. Even though in the winter months the daylight only shows for 45 or 50 minutes, he can come home to a warm apartment where he can now exercise and keep in top shape.

This bill is making life better for the young men and women that serve our country. That is why I would urge all of my colleagues to support it. It is fiscally responsible and it does the right thing.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this well crafted, balanced, and bipartisan bill. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is fiscally conservative yet comprehensive. My good friend, the Gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HOBSON, The Chairman of the Military Construction subcommittee, has authored a bill that adheres to the budget caps while adequately addressing the needs of our armed services.

Chairman HOBSON faced a daunting challenge in crafting this legislation. The Administration's budget request represented the lowest nominal request for military construction since 1981. The Administration instead made the unprecedented request to defer funding to future fiscal years through incremental, or forward funding of projects. Furthermore, the Administration requested no new family housing projects through traditional military construction, but rather asked for a vast expansion of the housing privatization pilot program without first examining the effect that this would have upon local school districts that rely upon Impact Aid funding.

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation fully funds all military construction projects and reallocates funds from the privatization pilot program to traditional military construction accounts. This would not have been possible without Chairman HOBSON's leadership. He has helped to create a strong, bipartisan bill in the face of numerous obstacles. I ask all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and would like to commend the work of both the chairman, Mr. HOBSON and the ranking member, Mr. OLVER.

I believe the priorities which they have established in this bill are good for both our nation and for our nation's defense.

The funding constraints imposed by the balanced budget agreement make our choices more difficult.

However, we still must ensure that other priorities do not drive us away from one of the primary responsibilities the Congress has, and that is ensuring for the nation's defense.

The construction of quality family housing and barracks, as well as hospitals and child development centers all relate directly to the quality of life issues so important to retaining our men and women who serve our nation and who deserve the best that we can provide them.

We have witnessed our military forces time and again respond to our nation's call and demonstrate the courage, commitment and dedication that make our nation's defense the envy of the world.

I want to thank the subcommittee for providing these men and women a quality of life that makes the burden of leaving their families behind a bit easier to bear.

I also rise the support this bill which appropriates $8.5 billion for critical military construction needs in fiscal year 2000 and want to applaud the chairman and ranking member for what is in the bill before us:

—$4.2 billion for military construction, including: $789 million for barracks construction, $24 million for child development centers, $165 million for hospital and medical facilities, and $497 million for Guard and Reserve components.

—$3.6 billion for family housing, including: $747 million for new construction and renovation of family housing units and $2.8 billion for operation and maintenance of existing units.

—$700 million for expenses related to base realignment and closure.

I also want to point out some of the projects included in this bill that will have such a positive impact on the defense installations in my district such as;

For the Patuxent River Naval Air Station: $3.06 million for a ship & air test and evaluation facility, $1.5 million for a indoor firing range, and $4.15 million for an aircrew water survival training facility.

For Fort Meade: $10.07 million for a sewage treatment plant.

In closing, I want to thank the subcommittee for funding these military construction priorities and for so effectively addressing the needs of our men and women in uniform and their families.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 2465, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for FY 2000. This important bipartisan legislation provides $8.5 billion for military housing and addresses a variety of quality of life issues for U.S. troops.

It is time that we made basic improvements in base facilities to support our troops. H.R. 2465 will address such quality of life issues in a number of ways. For example, the bill provides almost $965 million for barracks, hospitals and medical facilities, and $747 million for new housing units for troops and their families.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 2465 includes $16.8 million to continue a much-needed family housing project at Vandenberg Air Force Base in my district. Vandenberg is in the process of building 108 two, three, and four bedroom housing units on the base. The goal is to provide safe, modern, and efficient housing for service men and women and their family members.

This particular housing project provides the services with a unique model of how development can be structured to strengthen and enhance a sense of community among a highly transitory population.

I am also proud to say that this bill funds priority projects and services for American forces for the next fiscal year, and still manages to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to address funding for a new Army Reserve Center in Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Army Reserve in Lincoln, Nebraska, currently leases a building assigned to the Agriculture Campus of the University of Nebraska in Lincoln. The University's plans for expanding its classroom space are being hindered by the Army Reserve's occupancy. Of late, the desire of the University to reclaim the facility has become more pressing. The Nebraska Army Reserve needs to construct a new building to serve as its center.

The Nebraska Army Reserve has identified an alternative to the current situation, but it lacks the funding needed to get it out of the starting blocks. Therefore, $1.3 million is needed to proceed with land acquisition and to develop preliminary design specifications. This Member supports the Nebraska Army Reserve's request for ''seed money'' in the amount of $1.3 million to fund the planning and acquisition of land for this relocated Center.

Our colleges and universities have enough challenges. Forcing them to delay, or work around, improvements to and expansion of their programs should not be unnecessarily adding to those challenges. We ask our military personnel to make enough sacrifices. Depriving them of modern, badly needed facilities should not be one of them.

While the bill before the House today does not include this funding request, this Member would note that the Senate version of the military construction appropriation, S. 1205, which was passed on June 16, 1999, by a vote of 97 to 2, already includes funding for this requirement.

To bring the House measure into agreement with Senate version, and for the reasons above, this Member urges the House conferees—who will be appointed to the conference on the Military Construction Appropriations bill—to agree to the Senate's funding level of $1.3 million for the construction of a new Army Reserve Center in Lincoln, Nebraska, in the conference report for H.R. 2465.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, I rise in support of this bill. Over the past months, the subcommittee has heard from many members of our Nation's armed forces and has traveled to bases at home and abroad to see first-hand the needs of our men and women in uniform. Their primary concern has been the continued deterioration of the infrastructure which supports our defense mission here and around the world. The President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2000 did little to alleviate these concerns. In response to his inadequate request, the Subcommittee added $3 billion more than the President, an increase of 56%.

Our efforts are aimed at providing our armed forces with the best facilities, training, and equipment possible. Military construction accounts for $4.9 billion or 49 percent of this bill. These funds will be used for barracks, child development centers, medical facilities, and other projects to strengthen and support critical missions. National Guard and Reserve components will receive nearly $500 million.

We have worked hard to address quality of life issues as well. This bill sends a clear message that we will take care of our country's military and their families. Family housing projects account for $3.6 billion or 43 percent of the bill. Within the family housing section, $2.8 billion will go for operation and maintenance of existing units, and $747 million will be used for the construction of new housing.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fiscally responsible. At the same time, it helps rebuild our military

infrastructure and addresses quality of life issues which are so important to maintaining a strong and motivated military.

I urge my colleagues to support the hard work of the Committee and vote for this Military Construction bill.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for H.R. 2465, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for FY2000. This legislation addresses ''quality of life'' issues for our service personnel.

H.R. 2465 will significantly improve the living and working conditions of our military personnel. As former Chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, I have personally seen the poor and unsafe living and working conditions we subject our soldiers to both here in the U.S. and abroad. This legislation will go a long way in addressing many of these needs. We must do as much as we can if we hope to retain these quality personnel.

Our military is the most powerful fighting force in the world, yet our soldiers go home every evening to homes that are simply not acceptable or safe. I commend the members of the Military Construction Subcommittee and Chairman HOBSON for their dedication to the men and women of our Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2465 goes much deeper than just appropriating funds, this legislation will keep the people who protect and serve our country safe. We shouldn't keep asking our servicemen and women to put their lives on the line if we can't provide them with the basics they need to raise a family and live decently.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2465 and am particularly pleased with the work that was done in regard to the Lemoore Naval Air Station, which is located in my district in Lemoore, California. I would like to thank both Chairman HOBSON and Representative OLVER for all their hard work in ensuring that Naval Air Station Lemoore is prepared for the upcoming challenges the Navy will place on the base. I would also like to thank Representative MURTHA for his continued support of much needed projects at Lemoore.

I know that funding in this year's Military Construction Appropriations was under considerable budget constraints and so I am pleased that several vital projects for Lemoore were included in the final markup of the bill.

Naval Air Station Lemoore currently supports 27,000 military, civilian, dependent, and retired personnel as the Navy's only West coast Master Jet Air Station. With Lemoore Naval Air Station being designated as the base for the new F/A–18E/F Super Hornet Fighter Aircraft, it is projected that this figure will grow to 33,000 over the next 5 years.

Considering the cost of training these additional pilots, as well as the critical importance of the F/A–18's Super Hornets to the future of the Naval air program, military construction projects at Lemoore Naval Air Station have become a vital component of not only the base's mission, but the mission of our National Defense.

Due to this significant growth, secluded location and deteriorating facilities, quality of life construction projects have become critically important.

A recent survey done at Lemoore confirmed this reality when pilots reported that living conditions diminish morale and threaten pilot retention rates when they are not addressed.

I am confident that we can work to properly address these concerns if we are able to construct and upgrade facilities that directly affect the quality of life of our nation's military personnel.

The military construction projects in the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations for Lemoore provide a good start in addressing these issues, but we must see to it that the Defense's million to improve morale and retain pilots continues to be implemented in the years ahead.

The bill we have before us today, H.R. 2465, includes language supporting this effort and specifically directs the Navy to ''accelerate the design of quality of life projects at Lemoore Naval Air Station, and to include the required construction funding in its fiscal year 2001 budget request.'' I am happy to see this direction included and am hopeful that the Administration and Congress will act accordingly.

Support of these military construction projects will help Naval Air Station Lemoore meet its national defense responsibilities in the coming decades.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to lend my strong support for passage of H.R. 2465, the Fiscal Year 2000 Military Construction Appropriations Act.

This $8.5 billion measure recognizes the needs of our military infrastructure, continues our efforts at base closure and realignment, and most importantly puts military families first. One of the much needed items in this bill to improve the quality of life for our people in uniform is the $10.952 million appropriation for the construction of the Marseilles National Guard Training Facility in my Congressional District.

The Marseilles complex has been requested by the Illinois Department of Military Affairs and the Pentagon since 1994. Not until this year did the President recognize the need for this facility and I am pleased that President Clinton included funding for this project in his FY 2000 budget. This facility would be the first permanent training complex for the National Guard in the State of Illinois, serving all of the 10,245 members of the Guard in Illinois. Currently, members of the Illinois National Guard are forced to travel to bases in Wisconsin and Kentucky some as far as 350 miles away to conduct routine maneuvers. As you can imagine, this places a severe stress on the scope and timing of military operations, and even greater stress on the members of the Guard and their families.

The Marseilles site is easily accessible from Interstate 80 and is in close proximity to Interstates 39 and 55, Chicago, Joliet and Springfield. The Marseilles site is currently used by the Guard for small training exercises that are conducted out of tents and military vehicles with restroom facilities consisting of portable toilets that are of an unacceptable condition for these troops. The proposed complex in Marseilles would reduce travel time to and from training for most Illinois Guard members and would include barracks and dining facilities that would help to boost morale and retention within the ranks. The immediate construction of the Marseilles complex would provide the multiple benefits of substantially helping local business, spurring development in the undeveloped area south of the Illinois River, while providing a convenient training site that will help to ensure troop readiness and an acceptable quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deep appreciation to Chairman HOBSON of the Military Construction Subcommittee, and on behalf of the residents and small business owners of Marseilles and the over 10,000 members of the Illinois National Guard I say thank you for helping to get this important project underway.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our distinguished Chairman for his commitment to our Armed Services personnel, who rely on the United States Congress to address important quality of life issues. The Chairman and the members of his subcommittee deserve our gratitude for their fine work in crafting the legislation before us. In particular, I want to thank the Chairman for his personal attention to the needs of our soldiers and airmen, and their families, at Ft. Bragg and Pope Air Force Base in the 8th District of North Carolina.

It should be noted that back in February the Chairman and his subcommittee were handed a flawed funding proposal by the Administration—one that called for an unprecedented piecemeal funding approach. The Chairman and his subcommittee wisely rejected this proposal, realizing that incremental funding simply doesn't work for military construction. Instead, the House is considering legislation that properly addresses that military housing needs of our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, let me also take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Chairman and those members who will join him in representing the House during the MilCon Appropriations conference an important issue to the 8th District and all of North Carolina. Included in the Senate version of this legislation is report language directing the Army National Guard to include for a combat arms educational facility in its Fiscal Year 2001 budget submission. The current facilities for the North Carolina Guard's education center are antiquated and no longer meet their needs.

I have before me a letter from Brigadier General Michael Squier, Deputy Director of the Army National Guard, stating that the Educational Facility is of the highest priority. Such a strong endorsement certainly indicates to me that this facility is an important project.

I appreciate the Chairman's consideration of the Senate language and his commitment to America's patriots in uniform.

DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Arlington, VA, May 25, 1999.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I deeply apologize for our error in submitting information on the Military Education Center at Fort Bragg. We had earlier reported that it was not in the Future Years Defense Plan. It most definitely is, as shown in the Army National Guard's Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Submission for Military Construction (copy enclosed).

This project is of the highest priority to the Army National Guard and has my personal interest along with that of Major General Rudisill, the Adjutant General of North Carolina.

Your support of the National Guard is appreciated as always.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. SQUIER,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Deputy Director, Army National Guard.

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

Mr. HOBSON. 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.

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 a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, $1,223,405,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $87,205,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, $968,862,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $65,010,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, $752,367,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $32,104,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $755,718,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided,* That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $33,324,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $135,129,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $180,870,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $92,515,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $21,574,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $66,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in Military Construction Authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, $81,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $89,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $1,089,812,000; in all $1,179,012,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $312,559,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $895,070,000; in all $1,207,629,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $344,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, $821,892,000; in all $1,166,888,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, $50,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004; for Operation and Maintenance, $41,440,000; in all $41,490,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, as the sole source of funds for planning, administrative, and oversight costs relating to family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2883, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, and supporting facilities.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $705,911,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not more than $360,073,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the

Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 20, line 17, 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 was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 20, line 17, is as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee; (3) where the estimated value is less than $25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Gulf, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the 5-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense'' to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

SEC. 121. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in ''Family Housing'' accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided*, That appropriations made available to the Fund shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

SEC. 124. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the congressional defense committees the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(c) In this section, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Military Construction Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Military Construction Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 125. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for operations and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of flag and general officer quarters: *Provided,* That not more than $15,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officers quarters without thirty days advance prior notification of the appropriate committees of Congress: *Provided further,* That out-of-cycle notifications are prohibited with the exception of those justified by emergency or safety-related items: *Provided further,* That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report on a quarterly basis to the appropriate committees of Congress all operations and maintenance expenditures for each individual flag and general officer quarters.

SEC. 127. The first proviso under the heading ''MILITARY CONSTRUCTION TRANSFER FUND'' in chapter 6 of title II of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) is amended by inserting ''and to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code'' after ''to military construction accounts''.

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provisions in this Act, the following accounts are hereby reduced by the specified amounts—

''Military Construction, Army'', $38,253,000;

''Military Construction, Navy'', $30,277,000;

''Military Construction, Air Force'', $23,511,000;

''Military Construction, Defense-wide'', $23,616,000;

''Military Construction, Army National Guard'', $4,223,000;

''Military Construction, Air National Guard'', $5,652,000;

''Military Construction, Army Reserve'', $2,891,000;

''Military Construction, Naval Reserve'', $674,000; and

''Military Construction, Air Force Reserve'', $2,080,000.

SEC. 129. The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are directed to submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress by June 1, 2000, a Family Housing Master Plan demonstrating how they plan to meet the year 2010 housing goals with traditional construction, operation and maintenance support, as well as privatization initiative proposals. Each plan shall include projected life cycle costs for family housing construction, basic allowance for housing, operation and maintenance, other associated costs, and a time line for housing completions each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the bill?

The Clerk will read the last 2 lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, 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. 2465) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 242, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)	Thomas	Wamp
Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Souder	Thompson (MS)	Watkins
Spence	Thornberry	Watt (NC)
Spratt	Thune	Watts (OK)
Stabenow	Tiahrt	Waxman
Stearns	Tierney	Weiner
Stenholm	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Strickland	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Stump	Traficant	Weller
Stupak	Turner	Wexler
Sununu	Udall (CO)	Whitfield
Talent	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Tancredo	Upton	Wilson
Tanner	Velazquez	Wolf
Tauscher	Vento	Woolsey
Tauzin	Visclosky	Wu
Taylor (MS)	Vitter	Wynn
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Young (AK)
Terry	Walsh	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Norwood	Royce
Paul	Stark

NOT VOTING—13

Brown (CA)	Kasich	Thurman
Chenoweth	McDermott	Weygand
Combest	Meek (FL)	Wise
Gejdenson	Scarborough	
Hastings (FL)	Sweeney	

□ 1515

Ms. BALDWIN changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Monday and earlier today due to the death of my uncle. Had I been here on Monday, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes 278 and 279. Today, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 280.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2466.

□ 1517

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. Chairman, for those who might not have noticed, this is Ohio day, both from the standpoint of the chairman of the two Appropriations bills being considered today and of the gentleman from Ohio presiding this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay a compliment to my ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). This is his first year of being the Ranking Member on the subcommittee, and he has been a partner. We have worked together on the things in this bill in a nonpartisan way. I think it is fair, and I think a lot of this is thanks to the contributions that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) made and also the staff, both his staff and the staff of the subcommittee. It has been a real pleasure to work with the gentleman from Washington on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, today I would ask Members in their mind's eye to fast forward to the year 2049, 50 years from now, because their actions and votes on this bill will be the America we leave to our children and grandchildren.

We have to ask ourselves some questions: Will it be an America free from the scars of resource exploitation? We have put an extra $11 million for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund to avoid that problem.

Will it be an Everglades fully watered and with its unique ecology preserved and enhanced? Again, when it is all said and done, we will have spent about $10 billion of U.S. taxpayer dollars to take care of the Everglades. If Members read the language in the bill, they will see we are making a point that we want to ensure that there is an adequate water supply, not just now but 50 years from now.

Will it be a Nation with clean air, clean water, with rivers that we point to with pride? Will there be 629 million acres of forests, parks, fish and wildlife facilities and grazing lands, with beautiful vistas, with unique ecological wonders?

Will there be an Smithsonian that continues to tell the unique story of our Nation's heritage? Will there be a Kennedy Center that continues to excite millions of visitors with a wide range of artistic opportunities? Will there be a Holocaust Museum that continues to remind Americans and people from many nations that this tragedy shall never happen again? Will there be a National Gallery Of Art and Sculpture Garden that shares the treasures of many nations in addition to our own?

Will there be new sources of energy that foster a livable society with a prosperous economy? Will we be a Nation that respects its arts and its humanities?

Members get to answer those questions today by giving a resounding vote of yes to this bill. We will soon be voting on a $265 billion defense bill to defend many of the values that this bill represents. Fourteen billion dollars, the amount of this bill, is a small price to invest in preserving these values.

We have made a number of important policy changes. The Inspector General at the Department of the Interior told us that the National Park Service was unable to balance its books. We have instituted reforms and turned that situation around in 18 months. This bill continues those reforms. We have made changes in many programs as a result of 18 oversight hearings over the past 4 years.

We have heard about the $1 million comfort stations built by the U.S. Park Service. We have streamlined and reformed the way in which the Park Service manages its construction program, and we are not going to have those kinds of activities in the future.

According to testimony of the leaders of the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Smithsonian, all of these agencies, that we have a $15 billion backlog maintenance. We have to take care of what we have, and we are doing that in this bill. We continue to work at it, and I think it makes a difference.

Our subcommittee recently visited some facilities in the State of Washington. In Olympic National Park we saw a building that was being fixed as a result of fees and as a result of the understanding that we need to take care of maintenance.

We are looking into problems of financial and contract management in the Department of Energy, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We have provided for the Everglades restoration effort in this bill. A unique feature, and I think it is one of management, that is that we require the States to provide a 25 percent match on weatherization. Forty-eight of the States have current balances, some of them over $1 billion. I think the States have a responsibility of participating, and frankly, if they do, they are going to be a little more careful how they manage the funds. Now they manage the funds and we provide all the money. Under this proposal, we have not reduced weatherization significantly; we are saying, States, you put up 25 percent and we will be able to do more. We will also get better management of the dollars involved. I think

this is a very positive approach to this program. I hope Members will all support it by their votes on the bill.

We have added $99 million to the Operation of the National Parks. We hear this mantra, ''they are going to shut down the parks.'' Do not believe it. We have added $99 million to support our national parks over what we provided last year, even though the bill in its present form is $1 million less than the 1999 bill, excluding the supplemental appropriations. It is $200 million less if we include the enacted bill, which would include the supplemental appropriations.

So we have been very careful in managing it, but we have tried to emphasize the things that are important to people: their parks, $99 million; $200 million for Indian education and health programs. I think we need to do more, but that is the best we could under the circumstances.

But when the American Dental Association testifies that only one Indian has dental care out of four, we need to remedy that. We need to ensure that every Native American has the health care he or she needs, and we likewise need to ensure that they have educational opportunities.

We saw the President visiting a reservation last week talking about the poverty there. The way to get out of poverty is to improve education. We have tried to address that as much as we could in this bill.

We have provided $205 million for high priority land acquisition. I know people would like to buy a lot more land, but that is the best we can do under the circumstances.

What we have tried is where we have inholdings, we have tried to focus on the importance of pulling together the lands that we have, so our priority has been to pick up wherever possible with a willing seller, a willing buyer, inholdings.

We have included $33 million additional for national wildlife refuges. I mentioned the Everglades. We have included land acquisition funds, but we have said that we want to guarantee that the water will be there not just tomorrow but 50 years from now, and to that end we have put in restrictive language to ensure that we have that guarantee before we commit vast sums of money from the taxpayers of this Nation. Their focus is on the Everglades. The taxpayers are not putting up $10 billion to $11 billion to provide more development money or more agriculture, they are putting up the money to take care of the Everglades, which belongs to all the people of this Nation. We have tried to recognize that.

I mentioned earlier that the AML fund is $11 million more than last year. We want to repair some of the scars we have inflicted on the landscape of America from coal mining. We have level funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities. I think that is consistent with the fact that the bill is level funded in terms of the 1999 appropriations.

I think all of these programs taken together represent a good management of our Nation's resources, and most importantly, I think they represent policies and programs that every one of us who support this bill will be able to point to our actions with pride 50 years from now, and on into the future as far as the eye can see.

I hope that the Members will support the bill, that we will continue this effort that we are making in managing our resources and the dollars to give the public the best possible value received for the money they provide in the form of taxes.

OVERVIEW OF BILL

Mr. Chairman, today I am pleased to bring to the House for its consideration the fiscal year 2000 Interior Appropriations bill. While the pressures of the 1997 budget agreement between the Congress and the White House have required us to make some difficult choices in this year's bill, I believe we are presenting you a good bill. The bill provides for $14.057 billion in budget authority and $14.556 billion in outlays. Funding is $200 million below the FY99 enacted bill and $1.1 billion below the Administration's FY 2000 request. Within these limits we are continuing to focus our priorities on operational shortfalls and backlog maintenance in the national parks, wildlife refuges and national forests by providing modest increases for these priorities.

Despite our severe funding limitations, we continue the federal commitment for the restoration of the Everglades with $114 million. This funding includes the federal commitment necessary for the purchase of critical lands within Everglades National Park, as well as the other national parks and wildlife refuges, critical to the restoration effort. In providing this funding, we have included specific language to ensure a true environmental restoration of the Everglades by requiring specific water flow amounts and timing for these critical natural areas.

Throughout my tenure as Chairman of this Subcommittee, I have focused on bringing improved management and accountability to the taxpayer. You may remember that in last year's bill we made changes to the Park Service's Denver Services Center and the way the Park Service manages and funds construction projects, so that the taxpayer will never again be asked to fund a $784,000 outhouse in a national park. This year we have focused on the various trust funds of the U.S. Forest Service. These funds are off budget funds which have not been transparent to the taxpayer. We have included a number of changes to address this situation, and I will enumerate them more specifically when I address the Forest Service portion of the bill.

As federal spending for these programs continues to be squeezed by our obligations to the American people to maintain balanced budgets and protect Social Security and Medicare, we must increasingly focus exclusively on our federal responsibility. States must share in these programs as our partners. For this reason, we have not provided funding for the states to purchase lands under the Administration's Lands Legacy program. State continue to do extremely well financially under the excellent economic conditions we enjoy. We call on these same states to make the financial commitment to protect lands of priority to them.

In the area of energy programs funded within the bill, we continue this philosophy by asking the states to participate in funding the Weatherization program. Throughout the many years of this program, only the federal government has provided the funding for this program, and in our FY00 bill we ask the states to share in the program with a 25 percent cost share.

Like last year, we have funded the bill without the selling oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) to finance its operations. Congress created the SPR IN 1975 to provide a national defense against future oil shocks. This year, we are pleased to report that the SPR is being filled with oil from royalties owed the federal government by entities producing oil from federal lands. This creative relationship between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy is working well, while at the same time adding to our nation's strategic oil defense.

THE NATION'S LANDS

The Interior Appropriations bill provides funding for the vast majority of our nation's federal lands. I would like to highlight the vast treasures we hold as a nation in the resources of our lands. Together as a nation we hold ownership of nearly one third of the land across this great country, and we cherish the open space and tranquility these vast holdings provide. They include 192 million acres in Forest Service land, 77 million acres within the National Park System, 94 million acres in Wildlife Refuges administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service and 264 million acres in Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings.

Although we often refer to our national parks as the ''crown jewels'' of our public lands which include the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone and Yosemite, many spectacular gems are also found on these other public lands. Both the Forest Service and the BLM administer their lands under a multiple use mandate, and therefore, these lands are used not only for recreation as our national parks, but also for hunting and fishing, as well as for generating revenues from minerals and oil and gas development.

While many people associate the Forest Service as a source for American's lumber needs, it is a little known fact that the Forest Service actually receives three times the number of visitors to its lands for recreational purposes than the national parks. Forest Service lands received more than 650 million visits last year.

The American public does not distinguish between federal lands administered by different agencies, and as such, I encourage these agencies to work together on behalf of the public. I would like to compliment the BLM and the Forest Service on their work to consolidate their activities at the field level to achieve savings and provide improved services to the public. The Department of Agriculture and Interior have also achieved success in coordinating their efforts on the development of the Joint Fire Science Plan which provides the scientific aspect of the fuels management programs of the Departments. I encourage all of the agencies to follow these excellent examples and coordinate their services effectively.

REVENUES FROM THE FEDERAL LANDS/REC FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

In addition to the growing role as respite to millions of Americans from the everyday stresses of an increasingly urbanized society, these lands also provide a major source of revenues. Revenues from mining, oil and gas leasing and grazing are expected to generate more than $6 billion in fiscal year 2000. These resources belong to the American people, and they are benefitting from the revenues they generate.

During my first year as Chairman of this Subcommittee, I initiated the recreation fee program demonstration on our federal lands. This is a concept I have supported for many years; it allows the parks, wildlife refuges, national forests and public lands to collect a modest fee from visitors. This fee stays in the park where it is collected and allows the land manager to use the funds to conduct backlog maintenance or improve services for the visitor on that particular site. We are receiving tremendous support of these fees from the American people, the land managers and from national organizations involved with our federal lands. The fees are expected to generate over $400 million over a five year period and will greatly enhance our ability to reduce the maintenance backlog on the public lands. Other unexpected benefits of the program include a reduction in vandalism which the superintendent at Muir Woods in California called to my attention recently. With Americans making a contribution to the land, they feel they have a stake in its beauty and preservation.

FOREST SERVICE LANDS

The National Forest System lands represent about one third of the nation's forest land and historically have produced approximately 20 percent of the total softwood harvested in the United States each year. Much more timber is grown on these lands each year than is harvested. The timber sale program generates revenues for the Treasury and for local timber-based economies, as well as providing the raw material for lumber, paper and other forest products that are critical to our economy. The timber program on public lands, however, has declined from a high of 11.1 billion board feet in FY90 to the 3.6 billion recommended in this bill and the same level as in fiscal year 1999. This number is a dramatic reduction over the decade, and further cuts to it would be an irresponsible act of the Congress and dramatically impact timber-dependent communities.

Earlier I mentioned increased accountability of various Forest Service trust funds. Despite continuing concerns expressed by this Committee, the House Agriculture Committee and the GAO about the accountability of these funds, we remain deeply troubled about the way these trust funds are being administered. To address these concerns, this year we are requiring the Forest Service to submit a detailed plan of operations to the Congress for the Knutson-Vandenberg (KV) fund, the salvage sale fund and the brush disposal fund. The plan should include an explanation and justification for the program of work and expected accomplishments at each national forest unit using KV funds. To address ongoing concerns that these funds have been used for purposes other than those for which they are intended, we have limited their use at both the regional and Washington levels to only those activities strictly related to the program. We have specifically prohibited their use for general assessments within either the Forest Service or the Department of Agriculture. The American people deserve to know that these funds are being used for their intended purposes of reforestation together with restoration of watersheds and habitats, and therefore we have also required that these funds be displayed in future budget justifications for the Forest Service. I am pleased with the new requirements we are placing on the management of these funds.

We are making a significant commitment to fire-fighting in this bill, with $561 million for wildland fire management. The fund supports preparation for wildfires, wildfire operations and reduction of hazardous fuels.

Last year we included the transfer of the Volunteer Fire Assistance program from the Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill to this one. This small grant program, through the State and Private Forestry account, is a tremendous partnership between local volunteer fire departments and the federal government. It allows for enhanced training and equipment to these local fire-fighting agencies and provides for highly trained volunteers should their assistance be requested at federal fire sites. The bill includes $4 million for this grant program, with a total of $29 million in total for the Cooperative Fire Assistance program. Clearly, the bill makes a strong commitment to the fire-fighting needs on the local, state and federal levels.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Health Care for our native Americans is the responsibility of the federal government and remains a challenge for this subcommittee. We continue our commitment to Indian Health Services with total funding of $2.4 billion, a $155 million increase over fiscal year 1999. Within this increase is additional funding of $35 million to meet contract support costs, a growing obligation. Within this increase we have also included an additional $20 million to construct the highest priority hospitals and clinics, thus providing needed access to health care.

SCIENCE

The bill includes $820 million for the U.S. Geological Survey. This Department of the Interior agency performs first-class scientific research and analysis in areas including water resources, geology and biological resources. I am pleased to report that our transfer of the Biological Resources Division to the U.S. Geological Survey continues to work very well, and the other bureaus rely on the expertise of the outstanding agency to meet their scientific needs.

We have provided $188 million for ecological services for the Fish and Wildlife Service, including $105 million for endangered species work. As we all know, the Endangered Species Act needs to be reauthorized. I urge the Administration to present legislation to the Congress so that together we may address vitally needed reforms for the program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Interior Appropriations Bill funds programs at the Department of Energy for research to develop technologies to more efficiently use fossil fuels. Low energy prices and energy efficient technologies are a major reason for our strong economy, so we must continue to support federal energy research programs for fossil energy, coal, oil and natural gas, as well as other sources of energy.

Funding for the Department of Energy's programs are cut $209 million below last year's level. With many fewer dollars, we continue to emphasize partnerships between the federal government and the private sector to ensure that there is a commitment to the technologies in the marketplace. Our goals continue to be to develop technologies that meet the highest energy efficiency and environmental standards possible. Fossil energy will remain the cornerstone of our nation's energy supply well into the next millennium and will also be the source of energy for the world's developing countries. Our continued leadership in this research is vital as we become an increasingly global economy.

DOE's Energy Efficiency account includes a number of programs, including the Industries of the Future program which is an outstanding public-private partnership as the nation's most energy intensive and highest polluting industries work with government in setting joint goals to increase efficiency and reduce waste as we look to these industries' futures. We have provided $193 million for this program, the success of which will continue to ensure world class economic strength in our leading industry sectors which employ so many Americans.

Funding for the state energy programs remains at the 1999 level of $33 million, and we have funded the Weatherization Assistance Program at $120 million, and we are now requiring a 25 percent cost share which I noted earlier. This requirement will allow us to leverage the program dollars and in turn expand the funding and the number of people who may benefit from the program.

Finally, we continue to support the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) and have provided $24 million for it. This program is an excellent industry/government partnership in which the private sector works with federal agencies to reduce energy usage by incurring the costs of installing high efficiency equipment in exchange for a share of the resulting energy savings. The program has great potential for energy savings, as the federal government is the largest energy user in the world.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS FOR THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Over the past few years, funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has been a challenge in this appropriations bill. During last year's floor debate on this bill, the House of Representatives voted to continue to provide federal funding for the NEA. This year we have included funding for the NEA and the NEH at the fiscal year 1999 levels of $98 million and $110 million, respectively. I believe the reforms we have put in place at the NEA are working, and the current directors of these agencies are doing a fine job on behalf of the American people.

CULTURAL AGENCIES

One of the most enjoyable tasks I have serving as Chairman of the Subcommittee, is overseeing the budget for our nation's cultural agencies. These fine agencies, including the Smithsonian Institution, the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery of Art and the U.S. Holocaust Museum all provide wonderful services to the American public not only when they come to visit our nation's capital, but also through numerous outreach programs throughout the states and local communities, as well as on the Internet.

For fiscal year 2000 we are providing $438 million for the Smithsonian Institution. This funding includes $48 million for repair and restoration of Smithsonian facilities. ''Taking care of what we have'' is a high priority for me, and I am pleased that the Smithsonian agrees with this priority in maintaining their world class facilities for all Americans to enjoy.

Within the constraints of the tight budget, we have provided modest increases for the various cultural agencies within the bill.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to reiterate that the bill I present before the House today is a good bill. It reflects the priorities of taking care of the lands and resources of all the American people. It is a responsible bill which keeps our obligation to balance the budget, while meeting the many responsibilities under our jurisdiction.

At this point Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert into the RECORD a table detailing the various accounts in the bill.

The table referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	612,511	641,100	632,068	+19,557	-9,032
Wildland fire management	286,895	305,850	292,399	+5,504	-13,451
Central hazardous materials fund	10,000	11,350	10,000	.....	-1,350
Construction	10,997	8,350	11,100	+103	+2,750
Payments in lieu of taxes	125,000	125,000	125,000	.....	.....
Land acquisition	14,600	48,900	20,000	+5,400	-28,900
Oregon and California grant lands	97,037	101,650	99,225	+2,188	-2,425
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,000	10,000	10,000	.....	.....
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,055	8,800	8,800	+745	.....
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	8,800	7,700	7,700	-1,100	.....
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,183,895	1,268,700	1,216,292	+32,397	-52,408
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	661,136	724,000	710,700	+49,564	-13,300
Construction	50,453	43,569	43,933	-6,520	+364
Emergency appropriations	37,612	.....	.....	-37,612	.....
Land acquisition	48,024	73,632	42,000	-6,024	-31,632
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	14,000	80,000	15,000	+1,000	-65,000
National wildlife refuge fund	10,779	10,000	10,779	.....	+779
North American wetlands conservation fund	15,000	15,000	15,000	.....	.....
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	800	800	800	.....	.....
Multinational species conservation fund	2,000	3,000	2,000	.....	-1,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	839,804	950,001	840,212	+408	-109,789
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system	1,285,604	1,389,627	1,387,307	+101,703	-2,320
Emergency appropriations	2,320	.....	.....	-2,320	.....
National recreation and preservation	46,225	48,336	45,449	-776	-2,887
Historic preservation fund	72,412	80,512	46,712	-25,700	-33,800
Construction	226,058	194,000	169,856	-56,202	-24,144
Emergency appropriations	13,680	.....	.....	-13,680	.....
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	.....	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance	147,925	172,468	102,000	-45,925	-70,468
Conservation grants and planning assistance	.....	200,000	.....	.....	-200,000
Urban park and recreation fund	.....	4,000	.....	.....	-4,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,764,224	2,058,943	1,721,324	-42,900	-337,619
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	797,896	838,485	820,444	+22,548	-18,041
Emergency appropriations	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management	217,902	234,082	234,082	+16,180	.....
Additions to receipts	-100,000	-124,000	-124,000	-24,000	.....
Oil spill research	6,118	6,118	6,118	.....	.....
Total, Minerals Management Service	124,020	116,200	116,200	-7,820	.....
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology	93,078	94,391	95,693	+2,615	+1,302
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	275	275	275	.....	.....
Subtotal	93,353	94,666	95,968	+2,615	+1,302
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	185,416	211,158	196,458	+11,042	-14,700
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	278,769	305,824	292,426	+13,657	-13,398
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	1,584,124	1,694,387	1,631,050	+46,926	-63,337
Construction	123,421	174,258	126,023	+2,602	-48,235
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	28,882	28,401	25,901	-2,981	-2,500
Indian guaranteed loan program account	5,001	5,008	5,008	+7	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	.....	.....
Indian land consolidation pilot	5,000	.....	.....	-5,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,746,428	1,902,054	1,787,982	+41,554	-114,072
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories	38,455	40,355	38,600	+145	-1,755
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant	27,720	27,720	27,720	.....	.....
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories	66,175	68,075	66,320	+145	-1,755

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Compact of Free Association	8,930	8,545	8,545	-385	
Mandatory payments	12,000	12,000	12,000		
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association	20,930	20,545	20,545	-385	
Total, Insular Affairs	87,105	88,620	86,865	-240	-1,755
Departmental management	64,686	63,064	62,864	-1,822	-200
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	80,347			-80,347	
Office of the Solicitor	36,784	41,500	36,784		-4,716
Office of Inspector General	25,486	27,614	26,086	+600	-1,528
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	61,299	90,025	90,025	+28,726	
Indian land consolidation pilot		10,000	5,000	+5,000	-5,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund	4,492	7,900	5,400	+908	-2,500
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses	8,000			-8,000	
Glacier Bay fishing (emergency appropriations)	26,000			-26,000	
Total, Departmental Offices	394,199	328,723	313,024	-81,175	-15,699
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	7,130,235	7,768,930	7,107,904	-22,331	-661,026
Appropriations	(6,999,276)	(7,798,930)	(7,137,904)	(+138,628)	(-661,026)
Emergency appropriations	(160,959)			(-160,959)	
Rescissions	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)		
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research	197,444	234,644	204,373	+6,929	-30,271
State and private forestry	170,722	252,422	181,464	+10,742	-70,958
National forest system	1,298,570	1,357,178	1,254,434	-44,136	-102,744
Wildland fire management	560,176	560,730	561,354	+1,178	+624
Emergency appropriations	102,000	90,000		-102,000	-90,000
Reconstruction and maintenance	297,352	295,000	396,602	+99,250	+101,602
Emergency appropriations	5,611			-5,611	
Land acquisition	117,918	118,000	1,000	-116,918	-117,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts	1,069	1,069	1,069		
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210	210	210		
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	3,300	3,300	3,300		
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	92	92	92		
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses	3,000			-3,000	
Total, Forest Service	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,603,898	-153,566	-308,747
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Clean coal technology: Deferral	-40,000	-256,000	-190,000	-150,000	+66,000
Fossil energy research and development	384,056	340,000	335,292	-48,764	-4,708
Biomass energy development (by transfer)		(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24,000)	
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-1,300	-1,000	-1,000	+300	
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	14,000			-14,000	
Elk Hills school lands fund	36,000	36,000	36,000		
Energy conservation	691,701	812,515	693,822	+2,121	-118,693
Biomass energy development (by transfer)		(25,000)	(25,000)	(+25,000)	
Economic regulation	1,801	2,000	2,000	+199	
Strategic petroleum reserve	160,120	159,000	159,000	-1,120	
SPR petroleum account		5,000			-5,000
Energy Information Administration	70,500	72,644	72,644	+2,144	
Total, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	1,316,878	1,170,159	1,107,758	-209,120	-62,401
Appropriations	(1,356,878)	(1,426,159)	(1,297,758)	(-59,120)	(-128,401)
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)		(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services	1,950,322	2,094,922	2,085,407	+135,085	-9,515
Indian health facilities	291,965	317,465	312,478	+20,513	-4,987
Total, Indian Health Service	2,242,287	2,412,387	2,397,885	+155,598	-14,502
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses	13,000	14,000	13,400	+400	-600
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute	4,250	4,250		-4,250	-4,250

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	347,154	380,501	371,501	+24,347	-9,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	4,400			-4,400	
Repair and restoration of buildings	40,000	47,900	47,900	+7,900	
Construction	16,000	19,000	19,000	+3,000	
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	4,700			-4,700	
Total, Smithsonian Institution	412,254	447,401	438,401	+26,147	-9,000
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses	57,938	61,438	61,538	+3,600	+100
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	6,311	6,311	6,311		
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	101			-101	
Total, National Gallery of Art	64,350	67,749	67,849	+3,499	+100
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance	12,187	14,000	12,441	+254	-1,559
Construction	20,000	20,000	20,000		
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	32,187	34,000	32,441	+254	-1,559
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses	5,840	6,040	7,040	+1,200	+1,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	83,500	137,000	83,500		-53,500
Matching grants	14,500	13,000	14,500		+1,500
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	98,000	150,000	98,000		-52,000
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration	96,800	129,800	96,800		-33,000
Matching grants	13,900	20,200	13,900		-6,300
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700	150,000	110,700		-39,300
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services					
Grants and administration	23,405	34,000	24,400	+995	-9,600
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	232,105	334,000	233,100	+995	-100,900
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses	898	1,078	935	+37	-143
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants	7,000	6,000	7,000		+1,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses	2,800	3,000	3,000	+200	
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	5,954	6,312	6,312	+358	
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	381			-381	
United States Holocaust Memorial Council					
Holocaust Memorial Council	32,107	33,786	33,286	+1,179	-500
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	900			-900	
Emergency appropriations	2,000			-2,000	
Total, United States Holocaust Memorial Council	35,007	33,786	33,286	-1,721	-500
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund	34,913	44,400	44,400	+9,487	
Total, title II, related agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	7,167,568	7,497,207	6,996,705	-170,863	-500,502
Appropriations	(7,091,875)	(7,663,207)	(7,186,705)	(+94,830)	(-476,502)
Emergency appropriations	(115,693)	(90,000)		(-115,693)	(-90,000)
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)		(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	14,297,803	15,266,137	14,104,609	-193,194	-1,161,528
Appropriations	(14,091,151)	(15,462,137)	(14,324,609)	(+233,458)	(-1,137,528)
Emergency appropriations	(276,652)	(90,000)		(-276,652)	(-90,000)
Rescissions	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)		
Deferral	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-190,000)	(-150,000)	(+66,000)
(By transfer)		(49,000)	(49,000)	(+49,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)		

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management	1,183,895	1,268,700	1,216,292	+32,397	-52,408
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	839,804	950,001	840,212	+408	-109,789
National Park Service	1,764,224	2,058,943	1,721,324	-42,900	-337,619
United States Geological Survey	798,896	838,485	820,444	+21,548	-18,041
Minerals Management Service	124,020	116,200	116,200	-7,820	.....
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	278,769	305,824	292,426	+13,657	-13,398
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,746,428	1,902,054	1,787,982	+41,554	-114,072
Departmental Offices	394,199	328,723	313,024	-81,175	-15,699
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	7,130,235	7,768,930	7,107,904	-22,331	-661,026
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Forest Service	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,603,898	-153,566	-308,747
Department of Energy	1,316,878	1,170,159	1,107,758	-209,120	-62,401
Indian Health Service	2,242,287	2,412,387	2,397,885	+155,598	-14,502
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	13,000	14,000	13,400	+400	-600
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	4,250	4,250	.....	-4,250	-4,250
Smithsonian Institution	412,254	447,401	438,401	+26,147	-9,000
National Gallery of Art	64,350	67,749	67,849	+3,499	+100
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	32,187	34,000	32,441	+254	-1,559
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	5,840	6,040	7,040	+1,200	+1,000
National Endowment for the Arts	98,000	150,000	98,000	.....	-52,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700	150,000	110,700	.....	-39,300
Institute of Museum and Library Services	23,405	34,000	24,400	+995	-9,600
Commission of Fine Arts	898	1,078	935	+37	-143
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,000	6,000	7,000	.....	+1,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,800	3,000	3,000	+200	.....
National Capital Planning Commission	6,335	6,312	6,312	-23	.....
Holocaust Memorial Council	35,007	33,786	33,286	-1,721	-500
Presidio Trust	34,913	44,400	44,400	+9,487	.....
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,167,568	7,497,207	6,996,705	-170,863	-500,502
Grand total	14,297,803	15,266,137	14,104,609	-193,194	-1,161,528

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 as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee in support of H.R. 2466, the FY 2000 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

I, too, want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the staff of the committee, both the majority and minority staff members. Debbie Weatherly and Del Davis have done a very fine job on this bill, and all the other staff members, including Leslie Turner on my staff.

□ 1530

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who has skillfully crafted this bill. This bill is fair and balanced and I believe adequately addresses the needs of the programs within its jurisdiction.

Our allocation was not high, nearly $1 billion below the President's budget request, which required many difficult decisions. Under those difficult circumstances, I believe the bill is justly prioritized. I also add that I am extremely pleased that the bill is free of many legislative riders objectionable to the Congress.

It is my firm hope that we can continue to work with the administration on a few key items which the subcommittee was unable to fund in this tight budget year. The Lands Legacy Initiative proposed by the administration was not fully funded in this bill. I am hopeful that we can continue a dialogue as the bill moves through the legislative process and perhaps make more money available for some of the key land acquisitions put forward by the President.

This bill supports our national wildlife refuge system and continues critical efforts to address the needs of threatened and endangered species. These vital programs enable our agencies to achieve better ecosystem management and more comprehensive protection of our public lands.

Just last week I had the pleasure of hosting several Members, including the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, in my home State of Washington. We toured several area parks including the Olympic National Park in my congressional district and were able to view firsthand some of the work being done on the ground both through annual appropriations as well as through the fee demonstration project.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for his attention and elevation of the backlog needs in our parks. We need to do something about that. This bill provides significant increases in operations money to protect the treasures of the park system throughout the United States.

The bill continues support for our Native American citizens and is instrumental in upholding their treaty rights. Through the Interior Appropriations bill, we support economic and educational assistance to the tribes, aid natural resource management and support tribal health programs through the Indian Health Service.

Lastly, the bill provides funding to support both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Although we were not able to provide the requested increases called for in the President's budget, it is my firm hope that the House will approve funding for the endowments and we can continue to seek some increase as the bill moves through the process.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2466 and the important program it sustains.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2466, the fiscal year 2000 funding bill for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies.

This bill provides $14.1 billion for the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Smithsonian, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And I am happy to say that based on the hard work of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and my colleagues, both the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and other valued members on the subcommittee, we have an opportunity to support a bill that will manage and protect our environment; it will maintain our obligations to our sovereign Indian nations; it will protect our Nation's cultural resources and maintain fiscal responsibility.

It was not an easy task for the chairman of our subcommittee to come up with all of the pressures of this bill in the form that this bill takes. But it is a good package. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for inserting language that I authored in the report that will force the Pacific Northwest region, which covers my State of Washington, to look at all impacts to the endangered salmon problem in the Pacific Northwest and not just focus on dam removal as the solution to restoration of our salmon populations. It is not the solution. It is a multifaceted problem that requires a great deal of analysis and careful consideration.

Right now our region faces an immediate challenge with almost 8,000 pairs of Caspian terns which nest on a man-made island called Rice Island, which is located 20 miles upriver from the mouth of the Columbia River.

The National Marine Fisheries Service estimates that over the past 2 years these little birds have feasted on between 10 and 23 million juvenile salmon that are migrating out to the ocean. These birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for carrying out.

I appreciate the committee working with me on report language that requires the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to come up with a mitigation plan that will include, but not be limited to, transporting these birds to areas that are more in line with their natural habitat.

If we come up with a responsible plan for managing the Caspian terns, we will see a positive impact on the number of salmon returning to the Columbia and Snake Rivers to spawn. This is an important piece of the salmon restoration puzzle that we cannot ignore.

I am also pleased that within our budget limitations we were able to increase funding for health care provided the Native Americans through the Indian Health Service. The health disparities among Native Americans are profound. One area in particular is diabetes that seriously affects Native American populations and other minority populations in our country. The prevalence of diabetes among Native Americans is higher than it is for the rest of the Nation's population, and the rate is rapidly increasing to epidemic proportions in some tribes across this Nation.

For the second year in a row, we have provided funds in this bill for diabetes screening through the Joslin Diabetes Center, a great center dedicated to curing and doing more research and understanding the complications of diabetes.

We have also included language in the report to increase the number of podiatrists within the Indian Health Service to attempt to avoid one of the major complications of diabetes through preventive care and early treatment of diabetic foot ulcers for Native American populations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a delicate balance for Forest Service funding and programs. As Members may remember, we reached a hard-fought agreement on this issue last year when supporters of active forest management agreed to eliminate the purchaser road credit program. That was a difficult problem to overcome, to eliminate that program. This program primarily affected small timber purchasers, many of which were in my district on the east side of the State of Washington.

While the agreement held throughout the process last year, attempts may be made today to unravel that agreement. So I urge all Members, all of my colleagues who may consider supporting a Forest Service amendment, to think hard about the agreement that was reached in good faith last year. We should not destroy the accord that was achieved.

All in all, this bill is well balanced. It considers carefully the delicate nature of the programs that are contained within the Interior appropriations measure. It is one that I hope will see great approval in this body. The chairman and the ranking member and all of us on the subcommittee worked very hard to make that balance occur. We still have to deal with the Senate. We have to get a bill that goes through the process to the President.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

On July 20, 1969, the lunar landing module of Apollo touched down in the Sea of Tranquility on the surface of the Moon. Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin descended from the landing module and became the first humans to walk on any heavenly body. This feat established American supremacy in space even to the present day.

The Apollo 11 mission represents the success and preeminence of the American Space Program; we must preserve the monuments of this era. Of all the artifacts representing the glory and triumph of the Apollo Program, one in particular stands out—the Saturn V Rocket. The Saturn V is the largest, most powerful rocket ever produced in history. The Soviet Union was never able to even attempt to undertake such an ambitious project.

Only three Saturn V Rockets remain in the world today. The U.S. Space & Rocket Center is home to one of these historic vehicles which has the distinction of being designated a National Historic Landmark. The Saturn V at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center has been on display for thirty years, and the elements have caused significant deterioration of the vehicle. Although there is no question that it should be preserved for future generations as a monument of the American Space Program, once again we face budget constraints that make this task a difficult one.

Restoration of the Saturn V at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center should be a priority of the Smithsonian. I am hopeful that we will be able to allocate the resources necessary for the restoration and preservation efforts being made by the U.S. Space & Rocket Center before it is too late.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), our ranking member, for the excellent job they have done putting this bill together under very difficult circumstances. I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for their hard work on the bill and thoughtful consideration of the many difficult issues that we faced.

What we have before us is a fair and balanced bill that genuinely takes into consideration the many different concerns and interests of Members of the House, and of the people that we represent.

None of us support every item in the bill, but I think all of us can agree that it is fair, reasonable, and representative. The difficult circumstances I allude to are obvious. Our subcommittee's allocation is far below the real needs of the agencies funded through this bill. Although we have heard widely varying figures on the National Park Service's maintenance backlog, it certainly amounts to several billion dollars at least. The same is true of the Forest Service.

As our population grows and our open space shrinks, we have an ever-increasing need to protect open space and wildlife to protect recreational opportunities for our people, to conserve the watersheds we all depend on, and to save our historic and cultural sites.

Our subcommittee received hundreds of requests from Members for projects that are sensible and worthy, but we could not fund them even though we would have liked to and should have. There simply was not enough money.

But our chairman, I think, in the final analysis has used his discretion very, very wisely. The bill and the bill report include language regarding the management of the Everglades restoration project that we hope and believe will guarantee that the project serves the national interest. And the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) should take full deserved credit for this.

We are putting Federal money into the reengineering of the Everglades because we want to see its unique ecosystem restored and conserved for the future because we want to reverse past mistakes that led to overdevelopment and overuse of fragile resources. This bill aims to ensure that that is what will happen and that the Federal funds will not ultimately be turned against the Everglades and be used to promote unwise development.

I am delighted to say that despite the constraints on this bill, it includes increased funds for the Park Service, which are badly needed to meet the demands both of conservation and increased visitorship. I am similarly very happy that the bill also includes a small increase in the Forest Service's recreation budget above the administration's request.

The national forests are more widely used for recreation even than the national parks; and recreation has become an increasingly important part of the Forest Service's mission, but its budget has not kept up. The increase is a much-needed step in the right direction.

The bill also provides for a small increase in the Forest Services State and private forestry budget. Again, this is very welcomed. These programs are not as well known as they should be, but they are immensely valuable to those States where most forests are in non-Federal ownership.

In my own State, they are particularly important for the role they play in protecting our urban watersheds, but they also provide critical assistance to people who never see a forest through their support for such beneficial and popular projects as urban tree planting and disease prevention.

The Interior bill's public lands titles almost always attract more attention than its energy research and conservation provisions, but I am also pleased in what we could accomplish in those areas as well. Our subcommittee heard a great deal about the progress that can be made if we keep supporting these programs in achieving energy independence and providing our citizens with a cleaner environment. I am particularly pleased that the bill increases funding for Energy Department conservation programs that can help our constituents reduce their household energy costs.

There were some disappointments. I am sorry that the bill provides no increase for the Arts and Humanities Endowments, despite the administration's excellent plan for new outreach and education programs at both those agencies. I am hoping we can correct that in an amendment.

I am sorry too the bill provides only a small fraction of the administration's request for its Lands Legacy programs. But these are good programs, and I hope that they could be improved upon in the final analysis.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill and our chairman and our ranking member deserve great credit for the way they have put it together.

I strongly believe we should acquire and protect critical lands for open space, recreation, and wildlife habitat while we can: I have seen to many lost opportunities in my own state. But I realize the funding constraints made full funding of Lands Legacy impossible. Finally, I regret that the bill does not include requested funding for the addition to the Roosevelt Memorial here in Washington that the last Congress authorized, but I hope that can be resolved soon.

I will be supporting several amendments that I believe would improve our bill, but again, I urge support for the bill itself.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking Democrat on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a good friend.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me this time. I know how precious it is during general debate; and I greatly appreciate it because there is a very important message that I want to share with my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Washington.

While the rest of America was heeding John Adams's appeal to celebrate the birth of our Nation with fireworks, Mother Nature went on a rampage of her own with fireworks of a different kind in the Boundary Waters Canoe area of Minnesota in my district.

Over the 4th of July with a storm packing 100-mile-an-hour winds that leveled 340,000 acres of the Boundary

Waters Canoe area, the Nation's largest water-based wilderness, 250,000 acres of lands, 21 million trees estimated down, 6 million cords, which is equal to the total wood supply, the total cut, for 2 years for the whole State of Minnesota.

□ 1545

We have an enormous fuel supply on the ground. Trees that began growing years before the Civil War were ripped out, flattened. Chain saws, 24-inch bar chain saws on either side of the tree cannot cut through them.

But the Forest Service did absolutely heroic service. I want to pay tribute to the Forest Service personnel who worked 18-hour days over several days to inspect 1,300 camp sites and rescue some 20 injured campers and free hundreds of others. There were 3,000 in the wilderness at the time.

I flew over the area on Sunday and observed a scene that perhaps the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) only can fully appreciate. It is like the aftermath of the Mount St. Helens' disaster where trees were just flattened, blasted. They are piled, in many cases, one on top of each other, 20 feet high. The line supervisor for the electric co-op said he walked a half mile in from the roadway to one of the sites to begin work on power restoration and never stepped on land the entire way, just walked on downed trees.

The Forest Service had been absolutely superb. The three rural electric co-ops have been magnificent. They have had their teams out there working 15- and 18-hour days, 35 hours the first few days.

There will be benefits for those areas outside the Boundary Waters. But inside the Boundary Waters, there are a number of Forest Service supply facilities. There is one that I have known about in the Kekekabic Trail. It has always been hidden from view. It now looks like the Little House on the Prairie. One cannot imagine the destruction until one sees it oneself.

The reason I raise this issue here is that there is no FEMA support for the Forest Service, no Federal agency benefits when a disaster declaration is made, which it will be made, I am confident, by the President. There is a disaster fund for the Department of Agriculture that may be available to bail out the Forest Service.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they are using some of the rec. fee money for immediate solutions or assistance. The gentleman makes the point that we otherwise would be waiting, and this is a peak visitation time of year. So I am pleased that they are moving ahead and again serving the public, which was the objective of this program to begin with.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, but, ultimately, there is going to be a huge cost. We do not know what the extent of it is.

I raise the issue now to appeal to the leadership of the subcommittee that, by the time we get to conference, I am hoping my colleagues in the Senate will have the assessment, perhaps offer supplemental appropriations there to cover the cost for the Forest Service who are hiring people with money they do not have to serve time that is available now.

The resort community has lost a quarter of a million dollars business in the first 5 days. They do not have 100 feet of hiking trails opened for their visitors. The winter season is coming. We will not have cross country trails. We will not have snowmobile trails in the area outside the Boundary Waters unless the salvage work can begin promptly.

So, at the appropriate time, I appeal to the mercy and understanding of our colleagues to provide the additional funding. It will be in the few millions. It will not be in the billions or so that we have for Mount St. Helens, but it will be in the several millions.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his leadership, but I know of his great concern about the Boundary Waters in his area in Minnesota.

We also had another storm besides the incredible events at Mount St. Helens, the Columbus Day storm of 1962 when 8 billion board feet went down in both Washington and Oregon from an incredible storm. We have been there and seen that. In fact, that is how log exporting started in our country, because we had all this excess logs. We started exporting them to Japan and other countries. But we will be glad to work with the gentleman as we go through the process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for their understanding.

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

I want to talk about some positive things we observed during our visit to parks and forests in the Northwest. We saw a lot of volunteers there. I think one of the great stories of this bill and of our public lands is how many people, particularly senior citizens, volunteer their time.

One gentleman at Mount St. Helens who was telling the people all about what had happened there said he drove 60 miles each way every day to come up there and lecture, and he did a great job. He is doing this as a volunteer.

We are advised there are almost 300,000 people who volunteer their time, their energy and their knowledge serving in our public lands. I think that is a great story about the American people.

Secondly, in the number of visitors, we had over 1 billion 225 million visitor days in our public lands. I think this, too, illustrates how much the American people care about these lands.

Lastly, a little vignette that I observed at one of the places where they have the recreation fee demo program. They also had a place one could deposit some extra money if one chose to do so, and the jar was getting pretty well filled up, which said people are not only willing to pay a pretty modest fee, which they knew would stay in the parks or the forests or the wildlife refuges or BLM, as the case might be, but they also want to contribute some extra money.

So I think there are some really positive dimensions to this whole program in terms of how the American people feel about their public lands.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who has been a leader in this Congress on livability and particularly in the Columbia River Gorge where I had a chance to visit with him this last week.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, because I think they started the debate with the proper tone. It is a 50-year vision, and it is just a starting point, I hope, for this Congress.

What the bill talks about today is fundamental infrastructure for livable communities. As we try and deal with the consequences of unplanned growth around the country, the stewardship of our public lands both in wilderness areas and what happens in our developed communities are more and more important.

I wanted to thank the committee for their hard work to diffuse some of the volatile legislative hot buttons, being able to provide at least a stable funding for the arts and minimize the toxic riders that have obscured the important debate that has attended this bill in the past.

Last week, it was my pleasure to watch the hard-working members of this subcommittee and their staff in our region of the Pacific Northwest. I am pleased that they had a chance to look firsthand at the Columbia River Gorge where I am convinced that each dollar that is invested will go further than any place else in America in protecting a critical legacy. We saw firsthand the impact of the subcommittee's efforts to try and make sure that we are maximizing resources and working creatively.

I think it is important that we allow the fee demo program to be able to work its way out and to look at the impacts. I hope that, in the words of the

Chair and the ranking member, that what we are seeing here, although we will not be perhaps debating in heated form some amendments that may come forward, I hope that we will keep in mind what we are trying to do in terms of this being a starting point.

I am hopeful that this Congress will give the subcommittee the resources they need for today and tomorrow to be able to make the investment in protecting this legacy, not just for today but for the next half century.

I appreciate the hard work the committee has done and look forward to building upon it in the course of this Congress to be able to realize that vision.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY), who I know has been a leader on historic preservation issues.

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

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the funding levels in this bill for the National Endowment for the Arts. I am disappointed that this bill is substantially less than the President's budget request.

While I am pleased that the bill requires the NEA to give priority in granting funds for educational projects, I am particularly disappointed that the bill does not include funds for a new program, Challenge America, which includes arts education, youth-at-risk programs, cultural heritage preservation, and community arts partnerships.

As a former schoolteacher, I believe that a key solution to youth violence and a key component to youth development is access to the arts in schools. If we are serious about curtailing youth violence, it is imperative that adequate funding be provided to bring music and art to our children.

If the Challenge America program is funded, state arts agencies would receive 40 percent of these funds, and at least 1,000 communities nationwide will benefit.

Research has shown that arts programs can have a very positive effect on our youth, helping to increase academic achievement and decrease delinquent behavior.

Children who are exposed to arts perform 30 percent better academically. High-risk elementary students who participated in an arts program for 1 year gained 8 percentile points on standardized language arts tests.

The Smart Symphonies program initiated by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences provides free CDs of classical music for infants in response to findings that show, among other things, that early exposure to classical music increases a child's ability to learn math and science.

In Missouri's fifth district, the Young Audiences Arts Partners Program integrates community arts resources into the curriculum of participating school districts, with a focus on not only teaching students to appreciate the arts, but also on talking about issues that the arts raise in healthy, nonjudgmental ways.

Let us make a commitment to our children to provide them with the tools they need to be responsible citizens in a democracy, to make good, informed choices, to live in peace with their neighbors and coworkers, and to enjoy life to its fullest. Let us begin to show our commitment to our children by prioritizing funding for the arts and encouraging arts programs in our schools and communities.

Later in the debate, Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be offered to increase funding for the NEA, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for yielding me this time, and I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to call attention to an amendment that I will be offering along with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) later on in this bill.

That amendment deals with the issue of payment in lieu of taxes. As my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, there are some 1,800 counties throughout the United States that have land in them that is owned by the Federal Government. Over the years, the Federal Government has not kept faith with these communities and has not paid a fair payment in lieu of taxes.

In the Congress, especially in recent years, we have been hearing a lot of discussion about what is called devolution, more respect, more authority for local counties and local towns. It seems to me that if we are sincere about respecting our States and our towns that we should be fair with them in terms of providing them the payment in lieu of taxes that they need.

So I would hope that, when this amendment comes up, which affects some 1,800 communities in America, it affects some 49 States, and it is an amendment similar to one that won here on the floor of the House last year, that we will once again support it.

It is unfair, it seems to me, to take advantage of communities all over this country, force them to inadequately fund their infrastructure, education, the services they provide their people because the Federal Government is not properly paying the in lieu of tax payments that it should.

I urge support of this amendment when it appears later.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the provision within H.R. 2466 which provides Guam with an increase of $5 million for Compact Impact aid for next year. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their support on this issue.

This $5 million is very much needed for Guam, and it should be understood that it is really a kind of reimbursement for the cost of unrestricted migration to Guam as a result of U.S. Compact agreements with the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

□ 1600

For nearly 10 years, financial costs have totaled well over $70 million, and this year we have $4.5 million and we want to increase it by $5 million to $10 million. This helps defray the costs because the actual cost per year to Guam is around $15 to $20 million.

We take the responsibility of helping out our island neighbors seriously, and it is not a wrong thing to do, because it is a Federal responsibility. I know that in the upcoming debate there will be a point of order raised against this issue, and I very much ask all of my colleagues to consider the importance of this issue for a very small jurisdiction and the ultimate fairness of getting the Federal Government to be responsible, even though it only compensates for about half of the costs associated with this issue.

There was no effort on my part to attempt to divert funding from other territories for this issue; but in the final analysis, when we suggested other alternatives, this was the only one that seemed appropriate at the time. I am hoping that in conference all the issues related to territorial issues will be resolved, because there are a number of unmet funding needs that all of the small insular areas have to deal with, and I urge every consideration that the voting Members of this House can give to those who represent districts who cannot vote in this body.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank our distinguished Chairman for his commitment to the natural resources and national treasures of America. Chairman REGULA, his committee and staff have all worked tirelessly to present the legislation before us and they deserve our gratitude for their fine efforts.

In particular, I want to thank the Chairman for his personal attention to the maintenance needs of the Uwharrie National Forest. My constituents in the eighth district, as well as the thousands of frequent users from all over North Carolina, can look forward to safer, cleaner and better recreational experiences at the Uwharrie.

Again, I appreciate the time and thought put into this bill and to the Chairman's commitment to preserving the beauty of our nation.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all his efforts on this measure. I request unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the funding levels in the bill for the National Endowment for the Arts. I'm disappointed that this bill is substantially less than the President's budget request.

While I am pleased that the bill requires the NEA to give priority in granting funds for educational projects, I'm particularly disappointed that the bill does not include funds for a new program, Challenge America, which includes arts education, youth-at-risk programs, cultural heritage preservation, and community arts partnerships.

As a former school teacher, I believe that a key solution to youth violence and key component to youth development is access to the arts in schools. If we're serious about curtailing youth violence, it is imperative that adequate funding be provided to bring music and art to our children. If the Challenge America program is funded, state arts agencies would receive 40 percent of these funds, and at least 1,000 communities nationwide will benefit.

Research has shown that arts programs can have a very positive impact on our youth, helping to increase academic achievement and decreasing delinquent behavior. The YouthARTS Development Project is the result of a three-year collaborative effort of the Regional Arts and Culture Council of Portland, Oregon; the San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs of San Antonio, Texas; and the Fulton County Arts Council of Atlanta, Georgia; and Americans for the Arts of Washington, DC. YouthARTS is funded in part by the NEA, and the program is implemented through local partners across the country.

The goals of YouthARTS include defining the critical elements and ''best practices of arts programs designed for at-risk youth populations, strengthening collaborative relationships among local and federal partners, and leveraging increased funding for at-risk youth programs. YouthARTS has already conducted extensive research, which has shown that arts programs really can have an impact on youth, including increasing academic achievement and decreasing delinquent behavior. Perhaps the most amazing change occurred in Portland, where, at the beginning of the program, less than half of the youth were able to cooperate with their peers, but after participating in the arts program, 100% of these same youth were able to cooperate, and approximately one third of the participants reported a more favorable attitude toward school after participating. In Atlanta, 25% of youth who participated in the arts program reported a more favorable attitude toward school than they did before they began the program, and 50% reported a decrease in their delinquent behaviors. In San Antonio, more than 16% of the youth participating reported a decrease in delinquent behaviors.

Additional studies show that children who are exposed to the arts perform 30% better academically. High risk elementary students who participated in an arts program for one year gained 8 percentile points on standardized language arts tests. The Smart Symphonies program initiated by the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS) provides free CD's of classical music for infants in response to findings that show, among other things that early exposure to classical music increases a child's ability to learn math and science.

In Missouri's fifth district, the Young Audiences Arts Partners Program integrates community arts resources into the curriculum of participating school districts, with a focus on not only teaching students to appreciate the arts, but also on talking about issues that the arts raise in healthy, nonjudgmental ways. Let us make a commitment to our children to provide them with the tools they need to be responsible citizens in a democracy—to make good, informed choices; to live in peace with their neighbors and coworkers; and to enjoy life to the fullest extent possible. Let us begin to show our commitment to our children by prioritizing funding for the Arts and encouraging Arts programs in our school and communities.

Later in the debate, an amendment will be offered to increase funding for the NEA and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment offered by the Gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2466, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

My support of this legislation is somewhat of a precedent. Too often in recent years in this House, I have been forced not only to speak out in opposition to this important appropriation bill but to actively work to defeat the legislation. Whether it be the riders, non-authorized funding for pet projects, or major policy debates over logging roads and the future of the Northwest temperate rain forests, the Interior Appropriations have annually been a magnet to controversy and the inclusion of extraneous provisions. Fortunately, this legislation has avoided most of those fatal flaws. It isn't always money. But this Interior Appropriations Bill has culminated in a super-imposed untouchable and unacceptable bad policy in recent years. This year's bill is a much better result to this hour.

Such success is due to the bipartisan leadership of Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member DICKS. Under their leadership, the Committee has been able to forestall such controversial riders and policy provisions. Hopefully, that success will continue through today's floor action. A strong vote of support by this House will only strengthen the hands of the conferees in dealing with the inevitable add-ons of the Senate.

While I do support H.R. 2466, the bill does have several deficiencies. The principal shortfall is the anemic funding level provided in this legislation for many important programs. I recognize that this flaw is the result of the spending caps in law that afflict all domestic discretionary programs. The decision by the majority party to bleed dry these programs is a shortsighted decision that will undermine our national conservation efforts in the long run. While some seek to score political points in this legislation, the price of any rhetorical victories will be continued degradation of our national parks, forests and rangelands. Such continued degradation is a tragic political decision that will be exacerbated by the Chairman's amendment to cut an additional $138 million, 50% aimed at vital components of land management program and BLM land acquisition funding.

Today, this Body will have the opportunity to improve the legislation through the adoption of significant amendments. Such amendments include Mr. MILLER's of California, that will provide $4 million for the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program (UPARR) and Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment that will fund the state component of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. These programs, UPARR, LWCF, Emergency Energy Assistance Authorization, the Sanders Amendment, which tries to improve the Energy Assistance Program, are proven initiatives that provide crucial matching funds for local communities to improve and expand public recreational programs and facilities. With tight budgetary restraints, recreational program funding at all levels of government has suffered year after year. As a result, local parks and playgrounds are falling into disrepair and recreational programs are being closed. Those decisions are unfortunate. While our National Park System is our nation's crown jewels, our local park systems are our local family heirlooms. Our national parks are the place where traditions and memories are made and treasured. Local/State open spaces are the home to family picnics, youth soccer and baseball games, family nature hikes and the local concerts. They are the glue that bind our communities and families together. For this reason, President Clinton sought full funding of the LWCF/HPF within the context of the Lands Legacy Initiative 2000. To date, this initiative has unfortunately been sidetracked today's appropriation measure underlines the absolute need to set aside these funds in a trust fund provisions in this measure that are less than one-third the commitment and promise existing in law.

Today, our local parks and recreation programs are more important than ever. Just last month, the House debated the juvenile justice measure seeking punitive actions increasing penalties for juveniles who break the law. Today some amendments give us an opportunity to vote for youth crime prevention. At a time when Congress is acting on policy to put more kids in jail, it's high time we provide recreational opportunities and put more kids in youth sports, arts and other after-school programs and crime prevention activities that positively address the delinquency issue.

Unfortunately, the Committee chose to so inadequately fund the President's Lands Legacy Initiative. This new proposal would be a solid down payment on protecting and preserving our nation's critical lands. It is an initiative which should enjoy bipartisan support and provides a transition basis to rectify the current deficiencies in existing appropriation acts, that continue in this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of serving in this Body with Mo Udall. As Chair of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mo would speak eloquently of our stewardship responsibility to pass on America's natural lands and resources to future generations in as good a condition as we inherited it. This bill takes modest steps to achieve that goal but we can and should do better.

Hopefully by the end of the cycle this year we will be doing be.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his great appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee, and to all members of the Subcommittee for the inclusion of a $10 million appropriation for the first phase of construction for a replacement Indian Health Service (IHS) hospital located in

Winnebago, Nebraska, to serve the Winnebago and Omaha tribes. Of course, the Subcommittee is already well-aware of the ongoing situation with this hospital. Indeed, last year the Subcommittee kept the process going by including funds to complete the design phase of the project for which this Member and Native Americans in the three state region are very grateful. Now, construction dollars are needed.

Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget overruled Indian Health Service's FY2000 budget request for the first phase of construction, so there was no request by the Administration. Once the design is completed, it is important to begin funding for the first phase of construction without a delay. If there is a time lapse between completion of design and construction, it is very possible that costs will increase, making this project more expensive. That is why this appropriation action at this time is so critical.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member wishes to acknowledge and express his most sincere appreciation for the extraordinary assistance that Chairman REGULA, the Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee staff have provided thus far on this important project.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to congratulate Mr. REGULA, the Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, for his fine work on this legislation. However, I would also like to pay tribute to a provision within this legislation on the Pacific Crest Trial.

The Pacific Crest Trail is a marvelous stretch of land that runs from California, through Oregon, and into Washington state. Established in 1968, this trail operates over 2,650 miles with a large portion of that land owned by the Federal government through the Park Service, Forest Service, or BLM. However, nearly 300 miles of this trail are located on simple right-of-passage easements across public land or along public highways. The land along the highways, it should be noted, were never intended as permanent routes and today have become extremely hazardous for users of the trail.

It should also be noted that during the last 20 years, Congress has appropriated more than $200 million to the Park Service to acquire private land for the Appalachian Trail, an effort that is now complete. During this same time period, the Pacific Crest Trail, managed by the Forest Service, has received a fraction of that amount for land acquisition. As I stated earlier, the 300 miles of trail that run along dangerous throughways are the result of this failure.

I am pleased to announce that Chairman REGULA has agreed with many of my California Colleagues that this trail needs to become a priority. I am pleased that he saw fit to include a line-item of $1.5 million for this project in the Interior Appropriations Act. I am more pleased that the report language included will leave no doubt in anyone's mind of the importance that this project now holds.

I would like to thank Chairman REGULA on behalf of myself, my constituents, the many users of the Pacific Crest Trail for his leadership on this important issue.

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

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

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

The amendment printed in House Report 106–228 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be 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 a demand for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 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 interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), $632,068,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,147,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i)); and of which $2,500,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2000 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred; in addition, $33,529,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than $632,068,000, and $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities, and of which $2,500,000, to remain available until expended, for coalbed methane Applications for Permits to Drill in the Powder River Basin: *Provided,* That unless there is a written agreement in place between the coal mining operator and a gas producer, the funds available herein shall not be used to process or approve coalbed methane Applications for Permits to Drill for well sites that are located within an area, which as of the date of the coalbed methane Application for Permit to Drill, are covered by: (1) a coal lease, (2) a coal mining permit, or (3) an application for a coal mining lease: *Provided further,* That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. MCGOVERN:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 69, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $29,000,000)''.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to restore $30 million in funding to the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I disagree on this issue, but I want to thank him for his continuing graciousness as we take up debate on this important issue, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for cosponsoring this amendment and for their commitment to preserving open space.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a proven track record and strong bipartisan support. It is based on a simple idea, that the receipts from nonrenewal public resources, like offshore oil and gas, should be reinvested into a renewable resource: public open space.

Now a trust fund was established over 30 years ago to meet the need for more open space. In that time, tens of thousands of park and recreation projects across the country have been funded. Ball fields, scenic trails, nature preserves, and historical sites all have been saved for future generations.

Unfortunately, in recent years, Congress has chosen to walk away from its commitment to States and local communities. While the Federal funding of the LWCF, which protects Federal lands, has been funded, the State-side program has been zeroed out. By failing to fund the State-side program, we are walking away from an important promise. This amendment proposes to help rectify that mistake by redirecting $30 million in the bill to the National Park Service for the purpose of funding the State-side program.

This amendment offsets this modest step by reducing funding for the Energy Department's fossil energy research and development by $29 million and for the Bureau of Land Management's transportation facilities and maintenance by $1 million. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we should be arguing for much more than $30 million. It would take literally hundreds of millions of dollars to restore the trust in the trust fund and gives States what they are owed. All we are asking today is a modest step in the right direction.

Critics will argue that the States should take up the slack, that they should fund these projects by themselves. After all, many States have large surpluses, so why should they not foot the entire bill? I would point out the States have been and will be part of the State-side program. The program is a partnership, as States and towns match every Federal dollar.

By passing this amendment, we will urge States to use more of their own money to fund these vitals projects; we will help those States leverage money; we can help get open space preservation off the drawing boards.

That is why State and local officials across the country support the State-side program. Those opposed to this amendment should ask their governor, their mayor, their city counselor, their town manager if they support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Ask them if they could use a little Federal help in preserving parks and open space.

Last year 10 States, 22 counties, and 93 towns voted on open-space initiatives. Almost 90 percent of these initiatives passed, triggering over $5 billion in preservation spending. Clearly, America is saying something. It is time that Congress listens.

We have all talked about issues of sprawl and livable communities. We have all seen, often in our own congressional districts, space that was once open and green converted into a strip mall or a housing development.

Now is the time to do something about it. Kids in cities need safe green places to play in. Without safe, healthy parks they go home to school and back without ever interacting with a natural area, a few trees, some grass, and a place to explore.

Unused open space in a rural area is nature. Unused open space in a city is a vacant lot with garbage, glass, dirty needles, and crime. In the suburbs, family farms and woodland are being paved over, succumbing to the ravenous appetite of sprawl and development.

Time is running out. For every year we walk away from funding the State-side program, another park disappears, another open field vanishes, another healthy green space is lost forever.

This amendment, as I said, is supported by every major environmental organization in the country. It is supported by our Nation's governors, it is supported by our Nation's mayors, it is supported by the National Association of Realtors. That speaks clearly to the broad support enjoyed by the State-side program.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to reinstate the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to support a healthier environment for us all.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have to rise and object to this amendment. We are faced with $15 billion in backlog maintenance in our parks, in our forests, and our other Federal agencies. In 1999 every State had a surplus. All States have a surplus. Forty-nine States had a surplus in 1998. It seems to me it is time for them to measure up in meeting their own needs.

The fact of the matter is they probably ought to send us some money to support our parks, because every national park, every national forest, every fish and wildlife facility, every BLM is in a State, and it is providing recreation. It is providing all kinds of benefits for the people of these States, and I think these facilities need additional support. The States should accept responsibility.

I can remember when there was a State-side program. A lot of the money went into golf courses, marinas, swimming pools, tennis courts, and other facilities of that type. I do not think it is the Federal responsibility to fund these programs for the States. They should meet their own needs. They have the money to do it with.

Thirteen States had a surplus in excess of $1 billion in 1998. Twenty-one States had a surplus in excess of 10 percent over their annual funding. One State has three times what it needs to manage its annual budget. Yet here we are talking about sending out some of the desperately needed money that we should use for additional land acquisition, where we have inholdings in our parks; to meet the maintenance needs of our parks; to do a responsible job of managing these parks.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think that the States should take their own responsibility and use their surplus funds to meet their needs, because many of these programs are coordinated with the Federal facilities, and certainly it is something that they have the resources to do that with. The responsible position on this amendment is to vote ''no,'' to retain these funds for the Federal challenges that we have.

And, of course, the offset is fossil energy. This is an important program. The fossil energy program guarantees our future in terms of energy. Just this week it was announced that the price of gasoline was going up. How do we know there will not be another OPEC crisis? In this bill we are trying to provide the resources to DOE to ensure that that does not happen. If the States are to continue that kind of prosperity that is giving them these huge balances, they need to have a strong economy. A strong economy is built on energy all across the board. And to take a bite out of fossil energy research is certainly shortsighted in this day and age, because we have no idea what the needs will be.

Our energy programs are not only useful in terms of developing new techniques to use the resources we have, coal, natural gas, and the other types of energy that is part of the ownership of the United States, but these programs also generate jobs in the United States because we sell this technology to other countries. China, with 1.2 billion people is very energetically trying to get into the 21st century, and they need power. They need to use their coal resources. They will buy the technology that we develop in our fossil programs. That is good for America and good for jobs.

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

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned we take a bite out of the fossil fuel research and development account. My bill takes $29 million from an account that is in excess of $360 million. That is 8 percent, $30 million to go to help preserve parks, to help preserve ball fields and recreational areas for our kids in cities and suburban areas.

We all talk about livable communities, and $30 million is not that much. Quite frankly, as I said, we should be asking for much more than that, given the promise this Congress made to the American people.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right, it is not that much. Spread over 50 States, it would barely make a dent. About all we would get done is hire the people to administer the funds. I think it is unrealistic to think about $30 million, and yet it would cripple some of these important fossil programs.

Furthermore, we have to take care of the maintenance of what we have. We have a Federal responsibility. These funds are generated from Federal lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, these are funds are generated beyond the 3 mile limit offshore. The States get the revenues from their own State lands, and they get the revenues from the first 3 miles from offshore.

We asked the National Governors Association to tell us how much the States collect in revenues from their own lands, and they would not tell us. They did not want us to know because that would be something that would not be terribly attractive when they are trying to get their hand in the Federal till.

But I also might point out that the States now get over $600 million that they share with the Federal Government on royalties and payments to counties and so on. So keep in mind we are already doing a lot, and that coupled with their own State funds from their lands is more than the Land and Water Conservation Fund in total.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, $30 million may not sound like a lot of money to some people in this chamber here, but it means a lot to some of the communities.

We are talking about towns trying to acquire land that may be only a couple hundred thousand dollars. And every State under this bill would get some money. The State of Ohio would get close to $1 million. That money would mean a lot to a lot of communities trying to protect open space and park land.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the interior appropriations bill and in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member; and the members of the subcommittee have done an excellent job on the bill, and I applaud them for their efforts.

I am also pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), in support of our amendment to offer additional funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We in New Jersey see firsthand the benefits of natural resource protection. The citizens of my State have used our collective wisdom, I hope, to voluntarily preserve 40 percent, let me repeat, 40 percent of our land by the year 2010. The Garden State has a national reputation for making consistent efforts to preserve and protect our natural resources.

Between 1961 and 1995, New Jersey voters approved bond issues totaling more than $1.4 billion to acquire 390,000 acres of open space to preserve historic sites and to develop parks. Last November, there was overwhelming voter approval of a $1 billion open-space initiative.

□ 1615

Local citizens not only in New Jersey but on a national level keep making the argument that we are losing open lands to housing complexes, to shopping centers and that we need to do something to save our open spaces.

Today, we continue the fight to revitalize the Federal portion of the open space partnership. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, or what has been called the ''cornerstone of American conservation and recreation,'' should be strengthened.

Our Nation is enjoying tremendous benefits from the LWCF. Since 1965, the LWCF programs have provided New Jersey with over $145 million in matching funds to acquire open space and develop recreational facilities.

America's favorite park is not one of those big parks somewhere else. America's favorite park is the neighborhood park that America can get to.

For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund supported the first county park to open in Hudson County, New Jersey, in nearly 80 years. It also helped us add nearly 650 acres to Jenny Jump State Forest and to develop Liberty State Park, one of our Nation's most historic attractions.

These tremendous benefits do not stop in New Jersey. LWCF is doing wonderful things across the country. We can make preserving our open spaces a priority, but we need to preserve land. And the need to preserve land exceeds the supply of State and local funds. That is why we must restore the Stateside funding for LWCF. It would help us to acquire lands across the United States that are truly of national significance, from our precious coastal areas in California to the New Jersey highlands region.

It would help our Nation continue to develop urban waterfront parks, a vital part of restoring cities. And each State's growing partnership in preservation with local governments and nonprofit agencies would benefit from a restored Stateside allocation.

Across the United States, local governments are leading the way in the preservation of lands and natural resources, but they need Federal help to build on and complement what the States are already doing. This money could be used to protect our Nation's shorelines, to reduce pollution, to preserve open land, to increase recreational opportunities, and to maintain wildlife.

We are doing our part in New Jersey. Now we are asking that the Federal Government join us in our partnership by restoring Stateside funding for LWCF.

New Jersey's commitment to open space protection has helped increase awareness for environmental concerns throughout the country. We must take action today to protect open space and to provide outdoor recreation facilities across the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support the McGovern-Campbell–Hoeffel-Holt amendment for Stateside funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

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

Mr. Chairman, here is the story: The money comes from a fund. The fund was created out of the leases on offshore oil. And a compromise was worked out. The compromise was in 1965. The compromise said, since there is serious environmental questions about offshore oil leases, nevertheless, there is a serious energy need. We are going to allow those offshore leases outside the State boundaries, but the money is going to go to create, maintain, preserve environmentally sensitive areas both on the coast and elsewhere.

That was the compromise. That was the quid pro quo which led to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The problem was that the exact expression of the compromise was not written into law and, as so often happens in the Congress of the United States, understandings that were reached at one time that were not reduced to the precise words of the statute were forgotten. As happened ever since we began the process of using trust funds to fund our deficit, the Land and Water Conservation Fund built up; and year after year, we used it just like we did the Social Security trust fund, to make the deficit seem smaller.

That is the story. That is what has been happening.

Now, we are all very proud of the fact that we might be coming to a point where we need not actually any longer borrow from the Social Security trust fund. In fact, we still do borrow from it. I think all of us remember last year we dealt with the borrowings from the Highway Construction trust fund and we said that was wrong, we should not continue to borrow from that trust fund for general revenue purposes to make the deficit seem smaller.

And any colleagues will remember that this year we finally got around to deal with the Airport trust fund, the fund that was created out of the fees charged to airline passengers that that money would not simply be used as a general slush fund to make the deficit seem smaller but that, in each case, we would use the money that we raised from the American people for the purpose that we said we were intending it when we imposed the tax or the charge or the fee in the first place.

So if that is the Social Security, we will put it away in a lock box for social security purposes only. If that is the Airport trust fund, it would only be used for improvements in safety in airports. If it is the gas tax, it would only be used for improvements of our interstate highway system and those systems that connect to it. In other words, keep the promise.

In the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we have not kept the promise. This fund generates over $900 million each year, this year in particular, and yet we are allocating just over $200 million for its intended purpose, the acquisition and the preservation of Federal lands.

At this point, I should say, and I should have said at the very start, I have nothing but the highest regard for the chairman of the subcommittee. He has always been very honest and forthright in his dealings with me. And I know that he personally would like to see more money available for the Federal component of preservation, acquisition, enhancement of our natural treasures.

I agree with the chairman that we are underfunding our parks and maintenance thereof. I totally agree with him. I just wish we could find more money for that purpose. But what I do not think is right is to continue a process of using money raised for one purpose for another in order to make the deficit seem smaller. We should not be borrowing, essentially, $700 million out of the $900 million that are raised from these offshore oil lifting fees for purposes that were never intended. They are going into the general revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee to engage him in a colloquy if he would like.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague, he understands that we have a moratorium on drilling in the Federal waters offshore California that would normally be generating these revenues?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. REGULA. So I think it is a little bit out of place in a sense for California to want this money.

But, aside from that, am I correct, this is not limited to the purchase of land by the States? They could build marinas. They could build swimming pools. They could build tennis courts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time just to respond, if my colleague believes in federalism, the States should control the priorities set for the resources devoted to the States.

I quite agree with the point of the gentleman that there ought to have been dedication of some of this money, if not all of it, to the Federal side. But I did not control the amendment this year. This year the amendment is a very small one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CAMPBELL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the point the gentleman made, it is the ''Land and Water Conservation Fund.'' Conservation includes taking care of maintenance. It means conserving the resources. We are using the money in this way. We did not use all of it to buy land, but we use it for conservation of our national resources.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may put a question to the gentleman in return. If I have this wrong, I stand ready to be corrected.

Is it not true that the fund raises $900 million?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, and yet we are only devoting in the bill of the gentleman $205 million to this intended purpose?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. But we are also spending a lot of money on maintenance and conservation, which was part of the intent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman has very good purposes for the money. I just do not think it is the purpose intended in setting up this system.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was to preserve, to acquire, to maintain special land as a quid pro quo for allowing the lifting fee. And when we use it for other intended purposes, it is no different than using the Social Security trust fund or the Airport trust fund or the Highway trust fund.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it depends on the definition of the gentleman of ''conservation.''

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words and speak in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we are not against livable space; and we are not against parks. We wish that the authors of this amendment would have sat down and talked to some us who come from areas where fossil fuel is important, and we could have had a discussion with the authors to try to determine how we might have accommodated what they want to accomplish without hurting something that is incredibly important not only to our States and to our region but to this country and, in fact, to the world.

In December of 1997, I was in Kyoto when we passed the Kyoto agreement. I was not in favor of that agreement. I thought that we had made some errors. But I talked to some people from around the world that said, we need cleaner technology; we like what you are doing with cleaner coal technology; we like some of the things are you doing; there is a marketplace out there.

This committee has had to cut fossil energy research by over 20 percent in the past 4 years. To make further cuts at a time when the world is looking to us for new technologies so we can have cleaner air and more fuel efficiency is an irresponsible act.

The United States has large quantities of crude oil within our borders. I can remember the gas lines back in 1973, and I can remember the gas lines in 1979 during those Arab oil embargoes. For every barrel of oil that we produce in this country, we leave two barrels behind in the ground. We need to develop the technology.

I heard somebody mention earlier that we are only talking about 9 or 10 percent of the budget. I have not been in Washington, D.C., long enough to put the word ''only'' in front of $30 million. This $30 million would be crippling to what we are trying to do.

We just had the EPA saying that we are going to go to a particulate matter standard of 2.5 microns. That is going to require an even greater reduction in sulfur and nitrogen emissions. It is just a matter of fact. We have entire regions of our Nation, entire communities, where the workers who developed that coal, who mine that coal, who brought that oil out of the ground have given us cheap energy to build the economy that we have today. And now the authors of this amendment are causing us to say, because we do not want the States to be partially responsible for more livable space and for more park space and for reclamation of land, that we are going to tell those areas, the heck with you. You have already given us that cheap technology. We are walking away from you, we are turning our back, and we are going to take 10 percent of your money, and we are going to move it over here without having that discussion.

The electric utilities have already made dramatic reductions in their emissions. Sulfur pollutants have been cut in half from the 1990 levels. Our coal reserves in this country are equal to one trillion barrels of oil. At current consumption rates, we can fuel our economy for the next 250 years. Coal is the Nation's most affordable fuel for power generation. It is why the U.S. has the least expensive electricity of any free-market country. We do not want to have to balance livable space and park space and who is responsible for it against a significant portion of that research dollars. And, again, that is what the authors of this amendment are asking us to do.

DOE's research and partnership with industry has focused on technologies that permit us to use the full potential of fossil fuels without damaging the environment.

Some of us who come from, and I hate sometimes to use the word ''rustbelt,'' but for those of us who come from the Northeast and the Midwest where we lost tremendous numbers of jobs, areas where coal was mined, where oil was discovered, where the coal industry and the steel industry have gone down and people have been laid off by the tens of thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, we are trying to balance reclamation of those brownfield sites, reclamation of those inner city areas that could be used as parks, with the creation of jobs, with the keeping of jobs.

They are causing us now to make Sophie's choice, to decide whether or not we want to be able to reclaim those sites, whether we want to be able to promote livable space, and whether we want to kill what is left of those blue-collar industries that are still in our area.

We still, fortunately, mine some coal in Pennsylvania. We would like to be able to have more fossil fuel R&D so that we can continue to produce more coal and we can find a market for it.

□ 1630

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) said, and I associate myself with his remarks, we want to create future jobs of showing the world how they can better use those carbon-based fuels, whether it is oil, whether it is natural gas, whether it is coal, we can

take that technology and again creating a lot more jobs and new technologies here based on these old technologies.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It just struck me that we visited Mount St. Helens last week and they said that some of the ash from that disaster went all the way around the world and came back to Mount St. Helens. That illustrates how pollution travels worldwide. The point the gentleman makes is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) has expired.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it is not just the United States that needs clean energy technology but that the rest of the world have it because otherwise we pay the price along with their own people.

Mr. KLINK. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, I just want to make a few points.

The kind of research that is taking place with these dollars that they want to shift over, it is not that their program is not important but we are talking about research that would reduce pollutants to 10 times below current Federal requirements, that would boost power plant efficiency to almost double what today's capabilities are, from 33 to 60 percent, so that one power plant of the future can do the work of two of the world's power plants today.

If Members want to burn less coal, if they do not want to have to look at building more nuclear power plants and doing other things that may be distasteful, let us continue that kind of research. I just think that we could find a better way to do this. I think it is unfortunate the offset, again that you are making us take Sophie's choice. I would request and ask all of the Members that are listening to this, Mr. Chairman, to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a very simple purpose, to revive the State portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Under State law, law that has been in effect for 35 years, States are supposed to get a portion of revenues from offshore oil drilling to use for recreation and conservation projects. This amendment is a first step toward fulfilling that commitment which has been ignored over the past several years.

But this is not just a matter of fulfilling a commitment made to the States and the public when we allowed offshore oil drilling. This amendment would revive a program that had a proven track record of providing recreational facilities for millions of American families. This is a program that truly improved the quality of life.

There is no shortage of appropriate opportunities for using this money. Every State has a backlog of projects that has been piling up in anticipation of this money being restored. These projects will provide parks and playgrounds and preserve sensitive lands that otherwise would be subject to development.

The momentum for reviving the State portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been growing this year as more Members have learned about the good that has come from this program. My own Commissioner of Parks and Recreation, Bernadette Castro, of New York, has been a real leader in the effort. The various bills to take the program off-budget and guarantee it a stream of funding are evidence of that newfound support. But those bills will not come up for some time and will probably not provide any money next year. We need to act now.

I do not envy the plight of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) who is dealing with a difficult hand because there are so many restrictions on what he can do. I would like to, if I could wave a magic wand, give him and the subcommittee more money to deal with, because I think they deal with it in a very responsible way. But this is a long-standing commitment. This is just an entry to restore a program that has served a very useful purpose.

We talk a lot about family values. What is more important to the family than having these magnificent parks and recreational areas so that they together can enjoy a good life.

I urge support of the amendment. I want to thank the chairman and the subcommittee for being very thoughtful and deliberative in the process. I would point out to the distinguished gentleman that there are some who want to do away entirely with the clean coal technology program under the theory that if we do away with it, that is environmentally responsible because we are dealing with fossil fuels and we all know that they pollute a lot. I am not one who subscribes to that. I have worked with the gentleman as he well knows to protect the clean coal technology program and constantly improve it under the theory that if we have cleaner burning coal in the future, we are going to have a cleaner, healthier, safer environment for all of us.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Does the gentleman have any evidence that any of these 50 States that have surplus balances have given some money to the local communities to build their tennis courts and swimming pools and marinas?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I only can say, reclaiming my time, what the Governor of the great State of New York, George Pataki, has done. He went to the people of the State of New York and asked them, he put his name and credibility on the line and he got passed, the voters passed, a $1.75 billion environmental bond issue. That bond issue is used for a whole host of very worthy projects within the State of New York that helps improve the quality of life.

I just want to have this money which is earmarked for a specific purpose, a portion of it used for that specific purpose, because I think the families of America deserve improved parks, I know that is one of the gentleman's primary objectives, and recreational areas. I think we can make a dent in it by what we do here by voting for this very important amendment.

Once again, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

This amendment has a very simple purpose—to revive the state portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Under federal law—law that has been in effect for 35 years—states are supposed to get a portion of revenues from off-shore oil drilling to use for recreation and conservation projects. This amendment is a first step toward fulfilling that commitment, which has been ignored over the past several years.

But this is not just a matter of fulfilling a commitment made to the states and the public when we allowed off-shore oil drilling. This amendment would revive a program that had a proven track record of providing recreational facilities for millions of American families. This is a program that truly improved the quality of life.

And there is no shortage of appropriate opportunities for using this money. Every state has a backlog of projects that has been piling up in anticipation of this money being restored. These projects will provide parks and playgrounds and preserve sensitive lands that otherwise would be subject to development.

The momentum for reviving the state portion of LWCF has been growing this year as more Members have learned about the good that has come from this program. The various bills to take the program off-budget and guarantee it a stream of funding are evidence of that new-found support. But those bills will not come up for some time and will probably not provide money next year. We need to act now. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment and urge its adoption. I listened very carefully to the comments of my friend from Pennsylvania and

understand very well his concern about the fossil fuel research and development program that is being used as an offset for the proposed $30 million to be directed to the state-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I know that a number of my friends and my mentors from Pennsylvania have a concern about this amendment because of the offset.

It is only a partial answer to say to them that the offset represents 8 percent, certainly not a majority, 8 percent of the fossil fuel funding. A better answer, I believe, is that this amendment is not about fossil fuel research and development. As everyone knows, budgetary rules require us to have an offset. This is about restarting the state-side part of the land and water conservation program. If the fossil fuel program is as good as they say, and I have the belief that if it is as good as they say, then funding will be restored, funding will be provided. They currently receive $360 million for the fossil fuel program, and the state-side part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund gets zero.

If Members believe in the development of parks at the State and local level, if they believe in the development of recreational opportunities at the State and local level, we must pass this amendment to get this program back into business, and the fossil fuel programs supported by my very good friends will certainly attract their own level of support.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been the most successful of all Federal programs to direct Federal funding toward the acquisition of open space and parkland and to develop recreational opportunities. It is premised on very sound notion that when the nonrenewable resources on the Continental Shelf are developed for profit, that some share of that generated wealth should be given back to the Federal Government and the State governments to enhance recreational opportunities. It is the State part of that equation for 5 years that has not been funded at all. That is what we are trying to generate funding for through this amendment. These recreational opportunities are really the workhorse of our recreational opportunities in this country.

The programs to be funded by this State and Federal share would not be the parks with the grandeur of the Tetons or the vastness of Yellowstone but they would be the parks and recreational opportunities that people would use every day, the ballfields, the local parks, the swimming pools that all Americans need access to and that all Americans use. Even if they cannot afford a vacation out West, even if it is not accessible for them to go to Yosemite or Grand Teton, they can use these local recreational opportunities. That is what we are trying to restore. This State aspect of the Land and Water Conservation Fund worked well for a number of years although the entire fund has not been allocated the funding that it deserves, but for the last 5 or 6 years the program has not received funding at all.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement and rise in support of this amendment. This is a good amendment. This is a good bill. It does not have all the baggage on it that some of the bills have had in past years with regards to taking one step forward and two back. I commend the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member for their work.

On this particular topic, I think that this is an improvement, a modest improvement in this bill. This bill does not have enough money to go around, that is a problem we have to deal with through the 302(b) allocations and the budget caps that we have in place. The quicker we start facing up to that, the better off we are going to be.

But these dollars come, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated, from the Outer Continental Shelf and the fact is that we are pledged to take $900 million from that, available until appropriated, for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and a goodly portion of that should be going to the States. The fact is this bill has nothing in for that. It has less than a third of the money being appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and a small portion of the Historic Preservation Fund. It is almost over a billion dollars that were pledged using up one resource and investing in another. While this research on fossil fuel is good in itself, the fact is that we have to have a balanced bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) has expired.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on this and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I am pleased to rise in support.

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

I would simply conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying it is critically important that we get this State aspect of the Land and Water Conservation Fund back into business so we can provide the matching funds to State governments to provide those local recreational opportunities that are so important to all Americans.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because of the cause that the authors of the amendment have championed but because where they intend to take their offsets from.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be disinvesting in fossil fuel research in this country. We should be reinvesting. Here in the United States we have between 250 and 300 years of a coal supply. That is more recoverable oil than the entire world has. That is correct. That is more than the entire world has in recoverable oil. We should not be disinvesting. We should be reinvesting.

I have the honor and privilege of representing the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), a clean burning coal that meets all EPA requirements, low in sulfur and high in Btu. We should be investing in alternative uses of coal.

I currently have a bill pending before the Committee on Ways and Means to supply incentives, tax incentives so that we can take advantage of technology that already exists, where we can turn waste coal and raw coal into gasoline and into diesel fuel. These are the types of things we should be doing with fossil fuel research.

There is research being done at Penn State and Wilkes and many universities all over Pennsylvania and West Virginia. We should not be cutting research in these funds. We are too dependent in this country on foreign oil already.

I say to my colleagues in the Congress, we go through this fight every year. Every year this program is attacked. It has been cut significantly over the years. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the number that they have arrived at this year, protecting the research that is in this bill. I encourage all my colleagues to vote against this amendment. It is bad for Pennsylvania, it is bad for West Virginia, it is bad for Kentucky, it is bad for southern Illinois. We should defeat this amendment.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern-Campbell–Hoeffel-Holt amendment and add $30 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund state-side program, a program that funds local community needs, such as purchasing land for parks within a city itself. These funds come from Outer Continental Shelf oil drilling revenues. They are intended to be funded by $450 million annually for Federal land purchases and $450 million annually for state-side purchases. However, we only see a small fraction of that money for those intended purposes.

Since its inception in 1995, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been invaluable in protecting wetlands, wildlife refuges, endangered species habitat and creating parks and open spaces as well as providing land for recreation.

□ 1645

Stateside has protected more than 2 million acres of recreational land and helped develop more than 27,000 basic recreation facilities nationwide.

This year the President asked for $200 million for Stateside, but for the fifth consecutive year Stateside was zeroed out by the committee. It is time we invest in the Stateside part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This could mean more than $2.5 million for my State, California, and this amendment would mean a lot to most of the States in this Nation.

As our Nation grows, we must fund preservation because funding preservation is smart growth. If someone has land in one of my colleagues' areas, in their community, that could be purchased in their district for everyone in the district to enjoy, because I know I do, and I bet all of my colleagues do, actually, they should support this amendment. Open space preservation is smart growth, and it is a bipartisan idea that has generated great support across the Nation.

In the last election, there were 148 ballot measures from coast to coast regarding open space. Amazingly, 84 percent of these measures passed, showing the strong support that American people have for open space and for Stateside programs; and hopefully my colleagues will also support the Resources 2000 bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), H.R. 798, which would fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanently.

Please support the McGovern amendment.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the McGovern-Campbell–Holt and Hoeffel amendment, and I rise also to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for the job that they have done with this legislation under very, very difficult circumstances; and those difficult circumstances are one of the reasons that this amendment is here.

I believe that this amendment is an improvement to this legislation. I think it is an important amendment, it is an important amendment about the future of our local communities, about the quality of life, about the recreational opportunities of our families and about the preservation of important lands and important assets that provide the quality of life that most of us want for ourselves and for our constituents.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a fund that was developed out of a bargain between the development of the offshore oil and the preservation of nonreoccurring assets in our communities and throughout our Nation; and in the past, since 1965, we have appropriated some $3 billion to local governments, States and local governments, to help them protect and provide and conserve these assets. They have matched that with an additional $3 billion. That tells us the kind of priority that our local communities place upon this program.

But in 1995 it all stopped, it all stopped. One of the most successful programs that we have at the Federal level stopped. Since that time, if we were to put the money that this program was truly entitled to, there would have been an additional $2.5 billion that would have then been matched by another $2.5 billion, $5 billion going into improve the quality of life and to protect and conserve natural resources and assets and local communities based upon the priorities of those local communities.

Many speakers have gotten up here and told about how their States have passed bond issues to help to do this. Local jurisdictions have added to their tax revenues, they have added on to their sales tax, they have added on to their gas tax to try and protect these resources, and this money flows into that in a partnership with not only those local governments but with foundations and private individuals and corporations and others that contributed. This money becomes a catalyst for billions of dollars that benefit our local constituents and our local communities; and it is a very, very important amount of money. It is very important in the sense that the opportunities are being lost in so many of our communities through rapid growth to kind of provide the kind of protection that is necessary so we can have open spaces.

Yes, it might include a swimming pool or two; and, yes, it might include a swimming lagoon on important rivers and important reservoirs in areas that are regional facilities. And it might include trails, and it might include a lot of assets that local communities believe are important if they are going to provide the kind of quality of life that attracts families, that attracts businesses and that allows communities to thrive and to have a thriving economy.

That is what this legislation was set up to do, but the oxygen has been cut off, the money has been cut off for no good reason. Because it was not about this being a bad program or an unsuccessful program or a wasteful program. It was just a decision that was made. And yet the law remains on the books. It says we are supposed to dedicate this money.

This is very similar to the debates that we are having with respect to Social Security and we had with the Highway trust fund. We told the people of America that this money in this fund would be used for this purpose. There is a lot of concerns now that the offset is SPRO, or the offset is one of the energy funds.

Well, let me tell my colleagues the Stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund has been an offset for everything else this government has wanted to do because the money has been pirated out of this fund and used for whatever purposes to make the deficit look smaller or for whatever programs the Congress of the United States wanted to do. We owe this fund billions of dollars, and here we have an effort by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) to restore $30 billion for the next fiscal year so our communities can get on with improving the quality of life and protecting these assets. And as flush as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will tell us the States are, I do not see people saying we are not going to send them PILT or we are not going send them money, so this is about priorities.

But as flush as those States are, the list of projects that are essential and necessary to continue the growth; otherwise, do my colleagues know what they get? They get what we have in so many communities now, no growth, no improvements, no transportation improvements, because people see with congestion, the lack of quality of life, that they are not going to engage in that kind of economic growth.

This is one of the buffers that allows our communities to continue to be a decent place to live, a decent place to raise our children and to enjoy and to do business.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(On request of Mr. REGULA and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was reduced from 300 million to 25 in a Democrat Congress under the leadership of Mr. Yates, and I believe the gentleman in the well was a Member of the House at that time. I wonder how he felt about it at the time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I disagreed with it then, and I disagreed before that was done. I mean, I think that this fund, and, as my colleagues know, I have introduced legislation to provide for the full funding, the full funding on water conservation, half to the Federal side and half to the State side, and an overwhelming number of Members of this House of Representatives supported either my bill or Mr. YOUNG'S bill to do that because they are hearing from their communities and also hearing what my colleagues have been telling us about the backlog in national parks and national lands of this country that needs to be done there.

We have starved these funds. It has been a bipartisan effort to starve these funds. I am not blaming the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). He has come in almost at the end of the show where it is even more difficult to try to get his bill out of committee and meet the demands of this country. But that has been a bipartisan effort, but the time has come to reverse it. The time has come to reverse it, and this amendment is a modest step in the efforts to do that.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman would yield further, would the gentleman agree to lift the moratorium on offshore drilling in California so we could beef up the fund?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Why would I do that when the gentleman is stealing all the money?

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

(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 Massachusetts. This well-intentioned amendment would increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a goal I share. However, the programs proposed to be cut to offset this amendment are equally important and deserve another look.

By this amendment we propose to cut an additional $29 million from the fossil energy budget, and my friend tells me that is only an 8 percent cut. Well, let me tell my friend this program has seen steady decreases over the past 10 years, deceases of 7 percent, 10 percent, 13 percent depending on the year. Eighty-five percent of our U.S. energy supply currently comes from fossil fuels. This figure is going to go up, not down in the coming years. By the year 2015, 88 percent of the energy we consume will come from fossil fuels. The important research the Department of Energy performs on oil, gas, coal and other fuels is entirely directed at making these fuels burn more efficiently and with fewer emissions. I think these are goals we all support.

The emerging renewables, solar, wind and geothermal, currently supply less than 1 percent of the energy needs in the United States. Research on this small share of our energy supply has increased greatly during the last 10 years, despite its relative unimportance to our energy supply. I am all too aware that the Green Scissors Report, among others, has severely criticized the U.S. fossil energy research program. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, every July the fossil fuel research program becomes a convenient whipping boy for legislators looking for budget offsets. Well, I am sorry to see that these criticisms take no consideration of the fact that renewable energy still supplies a very small percentage of our energy needs.

As we work together towards a future energy-use environment of cleaner, more efficient fuels, we need to recognize that our energy supply, this country's energy habits, will not and cannot change overnight. Cleaner and more efficient means of accessing oil, gas and coal are sorely needed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my friends that the fossil energy program has been revamped and retooled in response to input from Congress over the past few years. The fossil energy program has shifted to focus on such exciting new technologies such as fuel cells which are clean burning, relocatable energy sources that fit perfectly into a deregulated power environment; the ''Vision-21'' clean power plant, which will combine existing technologies to greatly reduce emissions from our utilities; and gas hydrates, an exciting, hidden source of natural gas on the ocean floor that is estimated to offer hundreds or even thousands of times more reserves than all the existing fossil energy supplies combined.

Mr. Chairman, as our energy researchers have pursued this fundamental shift in response to congressional criticism are we governing responsibly and effectively if we continue to take ill-considered cuts out of this program? Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, and I want to salute my colleagues that have written it and brought it forward to us. I think that they have done a very, very important task for us and this is a very important debate.

Before I talk about the amendment and why I think it is a prudent one, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who has been faced with enormous challenges, a budget that does not match it, but I think a heart and a mind that has stretched to do magnificent things in our country. He is absolutely right that we are not committing the kind of resources that we should to the conservation and the protection of the lands that we are already responsible for. So in no way do my comments or should my comments be thought of as being critical of what he has done, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate his leadership and what has come from it.

When the Congress created the Land and Water Conservation Fund in 1964 to purchase land and water resources for the creation of open spaces and local and national parks and recreational areas, the Congress then took an enormous important step. One of my distinguished colleagues came to the floor earlier and said, this is Sophie's Choice. It is not. Sophie's Choice is a movie with a marvelous actress in it. This is not Sophie's Choice. This is about the Congress stepping up and really keeping at least part of her word from 1964.

□ 1700

Thanks to that congressional act, nearly 7 million acres of parkland are now protected, and over 37,000 State and local park and recreation projects have been created.

I cannot think of an action that the Congress has taken that meets with the success of this. This is one of the most meritorious cases in our Nation. In my district alone, with one of its great values being the environment and the protection of parklands and open space, nearly 8,000 acres have been preserved since 1964. In fact, it is an area that is one of the envies of our Nation because so much has been protected.

When we enacted the Land and Water Conservation Fund to an authorized level of $900 million, we continued to fund the program, but not at the levels that we had originally promised. In fact, they have gone lower and lower, and we have continued to divert funds away from land and water and conservation, and that is what this amendment tries to repair in a very small way today.

I think we should take the next step by fully and permanently funding the Act. My good and great friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), along with many others, seeks to do that. I am proud to cosponsor the Resources 2000 Act.

Today we are looking for just a small step. The Miller bill is the final big step. Of course, we know he wears a very large shoe, and that shoe would accomplish a lot if that step were taken. So I support this because I think it is important.

It is not only important because we see what it has done, but we know, as Auntie Mame said, that we have miles to go and places to see in our country. This is an act that gives our local governments and our State governments the right kind of leverage. It attracts, it becomes a magnet for private funds, and it is one of the ingredients for one of the greatest recipes of success in our country.

Going to our parks, I have been very fond of saying, is one of the cheapest vacations for the American people. We want them at all levels. Everyone cannot get to Yosemite. Everyone cannot get to a national park. So let us move on and take a small step of Congress reestablishing her word, the word that was established in 1964, and take this important step today by embracing this amendment. It is a great one, it is a good one. It will do good things for our country.

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

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment which would provide the funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund stateside matching grants program.

If I may begin first by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for the attention they have given to a number of Members who have concerns for some of the projects that are State and local in orientation, I know it has been a difficult task, and everyone has pointed that out, that the money is just not there to certainly fund all these programs. So I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the effort they have made.

By the way, I want to thank the staff, as well. For the most part, in every discussion we have had, the staff has been very willing to discuss options and try to help those of us who are interested in trying to provide some of those projects which are park-related to our constituents back home.

For someone like me who has nothing but an urban setting in his district, I am completely urban, I have nothing but L.A. city territory, I have a concrete forest that I represent, it is difficult sometimes to accommodate the needs, especially the green needs, of my constituents.

Let me give a quick example. While we are spending in this appropriations bill for the Department of Interior approximately $1.7 billion for the National Park Service, $1.2 billion for the Bureau of Land Management, and $840 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service, no money is being allocated at this stage for stateside matching grant programs under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

For someone like me, that means the following. About 3 years ago I attended a middle school in my district. I asked what I thought was a pretty natural question. We were talking about the environment. I asked some of the kids in this class of about 30 kids, when was the last time they were at the beach. Los Angeles is right next to the beach. I was surprised when no one raised their hand.

I asked, well, how many have been to the beach? And we are talking about kids who are in their teens. About three of the 30 kids raised their hand. I am talking about kids who live no more than 20 miles from the beach. Most of these kids had never been to the beach in Los Angeles.

The closest State park to me is about 45 miles away. The closest national park is more than 60 miles away. Most of these kids have never been to either one of those, and they have not even been to something as close to them as the beach in Los Angeles.

It is difficult for some of our communities sometimes, especially in our very urban settings, the inner cities, to have opportunities to let kids understand what it is to see wildlife, to see nature in progress. For many of us, it is important to be able to help.

There is a project in Los Angeles right now which could use funding from the Stateside matching grant program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In fact, it is a program, a project that right now has a public and private partnership underway where right now the city of Los Angeles, the State of California, and the business community, along with community groups, have come in and provided 85 percent of the money they need to get a local park going so people can use it.

There is a park in a hilly area of Los Angeles which few people know about and use. If we can get this funding at the Federal level to help just a little bit more, we will be able to help thousands of inner city children who do not have access right now.

I know it is tough and I know the chairman and the ranking member have tried, but this is an amendment that will provide a meager amount, $30 million of the billions that we will be spending, on something that is so valuable, especially for kids who sometimes do not have access to any of this.

It is a worthy amendment. It came close to passing last year. I hope we have success this time around, because ultimately what we are talking about here is not some big national park or some big local park, we are talking about the smaller projects that reach really close to home where kids could ultimately use these facilities.

If we do not do it, again, we are going to deny these children not just the opportunity to play and recreate, but the chance to get a better sense of what it means to know the greater part of the country and nature as well, because too often, in the inner cities especially, many of these kids grow up not knowing anything but concrete buildings.

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

Mr. Chairman, I see this conversation this afternoon as an effort to restart an important discussion. It is about keeping faith with our commitments with the States, keeping faith with the needs and the programs that they have.

As the gentleman from California mentioned a few moments ago, we rightly owe billions of dollars to the very States under the terms of the 1964 act. There are, indeed, other reasons. Not every State with a surplus, for instance, is responding in a way that deals with the park and recreation and open space needs.

In my own State, I am ashamed to admit, despite the strongest economy in anybody's memory, despite having perhaps the strongest one, in fact, for 2 years running we had the strongest economy in the country, and despite having a large ballot measure majority in support of parks and open space, I am finding our State legislature backing money out that has been approved by the voters, in efforts to shift it elsewhere.

So there are lots of reasons, lots of variations around the country that I have seen as I have worked with communities across the country dealing on livability issues.

But there is something else going on here. There is a massive grass roots effort where citizens at the State and local level are seizing control. In 1998 there were 184 initiatives on the State and local level. Eighty-seven percent passed, usually with overwhelming majorities. Citizens understand, in the words of our chairman and the ranking member, that it is important to invest in this timeless legacy. The time is now.

There are very complex and intricate funding packages that we are seeing developed across the country that have State funds, that have local funds, that have Federal funds under enhancements and transportation. We have land trusts. We have individuals coming forward, foundations. It is exciting to see people step forward to try and fill if the gap at this critical time and meet this critical need, sometimes moving past the politicians.

This $30 million is critical, not just because it will leverage literally hundreds of millions of dollars across the country. It is important because it restarts the discussion here about keeping our commitment with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I think it is going to be the start of something that is very big.

As we discussed at the initiation of the debate on this bill, we want to start the discussion of the budget with a 50-year vision for this country. Everybody in this Chamber knows that we are going to add money to the budget process before we get out of town at the end of the fall, or the summer, or whenever we are finally set free. We are going to add more money. Everybody knows it.

Voting today to keep our commitment to the States, to the localities, to this massive national grass roots movement to try and restore our legacy, is going to give leverage to our subcommittee to be able to fight the good fight, and it is going to give heart to people across the country who are working to try and make their communities more livable.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to share my biases.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be more comfortable if the State of Oregon, which had a surplus balance in 1998 of $15 million, had spent some of that on local projects? And secondly, would he be more comfortable if this amendment were limited to land purchases and not marinas and tennis courts and swimming pools and any of the other things that they might find desirable?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. As I attempted to make clear, I am embarrassed that my State legislature has broken faith with the voters of Oregon by taking away money that they just approved at the ballot box and using it for other purposes.

So I feel that there is a very mixed record on the part of States. That is

why I support efforts of the Committee on Appropriations to have appropriate guidelines for the disbursement of Federal funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has expired.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy under the leadership of this subcommittee to look for ways to provide more explicit guidelines to help make sure that we get the most bang for the buck.

I would be loathe, however, to tell some States and localities that have very particular needs for park and recreation that they could not have the restoration of a marina or for some type of open space.

I think we have seen dramatically different projects emerge as a result of this grass roots effort. I think it looks different than some of the things that frankly would raise my eyebrows from a few years ago.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was critical of the legislature for taking the money back, but I would have to point out that if this were to be done on a substantial scale, we ought to take it out of the 378 national parks. It has to come from somewhere. I know initially it is possible, but in setting up priorities, it could very well come out of parks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I just wanted to say that I think it is an inappropriate choice to cannibalize our national parks to keep a commitment that we have to State and local governments for their half of this fund.

I will work with the chairman, with the ranking member, as hard as I can to make sure that the gentleman has adequate resources to invest for the future without making a foolish decision to shortcircuit the next half century of preserving these great national treasures.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the McGovern-Campbell-Hoeffel-Holt amendment, but first to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for bringing to this floor a very good bill, and given the constraints they were under, bringing to the floor an excellent bill.

Focusing on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of today's session I had a chance to watch the floor. There, Member after Member rose to praise the women's soccer team that won the World Cup, to praise our heroes more eloquently than I can here, Michelle Akers, Mia Hamm, Brandi and Briana, so many who filled us with pride.

But will that praise merely be empty symbolism, or are we actually willing to do something? Are we just going to talk about what sports mean to our kids, about teamwork and confidence-building, or are we going to do something?

□ 1715

We who praise what this woman's soccer team has done, to make sure that girls as well as boys fill the clubs, fill the teams and are out there playing sports rather than being distracted by the latest splatter video game or experimenting with sex and drugs and violence, we who are so good at rhetoric need to put this Nation's money where our mouth is.

Likewise, we have to keep faith with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We promised the people of this country over 20 years ago that the funds obtained from offshore oil drilling would go to preserve open space in our Nation, across the country, for our national parks and also in the State-side program for recreation.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this amendment has been criticized because it means an 8 percent cut to coal research. But, Mr. Chairman, we have had not an 8 percent, not an 18 percent, but a 100 percent cut in the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. If this budget has got to be this tight, certainly the damage or the tightness or the inability to spend should be spread more equitably and $30 million should be found for recreation.

Mr. Chairman, most juvenile crime takes place between 2 p.m. and 8 p.m. What we need are supervised after-school activities, especially sports which build teamwork and which build confidence.

Mr. Chairman, in Montgomery County, for example, there are 1,000 soccer teams trying to play on a hundred fields. In Ft. Lauderdale there is a waiting list of a thousand kids waiting to play soccer. I had the chance to visit the grand opening of the new AYSO headquarters in the Los Angeles area, and everyone there involved in youth soccer said and asked just one question: Mr. Chairman, where will the children play?

The answer is to be found in this bill. It is time for us to expand the recreation facilities available to our youth and to have a vision of tomorrow's kids that involves teamwork outside and not splatter video games inside.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise today in support of the amendment of my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) to add $30 million to the State-side funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is a critical program to communities such as mine where our natural and human resources, in this case our youth, are both in jeopardy.

The funding provided by this amendment will give a tremendous boost to the efforts of our local communities to provide recreational outlets to our young people. Sadly, for the fifth year in a row the Interior Appropriations bill has not provided funds for this program.

Mr. Chairman, the development of new recreational outlets is overwhelmingly supported and needed by our constituents. In my district, the commissioner of parks and public lands has repeatedly called upon me to seek such funding as is found in the increase in the State-side funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

While some do, as we have heard not every community has a large surplus to spend. But even for the communities that do, it is time for the Federal Government to step up to the plate and do something positive for our young people and our communities, and it can do this through providing this funding.

I also want to take this opportunity to join my colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) in urging that all due consideration be given to the needs of all of the U.S. insular areas. While many of the districts of my colleagues are experiencing good fiscal fortunes, the non-State areas of Guam, American Samoa, and my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, are experiencing very tough financial times.

While our local governments are working to do all that they can to reduce spending and get our budgets balanced, we still need the assistance of the Federal Government if we are to be successful.

It is unfortunate and the cause of great concern when the needs of one insular area is pitted against the other, forcing us to choose between accepting financial help at the expense of another sister insular area. I urge the members of the subcommittee to be mindful of this fact as we go forward in crafting the final version of the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and urge my colleagues to support this modest $30 million allocation for state-side Land and Water Conservation funding.

Since its inception in 1964, the LWCF has been an American success story, enjoying support from both Republican and Democratic administrations.

For the past five years, however, this House has ignored the needs of states and communities that want to preserve open space. Cutting out State-side LWCF funding has handcuffed communities that want to purchase athletic fields, preserve historic sites, and ensure public access to pristine wilderness.

In Maine $32 million of state side funding has supported more than 700 projects—from the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, to Wolf's Neck Park, to the Deering Oaks Playground.

Today, the need for state-side funding is greater than ever. In just the past year, more than four million acres of Maine's ten million acre north woods has changed hands. Much of this land, which has traditionally been held by Maine-based companies, is now in the hands of out of state and multi-national corporations. A lack of funding has prevented the state from taking full advantage of the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect more of Maine's most valuable natural resources.

The Maine state legislature, with strong bipartisan support, recently approved a fifty million dollar bond package for land acquisition. But to have a significant impact, these funds will have to be matched with private and federal dollars.

State-side funding is absolutely critical for Maine, and communities throughout this country, to achieve their land preservation goals.

It's time for Congress to right the wrong of the past five years and fulfill its promise of funds for states and communities to preserve open space.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and empower local communities to preserve their natural resources for generations to come.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the House Livability Communities Task Force I strongly support the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Over the past several months I have been receiving letters from city and town planners, mayors, and town council members across Rhode Island expressing the importance of the Land Water Conservation fund to their communities.

Since 1966 the LWCF has provided more than $33 million, in grants, to the State of Rhode Island to preserve and protect open space and parks.

These funds have been used to make improvements to state beaches, in particular Misquamicut, Roger Wheeler, and East Matunuck all of which attract tourists from across New England.

The LWCF has also played a key role in the development of the State's park system. It is likely that without the LWCF Colt State Park, Lincoln Woods State Park, Fort Adams State Park and Goddard State Park would not exist as we know them today.

This amendment would provide the State of Rhode Island with approximately $308,000 for projects this may seem like a small amount of money but I can tell you from experience that money would go a long way to making improvements in Rhode Island's communities.

As a landscape architect, in both my professional and public careers I have seen first hand how these funds improve our communities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the McGovern amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, $292,399,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,300,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided,* That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further,* That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the ''Fire Protection'' and ''Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting Fund'' may be transferred and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further,* That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., Protection of United States Property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further,* That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, $11,100,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901–6907), $125,000,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to tell the Members that the plan is to roll any votes on amendments to about roughly 6:30 to 7 o'clock. Then the votes will occur on whatever amendments are pending. And we may continue some further action tonight, but there will be no more votes after that block that we do at that time.

So for purposes of planning, Members can count on that as being the format for the rest of the day.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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. 13 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 6, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 69, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment is supported by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). I should mention that last year a similar amendment passed this House by a vote of 241 to 185.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the very serious problem of underfunded mandates. It is an issue that we have heard a whole lot about in this body, of forcing citizens in close to 1,800 counties and 49 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 land. In other words, the Federal Government is not paying its fair share and is doing a disservice to local communities all over this country.

Just as an example, in my own small State of Vermont, over 50 towns in our southern counties are affected: Bennington, Rutland, Addison, Windham, and Windsor Counties. This amendment addresses the overall problem of underfunded payment in lieu of taxes by increasing funding for this program by $20 million from $125 million to $145 million.

Although this same amendment passed last year with broad bipartisan support, the conference committee only increased payment in lieu of taxes by $5 million instead of the $20 million increase that my amendment would have provided, which is why we are back this year.

Mr. Chairman, in real dollars, inflation-accounted-for dollars, PILT payments to counties and towns all across this Nation have been decreasing for a very long time. In real dollars since 1980, appropriations for payments in lieu of taxes have decreased by nearly $60 million, a 37-percent decline in value.

And while this amendment will not rectify by any means the entire problem, it will at least allow communities around this country to know that we understand their problems and that we are making some real attempts to address those problems by appropriating this $20 million. In fact, even if this increase is approved, it would still represent a 26.3-percent decline in value since 1980.

Mr. Chairman, I should add, and this is an important point, that the authorization for PILT today is approximately $260 million, over twice the appropriation level. In other words, the authorizers understand the problems facing the communities all over this country; but unfortunately in recent years for a variety of reasons, the appropriation process has not followed suit.

Mr. Chairman, the PILT program was established to address the fact that the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the land that it owns. These Federal lands can include national forests, national parks, Fish and Wildlife refuges, and land owned by the Bureau of Land Management. Like local property taxes, PILT payments are used to pay for school budgets, law enforcement, search and rescue, firefighting, parks and recreation, and other municipal expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the important point has to be made. In recent years in this body, there has been a lot of talk about devolution, a lot of talk about fiscal responsibility, a lot of talk about respect for counties, towns and cities. And yet what we are saying after all of that talk is, gee, we do not have to pay our bills. We talk about respecting local governments, but yet we do not have to own up to the fact that we owe them substantial sums of money.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is operating under real budget restrictions, and I happen to believe that we should do away with those budget caps and address many of the issues that we face. But I think when we deal with basic priorities, how do we talk about devolution and then turn our back and then say oh, yes, we will continue to owe counties, cities, and towns substantial sums of money?

Mr. Chairman, the $50 million that we are using for these purposes include $20 million in payment in lieu of taxes and $30 million for deficit reduction. Our national debt is still over $5 trillion. This amendment begins to address that issue. The funds would be transferred and offset from the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program, a program we have heard a whole lot about in the last few minutes. But let me say this in regard to that program. Let me quote from the report of the fiscal year 1997 Republican, underlined Republican, budget resolution. And I quote: ''The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SANDERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this is the Republican budget. ''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 has ample incentive to undertake. Some of this activity is simply corporate welfare * * *''

This is not the gentleman from Vermont; this is the Republican budget resolution. ''* * * corporate welfare for the oil, gas and utility industries. Much of it duplicates what industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technology for which the market has no interest.''

Mr. Chairman, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the beneficiaries of the fossil fuel program are some of the largest multinational corporations in the world including Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, ARCO, and Shell. These companies in fact are making large profits. They do not have to come to the taxpayer for all of this support.

So I think the time is now to be fair to communities all over this country, and I would urge support for this important amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a temptation to dip into the fossil program. It is a little bit ambiguous. If this were the late 1970s, we would not have any such amendments. We would have amendments increasing the fossil research, because when people were sitting in gas lines in the 1970s, when schools were closed down, hospitals were suffering for lack of fuel, we could not give enough money for fossil energy research. Now at this moment we have an adequate supply, so some say let us not worry about next week or next year, just cut the programs. And then if we have another crisis, we will dump a lot of money in.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) one of the reforms we instituted is that on any of these programs, there has to be a match. We are not saying give them the money. That is what happened in the 1970s, when we shoveled money out with no requirement for matching funds. Now companies that want to do research on new fuels, California of course has reformulated gasoline which came out of the fossil program, they have to put up their own money to show that they believe in the program and that it is effective.

So I think to just take a cut at fossil is not the right policy for the future of this Nation. And I think some of the arguments that were made earlier are clearly along those lines.

We have reduced fossil by 20 percent over the 4 years of our watch in this committee. At the same time, we have increased PILT funding by 23 percent. And I would point out that this bill is flat funded.

□ 1730

So if we go to PILT for more money, we have to do less for something else.

I understand that communities would like to have this money. But one of the things they do not take into consideration is that when we develop Federal facilities it energizes the visitor base, it energizes a lot of activity that does bring money into the communities other than just from PILT, because they have a lot of tourism, they have those kind of activities that are important to the communities that have Federal facilities.

It would be nice to put more money in PILT if we had more money. But given the fact that we have a very tight budget, given the fact that we had 2,000 requests for projects from the Members of this House, we have done the best we could.

We recognize that fossil research is important for the future of this Nation and to maintain energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

Once again, let me point out, I know the gentleman's job is a difficult job, and he has to balance a whole lot of needs.

I guess what I am arguing, and I am glad to hear that companies like Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, some of the largest conglomerates in the world, are contributing something into the program. I am glad to hear that.

But the bottom line is, do my colleagues not think these companies, many of them, are enjoying record-breaking profits? Do my colleagues not think they can pay for their own research and developments rather than stick it to local communities, many of whom have got to raise their regressive property tax to fund their basic needs? That is the only point that I would make.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is easy to pick out the big ones and point to them, but a lot of this money goes to very small companies that have innovative ideas. Every company started with an idea that one person had, whether it is Bell Telephone, Graham Bell or whomever. We find that most of this research is being done by small companies. They come up with their 50 percent. It is not easy for them to do it, but they believe in their ideas.

A very small amount, relatively, is going to the large companies. They are doing a lot of research on their own.

But my concern is that we as a Nation do not want to become dependent for energy on other outside sources. We are going to spend $265 billion on defense. One of the most important elements of the defense of this Nation is

to be energy independent. We found out in the late 1970s what it means to be dependent, in that case on OPEC. They called the tune, and we had lines for over a mile at our gasoline stations. We are trying to avoid that by looking to the future.

We have cut it 20 percent over the last 4 years. At the same time, we increased PILT 23 percent. I have to say to the gentleman, I think that is responsible management, given the amount of resources we have.

I know it is easy to take a whack on the fossil program. We have a prior amendment that has taken a whack on fossil. It is becoming the bank for every amendment that comes down the pike because it is sort of easy to attack because it is hard to visualize the benefits of a program like fossil energy research.

But the State of the gentleman from Vermont, I am quite sure, is very dependent on outside sources for energy. He would want his State to be energy independent for his industry and his other base to have the energy it needs. So I hope that the Members will reject this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) for their hard work and diligence on this issue.

I would like to note that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of Subcommittee on Interior who is running this bill here today, has been a friend of the PILT program.

While it is true this appropriations bill is flat funded, it requires difficult choices between many worthwhile projects and many worthwhile programs. But our amendment here, this amendment I am pleased to cosponsor with my friends, is really an amendment to help one of our local units of government, the local folks all across this Nation. The gentleman is right, we have to make priorities. Today I am going to stand with local units of government and ask for an increase in the PILT spending.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor and strong supporter of this amendment, it would only restore desperately needed funding to the PILT program. Each year, thousands of counties across this Nation lose out on millions of dollars of property tax revenue simply because the Federal Government owns the land.

In my district, the Federal Government owns large portions of land. For example, approximately 70 percent of the land in Gogebic County is in the Ottawa National Forest and owned by the Federal government. Since the Federal government does not pay property taxes on its own land, the PILT program was established to compensate counties for land the Federal government owns.

Since its adoption in 1976, however, the PILT program has neither kept pace with its authorized funding levels nor with the true costs of providing services in support of Federal lands. In fact, the PILT program is currently funded at less than half its authorized level.

Rural counties rely on PILT payments to provide essential services such as education, law enforcement, emergency fire and medical, search and rescue, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services. Without adequate funding for this program, rural counties struggle to provide these vital services.

Mr. Chairman, if the Federal government was required to pay taxes on the property it owned like any other individual or corporation, it would have been delinquent a long time ago for failure to pay taxes. The Federal government owned so much land in some of these counties, some school districts in my congressional district cannot even bond for school improvements, for school repairs or to build new schools because there is not a large enough tax base in the county for the bond marketers to loan them the money.

So this decision and the decision we will make here tonight goes a long way in not only trying to bring some equity into the PILT program but the effects are much greater than just simply government paying its share of taxes. It is allowing communities to exist, to make improvements, and to have an equitable economic base to exist.

The Federal government has decided that it is in the best interest of the Nation to own and protect certain lands. I do not think anyone would argue with that. What we are arguing here tonight, what our amendment says, is that we must not penalize our local communities because they have the good fortune to have the Federal government have jurisdiction over land within their counties. It is irresponsible for the Federal government to take these lands off the tax roll and then not provide just compensation.

Again, since 1976, the value of that program has shrunk by more than 50 percent. Mr. Chairman, this request is only for a small increase in the PILT program, but its impact and importance on the rural counties is large.

I urge my colleagues to cast a vote in favor of equity by voting in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues who have previously spoken about the amendment in offering our praise to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, for the consideration that he has given in providing the funding for payment in lieu of taxes. It is reassuring and comforting to know that the committee has time and again kept faith with county governments across this country in recognizing the obligation of the Federal government to those areas of this Nation from whom land has been taken and put in public trust.

I understand the very difficult balancing act that the chairman has had to engage in. I was an original author with our former colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, Frank Evans, 25 years ago of this language. We started out with a provision that would have provided full tax equivalency, a great idea, great goal. I see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) smiling about that, and I think he was, in principle, agreeing with us.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I can remember when Frank Evans offered the amendment in the Subcommittee on Interior that created PILT and was legislating on the appropriation. But I gather the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) did not object.

Mr. OBERSTAR. No, we did not object then.

A lot of things we do not object to legislating on appropriations bills, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio.

But we realized that that was not going to work when it turned out that one county with 1,500 people was going to get $4.5 million under this bill. So we agreed to limitations. But we also thought that successive governments, successive administrations would agree to increase the funding to keep pace with inflation. That has not happened in 20 years.

What we are doing here is helping the committee with a reallocation of priorities within its jurisdiction. We are in no way criticizing or increasing the total dollar amount but saying this should represent an adjustment of priorities within the committee's jurisdiction.

One simple down-home example, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has already cited, Cook County, Minnesota, 900,000 acres, 9 percent is in private ownership. Nine percent of the land has to support 100 percent of the demands and 91 percent of the rest of the property. Three thousand six hundred people have to support all of that territory.

In the summer, there are 15,000 tourists that come into that area. Those tourism dollars do not pay for the cost of ambulances. They do not pay for the cost of emergency helicopters to go into the remote areas to rescue people who have been injured in canoe trips. They are not paying right now for the disaster that has swept through this area that I described earlier this afternoon with the July 4th storm that blew down 250,000 acres of trees, 6 million cords of wood on the ground now. This is going to be devastating for Cook County.

But they need this little bit of increase in funding to be able to meet the requirements of serving the public. They do not do it just in the summer

months. They do not do it just now and then. Every day of the year that county government has to, with only 9 percent of the land, provide 100 percent of the cost, and we have not given them the resources. They cannot develop those public lands. So this little bit of payment helps make the adjustment.

The investment that the county has made, I have looked at these funds over the years, Mr. Chairman, they invested in capital equipment. They invested in capital improvements, in facilities that served the public. They are not using this money to cover the operating costs of the county, in the case of Cook County, nor in the case of Lake County or Saint Louis County. They are making permanent capital improvements to better serve the public. That is where these dollars go.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman's remarks. I just mention to the Members that this amendment was endorsed by the National Association of Counties, by the Taxpayers for Common Sense, by Friends of the Earth, by the Rural Public Lands Council, by the Sierra Club, by U.S. PIRG, and by Public Citizen.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, just in conclusion, for all those who, and most of us do, support holding land in public trust for the use of all of our citizens, the common heritage of all Americans, these forest lands and park lands and wilderness lands, think of those who live on the perimeter whose lifestyles and livelihoods depend on that land held in public trust for all Americans and realize that, were they given the opportunity, they could have made some investments.

The payment in lieu of taxes helps replace the lost dollars. Support this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, last year two hundred forty-one of us voted for an amendment to increase Payments in Lieu of Taxes by $20 million. Unfortunately, this addition for PILT was left out of the conference report.

This year we are again asking Congress to address the Federal Government's responsibility to help support local governments in areas where the Federal Government owns the land, removing it from the local tax base.

Federal landownership may not be as large an issue in my State of Kentucky as it is in others; however, for fiscal year 1998, local governments in Kentucky experienced nearly a $70,000 PILT loss from the previous year.

I support fossil fuel research and development projects, as these investments help make our energy more efficient, affordable and clean. However, the standard rate of PILT payments is authorized to increase from $1.47 per acre to $1.65 for this fiscal year. Full appropriation to meet this amount would have to more than $200 million at minimum.

This amendment to provide a 16 percent PILT increase helps us to begin to reduce the continued shortfall between PILT authorization and appropriations.

Kentucky county governments that receive PILT payments depend on these funds to help provide basic services, from education to waste removal.

Edmonson County in my district is home to Mammoth Cave National Park. With a population of just 11,000 and a per capita personal income of $12,000, the importance of PILT payments to the continuation of county services at a bearable cost to the taxpayers can not be understated.

PILT funds help pay salaries and administrative expenses of the county. They help support a 24-hour ambulance service for the National Park, as well as county residents. Federal land control has contributed to the isolation of many areas in Edmonson County. When major transportation routes expanded, the county was bypassed, in favor of areas with a larger tax base to support the projects. Equitable PILT payments are needed to make up for the tax base Edmonson County has given up for the National Park.

The concerns of Edmonson County are not unique. As the Federal Government continues to place responsibilities on local governments, PILT increases are necessary to relieve taxpayers nationwide.

The Bureau of Land Management reports property taxes would provide local governments with $1.48 per acre on average. PILT payments amount to just more than 17 cents an acre.

Last year's PILT payments were 54 percent less than authorized by the Payment In Lieu of Taxes Act. This law requires the Federal Government to compensate local governments as an offset in lost property taxes due to Federal ownership.

A majority of us voted to increase PILT payments last year. Please join me again in a vote to add $20 million to PILT to help often-struggling rural areas provide vital services to their residents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94–579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, $20,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; $99,225,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102–381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq., and Public Law 103–66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

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

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

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

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, $710,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, except as otherwise provided herein, of which $11,701,000 shall remain 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, and of which not less than $2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $6,532,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsections (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii): *Provided further,* That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to $400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to $1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses: *Provided further,* That hereafter, all fines collected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for violations of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1362–1407) and implementing regulations shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for the expenses of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in administering activities for the protection and recovery of manatees, polar bears, sea otters, and walruses, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, sums provided by private entities for activities pursuant to reimbursable agreements shall be credited to the ''Resource Management'' account and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That, heretofore and hereafter, in carrying out work under reimbursable agreements with any State, local, or tribal government, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may, without regard to 31 U.S.C. 1341 and notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, record obligations against accounts receivable from such entities, and shall credit amounts received from such entities to this appropriation, such credit to occur within 90 days of the date of the original request by the Service for payment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 11, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,130,000)''.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington reserves a point of order.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard a debate over why we should transfer money out of clean coal technology to a fund that was designed for conservation and protection of land and environment.

□ 1745

And we heard several people say that we ought to live up to that commitment, that that is the purpose for that fund. And we are going to vote on that in a little bit. This bill, in conjunction with the rest of the bills, has just as much commitment that should be attached to it.

I wanted to take a minute first and say to the chairman and the ranking member how much I appreciate the cooperation that they have given us this year in working on this bill, in taking our suggestions towards savings and the collegial manner in which they accepted some of our ideas and did not accept others. I am appreciative of the hard work they have done and the attitude with which they have accepted some of our ideas.

The purpose behind this amendment is to show the disparity when we look at just administrative accounts for the Fish and Wildlife Service. This bill, as it is presently written, has a 6.6 percent increase in administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service for a total of $114.7 million. And out of this, the central administration, that here in Washington, is increased by 6 percent; but the regional administration, those areas outside of Washington, are increased by only 3.5 percent.

So what, in effect, this bill does, besides the fact that it increases at three times the rate of inflation the bureaucracy associated with Fish and Wildlife, not touching any of the programs but just simply the administrative portion of this, it increases Washington-based bureaucracy at almost twice the rate at which we give increased funds for administration outside of Washington. The committee also increases the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation by 16.6 percent and increases the international affairs administration by 32 percent.

There is no question we should adequately fund these organizations, but I think there is a legitimate question that should be asked, and there should be an explanation by the committee as to why a bureaucracy here in Washington needs an increase in its administrative costs of 6.6 percent when, in fact, our seniors who are going to receive a Social Security increase in terms of cost of living are going to receive somewhere around 1.8 percent.

So we are going to recognize that it takes 3½ to four times to do in Washington what we are going to recognize that is needed by the members of our society who are receiving Social Security, not to mention the fact that this money is going to come out of Social Security, this increase in spending.

So the real question is, are we going to increase bureaucracy costs at a rate far above inflation and at the same time take the money to do that from the Social Security fund; or can we not pare it back to a 2 percent increase? Can we not realistically ask the employees of the Federal Government to live within the constraints we are asking the rest of the country to live within? So the purpose of this amendment basically brings us back down to a legitimate cost-of-living increase in terms of administrative costs.

I understand that Federal employees are going to have a pay increase out of that, but that is not the far and greater portion of this increase. And I would compare also the increases that were in the House-marked bill with what the Senate has marked up. And when we look at the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, they gave them an 8.3 percent increase. We have given them a 16.6 percent increase. In international affairs we gave them a 32 percent increase and the Senate gave a 4.7 percent increase.

Overall, the Senate increased 4.9 percent the cost of administration of the National Fish and Wildlife administrative overhead budget, and we have done them one better: we have increased it

6.6 percent. So all we are asking is simply give the American people a justification of why we should have this kind of increase in the administration of this agency and at the same time not be able to fund adequately some of the things that those that are dependent in our society are so desperately in need of.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, one point I would make is that the Fish and Wildlife Service, as the gentleman knows, has been called upon here with an incredible number of habitat conservation plans all over the country, but particularly in the Pacific Northwest, California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would just say that there are requirements for them to have personnel. And I am very sensitive to what the gentleman said about the increase in personnel in the regions, because it is in the regional offices where most of these negotiations are under way; but there is tremendous pressure on them to be involved, for example at Pacific Lumber company on the big settlement in California, where they had to have people there who could negotiate with the State and with the private parties in order to reach these agreements, which involve thousands and thousands of acres of incredibly important habitat.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes my point. Why do we fund at a very small increase the district regional offices and we are doubling that amount for the bureaucracy here in Washington?

The point is there is no question they have a workload, and there is no question we have good employees in this agency. The question is can we afford at this day and time to grow the Federal bureaucracy here in Washington at a rate twice at which we are growing the regional bureaucracy.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would support the gentleman if we were taking the money from out of D.C. and transferring it to the regions. That is the point I was trying to make. But as I understand the gentleman's amendment, we are not doing that. We are cutting the overall amount of money rather than transferring it from D.C. out to the regions.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time once again, the gentleman's position is whether we are taking it out of there or not, he favors a 6.6 percent increase for the bureaucracy here in Washington at the same time he is limiting the regional increase to 3.5 percent?

Mr. DICKS. No, I am not saying that. I am just saying the Fish and Wildlife Service, and also people back here, are called upon all the time to make judgments about what the regions are doing on these plans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has again expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one of the problems here is the private sector are the people who enter into these HCPs under the ESA, and they need to have somebody to deal with. Now, some of those people are in D.C. as well. These issues get raised up to the national level to be decided.

So I am just trying to explain that there has been a tremendous increase because of all of the listings under the endangered species act. I could tell the gentleman about my own area, of the salmon listings, the Marbled Murrelets, the Spotted Owl, and the pressure not only on Fish and Wildlife but NMFS as well to work with the private sector.

Mr. COBURN. I would be happy to support the gentleman if he would offer an amendment that would move the differences in the increase from Washington to the regional offices. I would support that.

I plan on withdrawing this amendment because I have another amendment to follow it that is much less severe and brings us back in line with the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COBURN. If we are going to enhance the ability of the Fish and Wildlife to do their job, the best way we enhance it is at the regional offices and not in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

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

I realize the gentleman has withdrawn his amendment, but I would point out a couple of facts, and that is that all we gave in the Washington office were for fixed costs, nothing more. There are no more people. It is a summary alignment that sort of distorted the numbers. So, in reality, we were just trying to get the fixed costs.

Also, I would mention to my colleagues that they have a wide range of responsibilities that do not always appear to most of us. When we were on the committee trip, we visited the forensic lab of the Fish and Wildlife Service, one of the finest facilities in the world, and they are called upon to provide assistance in many areas other than the United States, and of course they are compensated.

They deal with the problem of illegal taking of species. We have a treaty, the so-called Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species, and 150 nations are signatory to this treaty. It involves preventing the importation of endangered animals. They work with the Customs Service, a very impressive facility to say the least. And that of course comes under the administrative budget.

It is something that most people are not aware of, and yet it is a very vital part of having responsible enforcement of the Endangered Species Act and to ensure that we are not getting contraband in terms of furs or in terms of ivory that puts a burden on species in other parts of the world.

So I am pleased that the gentleman is going to withdraw this amendment, but I did want to mention these things because it is part of the Fish and Wildlife Service that does not get a lot of attention, but which is very important in terms of preserving species that I think are valuable to all of society.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman explain why our large increase in the international affairs is a $2 million increase in the budget for the administration of that one program and that is all here in Washington?

Mr. REGULA. I think I would respond to the gentleman by saying this is the program. It is not just administration. The number we have is the program. We had a lot of requests from Members on both sides of the aisle to give some additional assistance here.

I think, on balance, Fish and Wildlife has tried to be very responsible in the use of the monies we provide.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I am sort of sorry the gentleman withdrew his amendment because I share with him some concern about Fish and Wildlife, although I appreciate his doing that because I think that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the committee, as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), has certainly worked hard to develop a bill that can be acceptable both to the minority and to the Senate and to the administration.

My purpose in rising today is really to enter into a colloquy with the chairman and to remind him and to remind the minority that during the recent conference committee we had on the Kosovo monies there came an issue before the committee that we had ample votes to put forth and to attach to the Kosovo legislation and it had to do with an endangered species, the Alabaman sturgeon.

If my two colleagues will recall that night, and Senator BYRD was there,

calling me a rock for standing by him on a steel issue and he stood by me too on this sturgeon issue, and I appreciate Senator BYRD's doing that, but I am sure that my two colleagues are going to be upset and so is Senator BYRD when he finds out that, contrary to what we were told that night, that if we would withdraw our amendment that Fish and Wildlife would not proceed further on the endangered species program; that they are on until such time as the Senate had an opportunity to have a hearing on this prior to October of this year.

Well, contrary to the promise that we got that night, that was given to the chairman and the ranking member, and was given to me and Senator SHELBY, Fish and Wildlife ignored what they told us and proceeded almost a week later with calling for a public hearing on the sturgeon situation in Alabama, and called it at a time when neither Senator SHELBY nor I or any other member of the Alabama delegation could be there to testify.

So contrary to the wishes of the conference committee that night, they just are pressing right ahead. They simply ignore what they told us they were going to do. And I am here to tell my colleagues that we are going to have to address this once again during this process.

Not today, but sometime during this process we are going to have to teach Fish and Wildlife a lesson that they cannot come before a conference committee of the United States House and Senate and tell us they are going to do one thing, have us withdraw some proposal that is presented before us, and then turn around and do just exactly contrary to what they promised us they would do and what they backed up with a letter from the head of Fish and Wildlife.

□ 1800

So, Mr. Chairman, I know that you have already cut Fish and Wildlife somewhat this year. We may have to go deeper than this. But this issue of the sturgeon is going to come back in this process because we cannot tolerate a Federal agency doing this to such a prestigious committee chairman as my colleague and his ranking member.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I have two comments.

First of all, we as a committee have a difficult time making judgments on listings because of hundreds of them, as my colleague well knows.

Secondly, we do have a meeting scheduled next week on the very issue brought up. I would like to invite the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) to come to that meeting. We will be in touch with him. I plan to be there. We will have people from Fish and Wildlife, and I think we should raise the very issues that my colleague has pointed out here today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his comments.

The chairman is right, too. We cannot have this committee saying which species are going to be listed as endangered. And we did not ask that.

There is a 5-year study under way. We have found one of these endangered Alabama sturgeons that looks remarkably like the Mississippi sturgeon. And there are billions of them. But, in any event, we found one. We, through a grant from the U.S. Interior, have now established a program of breeding a sturgeon that looks like what they say is endangered. So we are right in the middle of a 5-year study.

Fish and Wildlife, knowing this, just suddenly decided that they wanted to go ahead and list it before we were successful in our endeavor. So I am not recommending that we start denying the Service the ability. All we asked for was a delay in order that we could have a hearing on this in the Senate.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, the meeting is scheduled for next Thursday. I was there the night when the commitment was made. We will raise all the issues that the gentleman has outlined today with Fish and Wildlife.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 11, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will not go through the details of the last amendment, but I would make a pleading to the chairman of this committee and the ranking member that the amount of increases that we have put in administration of the Fish and Wildlife far exceeds that which the Senate committee have put in and far exceeds that which is necessary on a routine basis for all of the bureaucracies within this government.

I know that we can probably come up with a justification for why we need to increase this 6.6 percent. But I would ask the ranking member and the chairman for us to really consider where this difference between the 4.9 percent increase that the Senate has and the 6.6 percent, where is the money going to come from?

We all know where it is going to come from. The money is going to come out of the Social Security trust fund in the year 2000. And if in fact we will pare back this $2 million, this $2 million is enough for 2,000 seniors to get Medicare for a year.

I am not saying the Senate is better at these than we are. What I am saying is, if we went out and asked the American public what kind of increase did they get in their operating budget to administer programs, whether it is State, local, municipal or if it is Federal, to see a 6.6 percent increase in a time when we are bound by the 1997 budget agreement, I know many of us do not feel bound by it, but I believe we should honor our commitments on this and live within the budget agreement that we voted for and passed and is a matter of law with the President, that increasing it 4.9 percent is a large increase in terms of administrative overhead and costs.

So my plea to my colleague is to at least consider this very small reduction in costs from 6.6 to 4.9 percent, saying, you know what, we really can be more efficient in the Federal government. We really do not have to spend this $2 million. We really can get by.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, we had extensive hearings on these issues; and in this bill he is going to see hundreds of puts and takes. We made cuts all over this bill, and a lot of programs were reduced. But in some cases we went along with what we considered legitimate increases. And we have got fixed costs. We have got pay. We have got GSA for the building space. I mean, these are all the costs of administration, and they do go up.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the costs for these services last year in 1999, according to the committee print, was $109,363,000. The recommendation of my colleagues is to increase that to $116,680,000, or an increase of $7,000,317. I do not know about California, but I know about Oklahoma, and that is a big increase.

My question is, I am not saying that my colleagues could not come up with a justification. They could probably come up with a justification for raising it 10 percent or 15 percent. I will give my colleagues that, that they can come up with that. What I am saying is, realistically, they are going to go to conference with the Senate level that is well below them.

So my point is, will my colleagues consider trimming this $2 million to put it in line with the Senate, to put it in line with the realistic growth in it, and also to recognize that the $2 million is going to come out of the Social Security surplus?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to go along with this. I think the recommendation of the committee is a sound recommendation.

Certain agencies, especially the Fish and Wildlife Service, with all the work that they have to do under the Endangered Species Act, I simply disagree with the gentleman respectfully. I think this is a justified increase.

I know the workload of these people because I am one of the people that is demanding that they increase their efforts. We need them to put in good people, and we want them to have good

people in D.C. We want them to have good people in the regions who can make decisions and not hold up the private sector when they come up on HCPs, which happens to be something I happen to be very familiar with.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

So, therefore, for the record, the position of the committee is that we will increase the bureaucracy in Washington at twice the rate we increase the bureaucracy in the private sector.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interest of the gentleman and his concern about this. As we all know, our bill is underneath our allocation. So it fits into the budgetary scheme that has been created by the majority, one that I have serious reservations about, but it does.

So I would say to the gentleman, we do meet all the guidelines of the 1997 budget agreement, as far as I know. And we have tried to do the best job we could after hearing all of these witnesses. I mean, I would show the gentleman all of the books of testimony that we have. We have listened to these people go into great detail about the workload increases. I am a demon on administration, too.

Now, if this were another agency, let us say it was the National Endowment for the Arts or Humanities, I would insist that we hold down D.C. But in this case, because of the explosion of work that is being required of these agencies because of all of these listings, I must tell my colleague, I think 6 or 7 percent is very reasonable.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, he might not have heard the first portion of my statement. I did thank him and the chairman for the work they did and recognizing that this is a good bill. I am not saying this is not a good bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, but now the gentleman wants to come in and try to nitpick it a little bit.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, yes, I want to save $2 million for senior citizens for the Social Security system. There is no question I want to do that.

Mr. DICKS. But it is not going to do that. My colleague knows full well as I do that all it is going to do is get us underneath the allocation further and then the Senate or somebody else will say, well, let us increase something to get back up to the level that the majority has authorized under the Budget Act. We do not take the money from here and move it over to somewhere else.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am just trying to get us down to the Senate. It is ironic that we are above the Senate, but I am trying to get us down to the Senate.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, with all due respect, I think the gentleman should refer to it as the ''other body'' under the rules. I call upon the Chair to enforce the rules.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would take that correction.

Mr. DICKS. And in good spirit.

But the other body, especially some of the leadership of the other body, may not support the Endangered Species Act and would like to see it undercut a little bit. So I would not be surprised if the other side cut back funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service because they are not as enthusiastic about it as maybe we are.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would just note from the committee print that the committee cuts ESA $5 million over last year, the Endangered Species Act in terms of the funding for it. So what they have done is cut the money for the Endangered Species Act but grow the bureaucracy. And to me I find that fairly contrary in terms of the idea.

Regardless of what the other body has done, my contention is I think that we can lead in the House over the other body and set an example.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out here that part of this cut would come out of the money we give to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which is a very responsible organization. They leverage these dollars three to one. For every one we have, they raise three in the private sector. They have a limit of 5 percent on administrative costs. They are extremely helpful in developing the habitat conservation programs.

I know that the HCPs would be something the gentleman, I believe, would strongly endorse. Because it basically takes the private sector, lays out an area for economic growth in an area for habitat, and I think it is, from what I have observed, a very positive program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is a voluntary program. That is the great thing. The companies like Waterhouse, Plum Creek, Murray Pacific, they all come in, they negotiate with the Feds. But they have got to have somebody to negotiate with it.

Again, I say this, if the amendment of the gentleman were to take it out of the administration nationally and give it to the regions, I could probably support that. But just to cut it out.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, would the gentleman agree with me that at the end of this bill we would have a conforming amendment to do that?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, well, we will consider that. We will think about that. I believe we have got some time between now and the end of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EHLERS:

Page 13, line 8, after the period add the following: ''In addition to the other amounts made available by this paragraph, there shall be available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service $422,000 to carry out section 1005 of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 941c).''.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) reserves a point of order.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, the gist of this amendment is to fund an authorization which was adopted last year by the Congress and has been signed into law by the President.

I am speaking at this point on behalf of the Great Lakes. I recognize the work of the chairman of this committee, who has been very supportive of these efforts. I also recognize the activities of the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, who has instituted some legislation in this regard. And, in fact, this amendment is an attempt to fund some activities that were sponsored by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

Many Americans fail to recognize the significance of the Great Lakes. They constitute 20 percent of the world's fresh water. They constitute 95 percent of the United States' fresh surface water. They contain six quadrillion gallons of fresh water.

I find it ironic that this country has spent hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, in fact, billions of dollars developing dams and other waterways in the West to provide fresh water and yet we often are stingy in providing funding for the Great Lakes, which is the greatest freshwater system in the world.

□ 1815

Last year, Congress unanimously passed and the President signed into

law the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act which reauthorized the original 1990 act. This act provides for the continuation of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife coordination offices, which are very important to the entire Great Lakes basin but importantly, as it relates to this amendment, the act creates a new grants program for implementation of fish and wildlife restoration projects. This structure provides a unique opportunity for enhancing coordination of restoration activities in the Great Lakes region, leveraging funds for restoration efforts and making real progress on the highest priority restoration activities needed in the region.

Enthusiasm for getting the program off to a rapid start is high in the region. In fact, interested parties have already drafted several proposals for the grant program, and the Council of Lake Committees has begun discussion of priorities.

I understand that no new grant programs were funded in this bill due to the tight budget cap and the chairman's desire to create a fair Interior appropriations bill. I also understand full well the difficulty of the appropriations process while in particular the difficulty the subcommittee chairman faced in trying to deal with this appropriations process while remaining within the caps in the 302(b) allocations.

I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. REGULA. Because of that respect, I do not plan to pursue this amendment but plan to withdraw it. However, I did want to offer the amendment and debate it so that, if additional funds become available later in the appropriations process, the chairman and the subcommittee will look kindly upon funding this particular grant program. The amount of money is $422,000, which is relatively small compared to the total of the bill, and I believe it would go a great distance toward renewing the restoration efforts in the Great Lakes. It will provide sufficient funds to leverage a great deal of State money to be put into this effort.

I would appreciate any comments the chairman might make upon this issue before I officially withdraw it.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes a good point. We would hope that if there are additional funds available, that we might be able to do this. The Great Lakes are a very precious resource. Water, I think, generally is going to grow in its importance. Therefore, one of the great efforts we should make as a Nation is to preserve freshwater supplies. We have heard the stories that some States want to build pipelines up to the Great Lakes to tap into that water supply, and we have a responsibility to this Nation to maintain and improve the quality of our freshwater lakes and supply that is part of our Nation's resources.

Mr. EHLERS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his willingness to consider this issue. Not only are other states hoping to tap into Great Lakes Water, but other countries are also seeking to tap into this supply and hope to ship water out of the Great Lakes to fulfill their own water needs. It is very important for us to maintain the purity of this water, make certain that it remains in this country, is used properly, and remains drinkable for our population. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his support and for his commitment to completion of the Parker River Wildlife Refuge headquarters complex and its visitors center in Newburyport, Massachusetts. I understand that we are waiting to reach a final agreement on the total cost of the project. My current understanding is that sufficient funds from previous years exist to move this project forward in fiscal year 2000. Is that the gentleman's understanding as well?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The Fish and Wildlife Service has told the committee that funds for planning and design are sufficient to continue this project through fiscal year 2000 and that further construction funding will not be needed for obligation until 2001. Let me assure the gentleman that the committee is committed to completing this project and to providing additional funding in the future when it is needed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and ask should new information come to light and should we reach resolution on the total cost of the project and additional funds are made available in the Interior allocation, would he consider some funding for the project in fiscal year 2000 as part of his conference negotiations?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, again let me assure the gentleman that the committee considers this a worthy project and I will be happy to work with him as we move forward in conference negotiations with the other body.

Mr. TIERNEY. Again I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $43,933,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT:

Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $250,000)''.

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $250,000)''.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves a point of order.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, recently the President announced from the White House that the American bald eagle, a symbol of our Nation and the freedom we cherish, is no longer on our country's endangered species list. We can be proud of this accomplishment and acknowledge the efforts and the vision of the individuals who have helped save this majestic raptor from extinction.

Today, I come to the floor to ask this body's support for what I believe to be an exceptional opportunity to help one community's dream become a reality. But more importantly I believe this Congress can make a modest investment in providing an exceptional site where millions of Americans will be able to enjoy viewing the American bald eagle in its natural habitat. I am proud to report that the city of Wabasha, Minnesota, has made a real commitment to building a first-class facility where visitors can do just this.

But first I want to say that I am fully aware of the very difficult task before the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), his subcommittee and staff in developing this bill that addresses the stewardship of our Nation's natural and national resources in a responsible and balanced way. I appreciate their hard work and many worthy funding projects they have been asked to consider. Despite the subcommittee's support for the eagle center last year, I regret that the budget constraints within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife precluded the agency from extending financial support for the construction of the center.

Rather than asking the agency to draw on its limited operations budget, my amendment transfers $250,000 from the Energy Information Administration to the construction account within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. With the EIA receiving an increase of $2.1 million over last year's budget for a total of $72.644 million, I would suggest that my proposed reduction would have a minimal impact on its operations. Indeed, the CBO has scored it to have a neutral budget impact. Again, this amendment requests a very modest contribution from the Federal Government for a project that will generate benefits that far exceed the costs.

For the past 9 years, 70 volunteers, people who live in Wabasha, Minnesota, have shared their riverfront with thousands of visitors who come to see a bald eagle in the wild. These visitors leave with a tangible connection to the eagles and a newfound interest in preserving our wildlife heritage and vanishing wild places.

But, Mr. Chairman, winters in Minnesota are very cold. An average visitor spends only about 10 minutes on the riverfront. An indoor eagle viewing and education facility would enhance the visitor experience. To get this incredible project moving forward, the city of Wabasha and the Minnesota legislature have already contributed over $1.9 million, about half of what the cost will be to build the national eagle center in Wabasha, Minnesota. Now the community is looking for a little support from Congress. I cannot think of a better way to celebrate the recovery of the once threatened American eagle.

Two years ago, CBS News reporter Harry Smith joined the ranks of America's wildlife watchers. He became a birdwatcher when he visited rural southeastern Minnesota to shoot a story about Wabasha's bald eagle center. He said, ''It makes the heart quicken to see the splendid symbol of our Nation, hundreds of them, in their natural environment sitting in the cottonwoods and fishing, along the banks of the upper Mississippi River.''

CBS News officials said the network received more phone calls requesting copies of Smith's eloquent story about the bald eagle's success in Wabasha than any story he has ever done.

Nowhere else in the lower 48 States can you and your family get a better view of our natural symbol. And there is nowhere else you can go to see so many bald eagles on any Sunday from November through March knowing that trained staff will be there to help you spot the birds and share information about them. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no admission charge.

Recently, the Minnesota Audubon Council and the Upper Mississippi River Campaign agreed to team up with the city to support the development of the project. They, too, recognize the eagles center as a unique visitor and teaching facility. In fact, Audubon is planning to use the center to be a key stopping point for the Great Rivers Birding Train which will run from the headwaters of the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis.

Nationally and locally, investments in wildlife and wild places are an investment in this country's natural resource legacy and its economic future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the chairman and my colleagues for their support of this very important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio insist on his point of order?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that this is a great project for the people that have a chance to view it, and I am pleased to note that the State and the local community is supporting it. But I would have to point out to the gentleman that this is not Federal land and we cannot meet all the operational and maintenance needs of the refuge system, the Federal refuge system.

We have requests in our committee for $175 million worth of non-Federal projects. We just simply had to take a position that we cannot do any because if we do one, then we have to perhaps try to do a lot of others. There is a waiting list of construction and maintenance projects within the Fish and Wildlife, projects that are on existing Federal lands.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he might consider trying to get this authorized as a Federal site and then it would be easier for us to consider it. But under the present circumstances, we simply cannot start down the road of funding non-Federal projects. I would hope the gentleman would withdraw the amendment. We do have to oppose it on the basis that we have rejected $175 million worth of other projects.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I think the difference here is that we are not going to be coming back every year for additional maintenance costs.

Mr. REGULA. I understand.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The point here is that we have recognized this is the national eagles center. The city has contributed already almost $1 million, the State of Minnesota has contributed almost $1 million. They intend to raise in addition to that perhaps as much as $2 million in private resources. We are asking for a very modest investment, because it is important, it is our national symbol, it is the national eagles center. So we are asking for a very modest amount to be transferred out of a department budget that was increased by over $2.5 million.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to have to come back for maintenance expenses every year. This would be just one way that the Federal Government could pick up a small portion of the overall cost.

Mr. REGULA. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but I have to point out, it is not an authorized Federal project and once we start funding these, this may be not a lot but the total of all of these projects is $175 million. We do not have it to begin with and we do not feel that we should be doing non-Federal projects when we have such a backlog of maintenance and high priority projects that are Federal lands.

I feel that the proper way would be either to get it authorized or, and I congratulate the communities, if they continue supporting this as either a State and local cooperative facility.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. With all due respect, I would hope that we can have a vote on this. We would like to have the gentleman's support. If in the end assuming that we may not prevail in this vote, it is something that is important, it is not just important to the people in Wabasha, Minnesota, it is really important to all Americans. As I say, it is one of the few places in the lower 48 United States where you can actually see eagles in the wild and I think it is going to be a tremendous resource not only for the upper Midwest but for all Americans.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the question of the gentleman, has there been any conversation with Fish and Wildlife as to whether or not they would like to have this in as part of their portfolio?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes, I have talked to Fish and Wildlife. They very much would like to be a part of this. They did not make it a priority item on their budget list this year, but they asked me if perhaps I could get it included individually in this particular manner.

Mr. REGULA. Again reclaiming my time, I would strongly urge the gentleman to consider getting it authorized so it could be a Federal project. I realize he does not want ongoing funds, but these do have a way of needing some additional funding in future years.

□ 1830

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would note that the use of cellular telephones is not permitted either on the floor of the House or within the gallery, and the Chair would ask the visitor within the gallery to cease use of a cellular telephone.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, $42,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

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

Could I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) what his intentions are now about how long we are going to go here before we are going to have the votes?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have two additional amendments that I think we can dispose of very quickly, and then it would be our intent to go to

the vote on the amendments that have been rolled, and those would be the last votes for today. We might continue. We will discuss that afterwards as to whether we want to continue any further debate on some of the amendments and roll them until tomorrow morning.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, does that include UPARR or not? Because we understand that is going to take 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague likes, we have one, an amendment from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY), which I will offer; and we are going to accept it. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has an amendment he wants to offer, and we could do UPARR.

Mr. DICKS. Then we will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543), as amended, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), $10,779,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101–233, as amended, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, $800,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201–4203, 4211–4213, 4221–4225, 4241–4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–96, 16 U.S.C. 4261–4266), and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301–5306), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds made available under this Act, Public Law 105–277, and Public Law 105–83 for rhinoceros, tiger, and Asian elephant conservation programs are exempt from any sanctions imposed against any country under section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. aa–1).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 70 passenger motor vehicles, of which 61 are for replacement only (including 36 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in Senate Report 105–56.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, including not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706, $1,387,307,000, of which $8,800,000 is for research, planning and interagency coordination in support of land acquisition for Everglades restoration shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $8,000,000, to remain available until expended, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201 of Public Law 100–203.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in a brief colloquy with the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the National Wildlife Refuge Fund, also known as the Refuge Revenue Sharing Fund, and this fund reimburses local governments for the burdens that the presence of the U.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Service acquired lands place upon them. Since Fiscal Year 1996, Congress has appropriated only $10 million for this fund, while at the same time has increased funding for the Service to provide for increased land acquisitions. These actions have caused a reduction in the funding for local governments, resulting in the loss of much-needed and very critical services.

Let me be very clear that I do support our Nation's refuges and the benefits that they provide. In fact, I have several refuges in my district alone. However, I do not believe that this is good policy to continue this trend that ultimately places an undue burden on our local governments across America.

Last year I testified in front of the Subcommittee on Interior regarding how initial transfers within local government accounts led to significant erosions of services in a parish which I represent, Cameron Parish, which is one-third owned, it has Federal refuges on them. When I testified last year, I also predicted that the percentage paid to local governments would fall below 70 percent of what we owe, of what Congress owes, unless Congress steps up to the plate. If enacted today, counties and parishes across America will receive only 56 percent of what they are entitled to through the National Wildlife Refuge Fund of Fiscal Year 2000.

I appreciate the subcommittee chair and ranking member and all the budget pressures that they are under when they are drafting and crafting this bill, but I respectfully request that during the conference committee that they be mindful of the impact that this trend has had on our local governments and work to seek additional funds for the National Wildlife Refuge Fund during the conference negotiations.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I am speaking only for myself. I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue on the floor.

As my colleagues know, the committee expressed its concern regarding this trend in House Report 106–222. I assure my colleagues that we will continue to work with the gentleman and in conference to attempt to find additional resources.

The committee report says that the committee is concerned about the priorities of the Service with respect to how they relate to meeting its obligations under the National Wildlife Refuge Fund. In particular, the committee questioned why this Service has continued to acquire appreciably more land over the past few years and yet has not requested additional funding for the National Wildlife Refuge Fund. This issue should be addressed in the next year's budget request, and we will continue to work with the gentleman on this issue.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate his raising it with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, $45,449,000: *Provided*, That no more than $100,000 may be used for overhead and program administrative expenses for the heritage partnership program.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Page 17, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 23, after each of the two dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. Currently, the CNMI territories have a built-up account of unspent Federal moneys in excess of $80 million that they have been unable or unwilling to match that we have appropriated to them. That is over 5 years of funding under the current regime that we have for these purposes. Because they have been unwilling or unable to match that funding, I am suggesting that we take $4 million out of that and put it into the very important and bipartisanly supported Urban Parks and Recreation amendment known as the UPARR program for recreation recovery. This $4 million would allow a number of States that had had their proposals for grants turned down because funding was not provided: Alabama, 200,000; California, 630,000; Florida, 288,000; Georgia 569,000; Maryland, 249,000; Massachusetts, 600,000; Texas, 330,000; North Carolina, 88,000; Ohio, 500. These are States that have come forward and have programs to provide for the recovery of recreational facilities, worn-out facilities.

We heard earlier today about the problems that soccer teams and Little League teams and Pop Warner teams are having to find facilities to offer recreational opportunities. That is why this legislation is supported by the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues. The police associations understand the importance of giving young people constructive activities to participate in from 3 to 6 in the afternoon, but if they do not have these opportunities, unfortunately some of them go into crime and other destructive behavior.

We believe it is important to fund these efforts. There is so many, there is such a backlog of need, it will not harm the CNMI due to the fact that they have a tremendous backlog of appropriated moneys that this committee has appropriated and that they have been unable to spend.

This committee has made essentially the same decision in removing $5 million from that amount of money for the purposes of giving it to other territories who are in need of this, who have programs, who have the demand, are willing to come up, in many instances, with the money that is to be spent with a match by the local effort. I would not support this effort if this money was to come out of the other territories' budgets for that purposes, but because of the way the rules changed, I have to offer it in this fashion, but it is my intent to keep consistent with what the committee did with respect to other funds with regard to CNMI, and I would hope that the committee could support this amendment.

As my colleagues know, there has been a dramatic resurgence in support from environmental organizations, from the Conference of Mayors, from the League of Cities and from the Police Athletic Leagues, from the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, all of which are prepared and are raising money to help in this effort; and this Federal money, again, is used on a matching basis. Local governments must make this a priority, they must put up their own money, and this money is used to help out so many of those States like Ohio and Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept this amendment, but let me have some qualifiers. I think that we need to explore this more clearly, but I believe the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands is mandatory payment, and I do not believe that we can take money out of that as proposed in the amendment. And, therefore, in the absence of having access to the CNMI money, the money would therefore have to come out of the Office of Insular Affairs. And that means American Samoa operations. It means from Brown Tree Snake control, from technical assistance to the territories and other vital programs. And these are poor areas, and I do not think the gentleman would want to do that, given his concern for people.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that qualifier, and I tried to say that in my rushed opening statement here. That would not be my intent.

As my colleagues know, this UPARR money is part of the President's request that my colleagues have tried to deal with, and I guess what I am counting on is, just as the gentleman tried to find additional moneys for the territories out of this account, that his creative talents would also find money perhaps for UPARR, which has such tremendous support on both sides of the aisle. If that is not able to happen, then I would not expect my colleague then to go to the next step, which would be to take money from the territories.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and based on that we accept the amendment.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment. We accepted it last year, we continue to work with him, and hopefully it will go further this year than it did last year.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, it is a very strong endorsement. I support it. I think it is a good program.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

I will not use the full time. I was very disappointed the chairman accepted the amendment. It is a bad amendment. See, my money is, in fact, guaranteed money to the CMI. I am sure he pointed it out. This is a mischievious amendment. It should never have been offered. I would suggest respectfully that the amendment should be soundly defeated. We will not vote on it because the gentleman has accepted it. But it better not be in the conference when it comes back to this House floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–333), $46,712,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2001, of which $11,722,000, pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 104–333 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective October 1, 1999 and thereafter the National Park Service may recover and expend all fee revenues derived from providing necessary review services associated with historic preservation tax certification, and such funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That section 403(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470x–2(a)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REGULA

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGULA:

Page 18, beginning at line 5, strike '': *Provided further*,'' and all that follows through line 8 and insert a period.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we were unaware of local opposition to this language when it was inserted in the bill in the other body last year, and we included it this year, and we accept the amendment to strike the provision, and this will enable the parties to negotiate on the issue of moving this facility.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, $169,856,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter all franchise fees collected from Statue of Liberty National Monument concessioners shall be covered into a special account established in the Treasury of the United States and shall be immediately available for expenditure by the Secretary for the purposes of stabilizing, rehabilitating and adaptively reusing deteriorated portions of Ellis Island grounds and buildings: *Provided further,* That, beginning in fiscal year 2001, expenditure of such fees is contingent upon a dollar-for-dollar, non-Federal cost share: *Provided further,* That the National Park Service will make available 37 percent, not to exceed $1,850,000, of the total cost of upgrading the Mariposa County, CA municipal solid waste disposal system: *Provided further,* That Mariposa County will provide assurance that future use fees paid by the National Park Service will be reflective of the capital contribution made by the National Park Service.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2000 by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, $102,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which $500,000 is to administer the State assistance program, and of which $42,400,000 for Federal land acquisition for the Everglades National Park, Big Cypress National Preserve, Biscayne National Park, and State grants for land acquisition in the State of Florida are contingent upon the following: (1) a signed, binding agreement between all principal Federal and non-Federal partners involved in the South Florida Restoration Initiative which provides specific volume, timing, location and duration of flow specifications and water quality measurements which will guarantee adequate and appropriate guaranteed water supply to the natural areas in southern Florida including all National Parks, Preserves, Wildlife Refuge lands, and other natural areas to ensure a restored ecosystem; (2) the submission of detailed legislative language to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, which accomplishes this goal; and (3) submission of a complete prioritized non-Federal land acquisition project list: *Provided,* That from the funds made available for land acquisition at Everglades National Park and Big Cypress National Preserve, after the requirements under this heading have been met, the Secretary may provide Federal assistance to the State of Florida for the acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, within the Everglades watershed (consisting of lands and waters within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys) under terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary, to improve and restore the hydrological function of the Everglades watershed: *Provided further,* That funds provided under this heading to the State of Florida are contingent upon new matching non-Federal funds by the State and shall be subject to an agreement that the lands to be acquired will be managed in perpetuity for the restoration of the Everglades: *Provided further,* That lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91–646) except for condemnations, declarations of taking, and lands with appraised value of $50,000 or less.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. MICA:

Page 19, line 20, before the dollar amount, inert ''$9,000,000 is for grants to the State of Florida for acquisition of land along the St. Johns River in Central Florida, and of which''.

Page 19, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,000,000)''.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief.

First of all, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the ranking member, and others, staff that have been so courteous to me in the past in trying to meet some of the concerns relating to protection of lands, endangered lands in Florida and other projects.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with this amendment not to ask for any more money, we have $114 million for Everglades restoration, but asking for consideration as we move forward in this process to take a small amount, approximately $9 million, about 8 percent of this total, for use in preservation of the land along the St. John's River.

We cannot just put all of our dollars and all of our money into restoration projects in Florida. It is critical that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. I was raised in south Florida, and now we are spending somewhere, in the Chairman's estimate, and the Corps of Engineers brought first on July 4 a proposal to spend somewhere between $7.8 and the chairman has estimated this may cost us $10 billion, between $8 and $10 billion to restore the Everglades.

What I am asking for here is consideration not to make the same mistake in central and north Florida, that we must preserve that land along John's River.

We have been successful today in acquiring 16,000 of 18,000 acres, which will connect the Ocala National Forest with the State Park just north of Orlando. That area is being inundated by growth that we saw years and years ago in south Florida, and we cannot make the same mistake now.

My plea this evening, Mr. Chairman, is that we take a few dollars and wisely set them aside for preservation of that precious St. John's River area that needs to be preserved, so we will not be coming back in 10 or 20 years and asking for billions and billions in restoration when we can spend a few million now for preservation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment so we can proceed with the business. I know the chairman will acquiesce to my request in conference.

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

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN); amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS); and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) 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.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—213

Abercrombie	Cook	Gilchrest
Ackerman	Crowley	Gilman
Andrews	Cummings	Gonzalez
Baird	Danner	Goode
Baldacci	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	Davis (IL)	Goss
Bass	DeFazio	Greenwood
Becerra	DeGette	Gutierrez
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hansen
Berkley	Deutsch	Hayworth
Berman	Dicks	Hilleary
Biggert	Dingell	Hinchey
Bilbray	Dixon	Hinojosa
Bishop	Doggett	Hoeffel
Blagojevich	Ehlers	Holt
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Hooley
Boehlert	Engel	Houghton
Bonior	Eshoo	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Evans	Inslee
Campbell	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Filner	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Capuano	Foley	Jenkins
Cardin	Forbes	Johnson, E. B.
Carson	Ford	Jones (OH)
Castle	Fossella	Kaptur
Clay	Fowler	Kelly
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kennedy
Clement	Franks (NJ)	Kildee
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Kilpatrick
Collins	Gallegly	Kind (WI)
Condit	Gejdenson	King (NY)
Conyers	Gephardt	

Kleczka
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—202

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fletcher
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Regula
Riley
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Allen
Baldwin
Brown (CA)
Chenoweth
Combest
Cox
Davis (VA)
Hastings (FL)
Kasich
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Rivers
Scarborough
Simpson
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauzin
Thompson (CA)
Thurman

□ 1913

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, STRICKLAND, GRAHAM, LINDER, HILLIARD, LUCAS of Kentucky, BERRY, HALL of Texas and CUNNINGHAM changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SAXTON, MCINNIS, COOK, EHRLICH, HULSHOF and HILLEARY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 281, the McGovern amendment, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 243, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is a demand for a recorded vote 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.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 169, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—248

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moore
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—169

Aderholt
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cardin
Clement
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
English
Eshoo
Ewing
Fattah
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent

Larson
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Mascara
McCrery
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Scott
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stenholm
Talent
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Allen
Baldwin
Brown (CA)
Combest
Davis (VA)
Hastings (FL)
Kasich
Kuykendall
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Rivers
Scarborough
Simpson
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauzin
Thurman

□ 1924

Ms. SANCHEZ changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 282, the Sanders Amendment; I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 287, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—131

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Campbell
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Foley
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Klink
LaHood
Largent
Lazio
Linder
Luther
Manzullo
Mascara
McHugh
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Norwood
Paul
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Radanovich
Ramstad
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Turner
Upton
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Young (AK)

NOES—287

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baird
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Allen
Baldwin
Brown (CA)
Combest
Davis (VA)
Hastings (FL)
Kasich
Kuykendall
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Rivers
Scarborough
Sununu
Sweeney
Tauzin
Thurman

□ 1933

Mr. LATHAM changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 282, on the Sanders Amendment No. 13. Had I been here, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 283, on the Coburn Amendment No. 2. Had I been here, I would have voted ''no.''

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

For the Members' information, what we plan to do is to rise from the Committee temporarily so that we can file Treasury Post Office, and we will then reconvene.

We have about four amendments that I think will be noncontroversial. We will try to get those out of the way, and that will conclude the business for the evening. There will be no more votes today.

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. LAHOOD) 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. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2490, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. KOLBE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–231) on the bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order against provisions in the bill are reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2466.

□ 1936

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) had been disposed of. The bill has been read through line 6 of page 21.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to directly construct timber access roads in the National Forest System.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) in offering this amendment. This is intended to be a friendly amendment, one that is consistent with the committee's recommendation in its report on page 91.

After many years of debate and close votes on this floor, this amendment would put the House clearly on record to end the controversial practice of using taxpayer subsidies to construct roads for commercial timber sales on national forest land. It is a straightforward amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers have helped construct over 483,000 miles of authorized roads in our national forests. That is a road system that is eight times, eight times longer than the interstate highway system, enough to circle the globe 15 times. While the administration has been happy to request and Congress has been happy to provide funding for new road construction in the past years, we have not been very adept at providing funds for maintaining existing roads.

As a result, the Forest Service estimates that there is a backlog of $8.4 million in capital improvements needed on forest roads for heavily used passenger vehicles. Less than 20 percent of the roads are being maintained to the safety and design standards.

Under Secretary Jim Lyons and Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck have testified repeatedly before Congress that it is fiscally and environmentally irresponsible to keep building new roads when they do not have the budget to address the annual maintenance needs or begin to address the backlog of maintenance on the existing road system. While I appreciate the committee has provided a $19 million increase in road maintenance, that is still much less than the $500 million annually needed that the agency estimates is necessary to catch up with the backlog of needs.

Recognizing that they have a major problem on their hands, the Forest Service is in the midst of an 18-month moratorium on new road construction in roadless areas in most national forests. The purpose of this time-out is to develop a long-term road policy and identify nonessential roads and those roads that should be reconstructed and maintained for safe and environmentally sound practices.

In my view, the remaining roadless areas in our national forests are vital reserves and must be maintained for clean water, fish and wildlife habitat, low-impact recreation, and wilderness values. I have joined with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), along with 162 of our colleagues, in urging the administration to come up with long-term protections of these critical roadless areas.

In closing, I wish to recognize the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), for their work in the committee report to resolve what has been a contentious issue in past years. I also want to acknowledge the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and our former colleague, Mr. Joe Kennedy, who were pioneers in this effort to reduce taxpayer subsidies to timber roads.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and to engage the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), in a colloquy.

I would like to ask the gentleman from California if he could help me clarify his amendment. Is it the gentleman's intention that his amendment apply only to appropriations for direct construction of timber access roads and not to any of the necessary planning, engineering, management, and support activities conducted by the agency?

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that he is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if the amendment is written to specifically target only appropriations for direct construction of timber access roads, I am pleased to support it. What I believe the gentleman is trying to accomplish is codification of the language already contained in the interior appropriations report on this matter.

For clarification, this amendment addresses the issue of appropriations for direct construction of timber access roads and does not affect the other necessary planning, engineering, management, and support activities of the Federal land management agencies. It will also not reduce or prohibit any funding which enables the agency to comply with necessary environmental regulations such as the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the RECORD information regarding the Urban Park and Recreation Fund.

The following is according to the fiscal year 2000 budget justification submitted by the National Park Service in support of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program:

URBAN PARK AND RECREATION FUND

Funding provided in the past has also contributed to the development of programs and projects such as the innovation project established in Tacoma, Washington. The goals of this innovative project were to provide at-risk youth alternatives to gangs and drugs through participation in outdoor recreation activities, and to develop life skills such as self-esteem, leadership, decision-making, and cooperation. The program was designed to operate as an extensive partnership involving professionals from the disciplines of parks and recreation, education, city government, social services and criminal justice. It

was designed to operate year-around with expanded activity during the summer months and over extended holiday periods. Youth participants were involved through various avenues such as schools, home school associations, youth service agencies and neighborhood community centers. The program has provided various activities such as backpacking in Olympic National Park; white water rafting on the Thompson River in British Columbia; cross-country skiing in Mount Rainier National Park; winter camping, inner-tubing and snow shoeing in various winter sports areas; water safety instruction; fishing, canoeing, boating and swimming, mountain biking on designated State and Federal lands; weekly environmental education and outdoor skills workshops; leadership training for advanced youth participants; and youth hosteling and meeting travelers from around the world.

The Tacoma program blossomed, leveraged other sources of funding and continues today as a model partnership program involving schools, government, criminal justice, social service and park and recreation agencies. It has since expanded to the adjacent community of Enumclaw, Washington. New partnerships have been formed with agencies such as Faith Group Homes and the Pierce County Juvenile Courts Probated Youth Program. This Tacoma program has received national recognition and was featured at a February 1995 invitational colloquium at Fort Worth, Texas, titled ''Recreation for At-Risk Youth: Programs that Work,'' sponsored by the National Park and Recreation Association.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a logical fulfillment of the agreement reached among Republicans last year to end the purchaser road credit. This amendment simply reiterates that no Federal funds have been appropriated to improve or construct timber access roads. Language with the identical substantive effect is already in the report accompanying the bill.

Just to clarify, this amendment applies only to the use of appropriated funds for actual construction of roads. Funds may still be used for the engineering design associated with road construction and reconstruction projects as well as for environmental reviews and public involvement. And private funds may still be used for road construction and reconstruction in any area where roads may be built, just as the report states.

This amendment is narrow, but it is a great step forward, concluding the work begun last year. Road costs must be borne by the companies that will benefit from their use. That is a win for the taxpayers and a win for the environment. I am pleased this amendment has drawn broad bipartisan support.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just wanted to say I was remiss in not mentioning his name when I was thanking those who had made this agreement possible so that the chairman and the ranking member could come to this agreement.

As the gentleman knows, he has the battle scars of many contentious battles on this floor over forest policy and road policy, and I want to thank him for his efforts last year, along with the members of the committee that dealt with the first step in this process, and for his support for this amendment, and again to the chairman and to the ranking member for their efforts in the markups of this legislation before it came to the floor.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with this amendment. It simply codifies what we had directed be done last year in the bill, and so it is appropriate to accept this amendment and we support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. NEY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 12, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. NEY:

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just start by congratulating the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the other members of the committee for a fine bill they have crafted. The purpose of this amendment will be to reduce the total amount for the departmental management in the Department of the Interior by $5 million.

As Members of the House, we just recently and have consistently cut our own Members' representational accounts. We have cut our franking accounts so we can show the American people we are willing to make sacrifices to balance the Nation's budget. I think it is only fair we begin cutting out some of the bureaucracy in some of the agencies, and I intend to do amendments along the appropriations process that will help to accomplish this.

□ 1945

With the help of the Congressional Research Service, I was able to find that the Department of Interior roughly has in the account $126 million in expense, of which travel is a part of it, for fiscal year 1998.

I think that there is significant and enough money in this account and it can sustain some type of cut that will again be part of the process to help to continue to balance our budget. I arrived at the $5 million figure by taking roughly 4 percent of the fiscal year 1998 report. Unfortunately, we do not have the 1999 numbers because they have not yet to be filed.

So, as my colleagues can see, the reduction of the $5 million comes out of the departmental management section of the bill, which is funded actually at $62.9 million. The Department of the Interior uses funds from this account and others for their travel. Reduction by the $5 million would fund the departmental management section at $57.9 million.

We as Members, Mr. Chairman, have sacrificed our MRAs, franking accounts, and rightfully so. We have even cut the Congressional Research Service. I feel that the bureaucracy can sustain this reduction.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would advise the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that we have cut this account $2 million already below the 1999 level and recognize that, in an effort to save money, this I think might be a little bit heavy. We need to assess it, and we could do that in the conference procedure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman. I mean, we have I think been very tight in terms of these increases. We have tried to hold them down. And we are talking about the management of the Department of the Interior, which is an agency that we demand a lot of. The Secretary of the Department of the Interior, his office, are under tremendous pressure on a whole series of fronts.

I mentioned to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) earlier, just the work that is being done today with all the very important habitat conservation plans that require input from the Secretary, they have got all the tribal account problems that we have been trying to get straightened out; and I just think that we are within our allocation. We have cut a lot of accounts here. This is one that I hope that we could spare. And I agree with the chairman that this is something we ought to continue to look at as we go into the conference.

So I urge a ''no'' vote unless the gentleman wants to withdraw his amendment.

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

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I do want to congratulate both gentlemen. I think they have done a fine job of this bill and on the accounts. And I just wanted to just note, we have cut in Congress our accounts and we have squeezed a little bit more.

So I just think that, in the areas of travel, all the agencies in the Federal government can squeeze just a little bit more out.

But I want to mention, my colleagues have done a fine job on the existing accounts.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just tell the gentleman that some of these things that we are talking about are uncontrollable. And these are pay raises that are, under the law, required. They have got Worker Compensation payments, unemployment compensation payments, rental payments to the GSA, some of which go up automatically.

So I do not believe that there is anything untoward here or anything that is excess. It is just that the cost of administration of these agencies goes up some each year. I think that this is a reasonable request and, therefore, again I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FALEOMAVAEGA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

At the end of title I, page 56, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) LOAN TO BE GRANTED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the ''Secretary''), in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make available to the government of American Samoa (hereinafter ''ASG''), the benefits of a loan in the amount of $18,600,000 bearing interest at a rate equal to the United States Treasury cost of borrowing for obligations of similar duration. Repayment of the loan shall be secured and accomplished pursuant to this section with funds, as they become due and payable to ASG from the Escrow Account established under the terms and conditions of the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (and the subsequent Enforcing Consent Decree) (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''the Agreement'') entered into by the parties November 23, 1998, and judgment granted by the High Court of American Samoa on January 5, 1999 (Civil Action 119–98, American Samoa Government v. Philip Morris Tobacco Co., et. al.).

(b) CONDITIONS REGARDING LOAN PROCEEDS.—Except as provided under subsection (e), no proceeds of the loan described in this section shall become available until ASG—

(1) has enacted legislation, or has taken such other or additional official action as the Secretary may deem satisfactory to secure and ensure repayment of the loan, irrevocably transferring and assigning for payment to the Department of the Interior (or to the Department of the Treasury, upon agreement between the Secretaries of such Departments) all amounts due and payable to ASG under the terms and conditions of the Agreement for a period of 26 years with the first payment beginning in 2000, such repayment to be further secured by a pledge of the full faith and credit of ASG;

(2) has entered into an agreement or memorandum of understanding described in subsection (c) with the Secretary identifying with specificity the manner in which approximately $14,300,000 of the loan proceeds will be used to pay debts of ASG incurred prior to April 15, 1999; and

(3) has provided to the Secretary an initial plan of fiscal and managerial reform as described in subsection (d) designed to bring the ASG's annual operating expenses into balance with projected revenues for the years 2003 and beyond, and identifying the manner in which approximately $4,300,000 of the loan proceeds will be utilized to facilitate implementation of the plan.

(c) PROCEDURE AND PRIORITIES FOR DEBT PAYMENTS.—

(1) In structuring the agreement or memorandum of understanding identified in subsection (b)(2), the ASG and the Secretary shall include provisions, which create priorities for the payment of creditors in the following order—

(A) debts incurred for services, supplies, facilities, equipment and materials directly connected with the provision of health, safety and welfare functions for the benefit of the general population of American Samoa (including, but not limited to, health care, fire and police protection, educational programs grades K - 12, and utility services for facilities belonging to or utilized by ASG and its agencies), wherein the creditor agrees to compromise and settle the existing debt for a payment not exceeding 75 percent of the amount owed, shall be given the highest priority for payment from the loan proceeds under this section;

(B) debts not exceeding a total amount of $200,000 owed to a single provider and incurred for any legitimate governmental purpose for the benefit of the general population of American Samoa, wherein the creditor agrees to compromise and settle the existing debt for a payment not exceeding 70 percent of the amount owed, shall be given the second highest priority for payment from the loan proceeds under this section;

(C) debts exceeding a total amount of $200,000 owed to a single provider and incurred for any legitimate governmental purpose for the benefit of the general population of American Samoa, wherein the creditor agrees to compromise and settle the existing debt for a payment not exceeding 65 percent of the amount owed, shall be given the third highest priority for payment from the loan proceeds under this section;

(D) other debts regardless of total amount owed or purpose for which incurred, wherein the creditor agrees to compromise and settle the existing debt for a payment not exceeding 60 percent of the amount owed, shall be given the fourth highest priority for payment from the loan proceeds under this section;

(E) debts described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of this paragraph, wherein the creditor declines to compromise and settle the debt for the percentage of the amount owed as specified under the applicable subparagraph, shall be given the lowest priority for payment from the loan proceeds under this section.

(2) The agreement described in subsection (b)(2) shall also generally provide a framework whereby the Governor of American Samoa shall, from time to time, be required to give 10 business days notice to the Secretary that ASG will make payment in accordance with this section to specified creditors and the amount which will be paid to each of such creditors. Upon issuance of payments in accordance with the notice, the Governor shall immediately confirm such payments to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall within three business days following receipt of such confirmation transfer from the loan proceeds an amount sufficient to reimburse ASG for the payments made to creditors.

(3) The agreement may contain such other provisions as are mutually agreeable, and which are calculated to simplify and expedite the payment of existing debt under this section and ensure the greatest level of compromise and settlement with creditors in order to maximize the retirement of ASG debt.

(d) FISCAL AND MANAGERIAL REFORM PROGRAM.—

(1) The initial plan of fiscal and managerial reform, designed to bring ASG's annual operating expenses into balance with projected revenues for the years 2003 and beyond as required under subsection (b)(3), should identify specific measures which will be implemented by ASG to accomplish such goal, the anticipated reduction in government operating expense which will be achieved by each measure, and should include a timetable for attainment of each reform measure identified therein.

(2) The initial plan should also identify with specificity the manner in which approximately $4,300,000 of the loan proceeds will be utilized to assist in meeting the reform plan's targets within the timetable specified through the use of incentives for early retirement, severance pay packages, outsourcing services, or any other expenditures for program elements reasonably calculated to result in reduced future operating expenses for ASG on a long term basis.

(3) Upon receipt of the initial plan, the Secretary shall consult with the Governor of American Samoa, and shall make any recommendations deemed reasonable and prudent to ensure the goals of reform are achieved. The reform plan shall contain objective criteria that can be documented by a competent third party, mutually agreeable to the Governor and the Secretary. The plan shall include specific targets for reducing the amounts of ASG local revenues expended on government payroll and overhead (including contracts for consulting services), and may include provisions which allow modest increases in support of the LBJ Hospital Authority reasonably calculated to assist the Authority implement reforms which will lead to an independent audit indicating annual expenditures at or below annual Authority receipts.

(4) The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Governor similar to that specified in subsection (c)(2) of this section, enabling ASG to make payments as contemplated in the reform plan and then to receive reimbursement from the Secretary out of the portion of loan proceeds allocated for the implementation of fiscal reforms.

(5) Within 60 days following receipt of the initial plan, the Secretary shall approve an interim final plan reasonably calculated to make substantial progress toward overall reform. The Secretary shall provide copies of the plan, and any subsequent modifications, to the House Committee on Resources, the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies.

(6) From time to time as deemed necessary, the Secretary shall consult further with the Governor of American Samoa, and shall approve such mutually agreeable modifications to the interim final plan as circumstances warrant in order to achieve the overall goals of ASG fiscal and managerial reforms.

(e) RELEASE OF LOAN PROCEEDS.—From the total proceeds of the loan described in this section, the Secretary shall make available—

(1) upon compliance by ASG with paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section and in accordance with subsection (c), approximately $14,300,000 in reimbursements as requested from time to time by the Governor for payments to creditors;

(2) upon compliance by ASG with paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(3) of this section and in accordance with subsection (d), approximately $4,300,000 in reimbursements as requested from time to time by the Governor for payments associated with implementation of the interim final reform plan; and

(3) notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, at any time the Secretary and the Governor mutually determine that the amount necessary to fund payments under paragraph (2) will total less than $4,300,000 then the Secretary may approve the amount of any unused portion of such sum for additional payments against ASG debt under paragraph (1).

(f) EXCEPTION.— Proceeds from the loan under this section shall be used solely for the purposes of debt payments and reform plan implementation as specified herein, except that the Secretary may provide an amount equal to not more than 2 percent of the total loan proceeds for the purpose of retaining the services of an individual or business entity to provide direct assistance and management expertise in carrying out the purposes of this section. Such individual or business entity shall be mutually agreeable to the Governor and the Secretary, may not be a current or former employee of, or contractor for, and may not be a creditor of ASG. Notwithstanding the preceding 2 sentences, the Governor and the Secretary may agree to also retain the services of any semi-autonomous agency of ASG which has established a record of sound management and fiscal responsibility, as evidenced by audited financial reports for at least 3 of the past 5 years, to coordinate with and assist any individual or entity retained under this subsection.

(g) CONSTRUCTION.—The provisions of this section are expressly applicable only to the utilization of proceeds from the loan described in this section, and nothing herein shall be construed to relieve ASG from any lawful debt or obligation except to the extent a creditor shall voluntarily enter into an arms length agreement to compromise and settle outstanding amounts under subsection (c).

(h) TERMINATION.—The payment of debt and the payments associated with implementation of the interim final reform plan shall be completed not later than October 1, 2003. On such date, any unused loan proceeds totaling $1,000,000 or less shall be transferred by the Secretary directly to ASG. If the amount of unused loan proceeds exceeds $1,000,000, then such amount shall be credited to the total of loan repayments specified in paragraph (b)(1). With approval of the Secretary, ASG may designate additional payments from time to time from funds available from any source, without regard to the original purpose of such funds.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, it would have been totally impossible for me if it had not been for the support and certainly the patience of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Interior, and also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking Democrat, for their support and assistance in getting this amendment worked out.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would authorize a procedure by which the American Samoan government can irrevocably assign for 26 years the rights to its proceeds under the 46-State tobacco lawsuit settlement; and, in return, American Samoa will receive $18.6 million from the United States government for a period of 3 years. The United States will receive back about $40 million in principal and interest and an additional amount required by CBO to score the provision as budget neutral.

Mr. Chairman, the money would be used to reduce the critical existing debt of the local government and to implement certain fiscal reforms. For this arrangement to become effective, local government would have to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the funds; and each payment would have to be approved in advance by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, the money for the financial reform of the American Samoan government would be used to reduce the size of the territorial workforce. Options could be used such as buyouts, early retirements and would be included in the agreement instituted between the Secretary of the Interior and the local government.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the endorsement of both the chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), as well as the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), supported this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 1, 1999.

Hon. NORM DICKS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKS: We have been contacted by our Colleague, Mr. Faleomavaega, seeking clearance of the House Committee on Resources for a proposal he is seeking to have incorporated into the pending FY2000 Interior Appropriations legislation. His proposal would have the Secretary of Interior arrange for an ''advance'' to the government of American Samoa (ASG) in the form of a fully repayable loan, secured by ASG's future payments from the 46-state tobacco lawsuit settlement. The purpose of this advance would be limited to payment of existing ASG debt, with a small portion available to fund implementation of badly-needed ASG fiscal and managerial reforms, and would be overseen by the Secretary.

It is our further understanding that the Congressional Budget Office has determined the budget impact score of the proposal to be ''neutral'' since ASG would be required to fully repay the $18.6 million principal, with interest, over a period of 26 years.

This letter is to inform you and the Members of your subcommittee that, on behalf of the House Committee on Resources, we have not reservations or objections to inclusion of the provision as currently drafted into the pending Interior Appropriations measure. Properly implemented, we believe this self-help project will greatly benefit both the people and the government of American Samoa in resolving a crucial fiscal dilemma and building a foundation for future progress and greater self-sufficiency. We encourage adoption of the proposal.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman, House Committee on Resources.

GEORGE MILLER,
Senior Democratic Member, House Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an 11-page piece of legislation. I think normally it should be handled by the authorizing committees. We do not have any objection to the substance of the amendment and are not going to oppose it. But I do think that it ought to be considered as part of the authorizing process. However, we will not object.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his outstanding work and his ingenuity. I have no objection to the amendment. In fact, we enthusiastically support it on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROWLEY:

Page 101, line 23, insert after ''individuals'' the following: '', including urban minorities,''.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered out of order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a strong supporter of the National Endowment for the Arts and as a strong believer in the positive effect that the arts have on our urban communities.

The National Endowment for the Arts has continued its laudable mission to bring the arts to segments of the population that would otherwise have a hard time accessing them. Through local theater troop performances and through shows at small museums, hundreds of communities have received exposure to the arts because of the NEA.

In order to ensure that all Americans have equal access to the arts, the NEA strives to give priority ''to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.''

The purpose behind my amendment is to help the NEA achieve its commendable goal of leaving no American untouched by the arts. To that end, I am proposing that this bill makes specific mention of one traditionally underserved population, urban minorities. I believe Congress should encourage the NEA to fund programs that improve the availability of the arts to minority populations in our cities.

Quite often, NEA funding has been directed to groups which serve an upper middle class audience. Many times these groups are inaccessible to many minority groups.

Mr. Chairman, in my own Congressional District of Queens, there is a large Latino population that the Queens Theatre in the Park targets each summer with its Latin Arts Festival, a multi-cultural ethnic celebration. This festival, though certainly successful in its own right, would greatly benefit from additional Federal funding.

The Queens Theater in the Park has consistently applied for Federal support from the NEA but has been denied funding despite the fact that they target an underserved community. For many families in my district, the average $75 cost to a Broadway play is far too expensive. Queens Theater in the Park and other local community arts groups are the only exposure many of my residents have to the arts.

That is but one example of the difficulty facing minority populations in accessing the arts in Queens, New York, and the Bronx and around this country. Projects targeted at urban youth would greatly help keep them off the streets and away from crime and drugs.

In the President's own NEA budget, he outlined a key initiative to use the arts as a way to help at-risk youths.

Mr. Chairman, in New York and in communities throughout our American cities there are tens of thousands of at-risk youths who will benefit from exposure to the arts. This amendment would help send a message to our urban youth that we are interested in improving their quality of life by helping to bring the arts to them.

The arts help break down the barriers caused by economic and cultural diversity that bring communities together and they offer hope.

I am not suggesting that we take funding away from any other program. I am only suggesting that we give projects affecting underserved minority communities, whether they be in our cities or our rural areas, equal access to important NEA funding.

Once again, let me state that this amendment will not expand the scope of the original language. It will merely perfect that language by emphasizing that urban minorities are included within the term ''underserved population.''

I urge my colleagues to stand up for equal access to the arts and support the Crowley amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment. I think it is very thoughtful.

I must tell him that I had the pleasure of taking one of the previous NEA directors, Jane Alexander, to Seattle; and we visited a very important program there at Garfield High School that was serving underserved minorities within the city of Seattle. Also, we had a very successful program in Tacoma with Dale Chihuly, who is one of the great glass artists of our time. He set up a program on the Hill Top in Tacoma, which is one of our urban areas in the city of Tacoma, and got these literally dozens of young children learning how to make glass pottery and other things; and it had a remarkable effect on their lives.

I think the gentleman brings a very serious point here, and I certainly am willing to accept his amendment and urge the House to accept it.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their support in bringing this amendment to the floor today.

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 a good amendment. We made a real effort in the arts to broaden the base, and this is just one more step in making that happen.

I think when Mr. Yates was here we had some groups come in from situations that the gentleman described and performed, and it made us realize how important access to the arts were in their lives.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I urge a positive vote.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crowley amendment. It is thoughtful. It will benefit arts in urban areas.

I also rise in support of the entire bill. I applaud the leadership of the chairman and the ranking member. I was concerned of how the committee would operate after my dear friend and colleague, Mr. Yates, left. But I see the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is continuing with the chairman in a very firm and strong way.

I particularly applaud the committee for wisely rejecting efforts to load this bill up with controversial anti-environmental riders. Unfortunately, the version of this bill passed by the Committee on Appropriations in the other House contains numerous riders that would never pass on their own and have absolutely no place in this legislation.

□ 2000

One of these riders, in particular, robs the American taxpayer of over $66 million per year. This rider would permit big oil companies to continue to underpay the royalties they owe to the Federal Government, States and Indian tribes—cheating taxpayers of millions and millions of dollars.

It would do this by blocking the Interior Department from implementing a new rule which would require big oil companies to pay royalties to the government based on the market value of the oil they produce. Currently, the oil companies are keeping two sets of books, one which they pay themselves, market value, and one which they pay the taxpayers, the Federal Government, which is greatly undervalued to the true value of the oil.

Earlier this year, I released a report demonstrating how these companies have cheated the American taxpayer of literally billions of dollars in the past several decades. They do this by complex trading devices which mask the real value of the oil they produce. By undervaluing their own oil, these companies can avoid paying the full royalty payments they owe.

The Justice Department investigated these practices and decided they were so wrong that it filed suit against several major oil companies for violating the False Claims Act. As a result, one company settled with the government and paid over $45 million. Numerous other companies have settled similar claims brought by States and private royalty owners for millions, and, in one case, billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the rule that the Interior Department is proposing is simple. It requires that oil companies pay royalties based on the fair market value of the oil they produce, just like everybody else when they sell their product to the Federal Government. But these oil companies that have been cheating the American taxpayer for years are now trying to block the Interior Department from implementing a rule using every excuse imaginable.

Mr. Chairman, this rider robs money from our schools, our environment, our States and our Indian tribes. It does this to benefit the most narrow special interest imaginable, big oil companies with billions of dollars in profits. I applaud the Committee on Appropriations for leaving this issue to the experts at the Interior Department and for not loading it up with other unnecessary and wrong antienvironmental riders.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

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. HAYES) 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. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 13, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on July 13, 1999 at 1:00 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a six-month periodic report on the national emergency concerning weapons of mass destruction declared by Executive Order 12938.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONCERNING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–93)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economics Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (''weapons of mass destruction'') and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 13, 1999.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hearafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING THE PLIGHT OF THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, recent events in India's state of Jammu and Kashmir, where radical Islamic militants have infiltrated into India's territory with the support of, and apparently active collaboration with, Pakistan, have drawn international attention to this mountainous region. Now that Pakistan has apparently agreed to withdraw its fighters who have crossed onto India's side of the Line of Control, I hope that the attention of the U.S. and the world community will finally focus on the long-ignored plight of the Kashmiri Pandits.

The Pandits, who are the Hindu community of Kashmir, have an ancient and a proud culture. Their roots in the Kashmir Valley run deep. The Pandits have been amongst the most afflicted victims of the Pakistani-supported campaign of terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir. Virtually the entire population of 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits have been forced to leave their ancestral homes and property. Threatened with violence and intimidation, they have been turned into refugees in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, in June, the Pandits received somewhat of a mixed message from the National Human Rights Commission of India. In a positive step, the Commission did accept jurisdiction over the issue of human rights in Kashmir which was a matter of some question because of the special status that the state of Jammu and Kashmir enjoys under India's federal system. But the Commission also announced that it would not term the violence against the Pandits as genocide as has been requested by leaders of the Pandit community as well as myself and other Members of Congress. The National Human Rights Commission also rejected the request to define the Pandits as an Internally Displaced People. The Commission did acknowledge that the Pandits had been victims of killings and ethnic cleansings as part of the militants' campaign to get Kashmir to secede from India.

The National Human Rights Commission has recently set up a committee to address the Pandits' concerns, which includes representatives from the Commission, the Jammu and Kashmir State Government, and one representative from the Pandit community. But, Mr. Speaker, the committee has not yet met.

I am asking my colleagues to join me in signing a letter to the National Human Rights Commission asking that the decisions on genocide and internally displaced persons be reconsidered and that the new committee begin regular meetings. I have often cited India's Human Rights Commission as a model for other Asian nations and developing nations the world over to emulate. It is an example of India's commitment to democracy and the rule of law. I am sure the commission will give serious consideration to these requests by myself and other Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have been calling along with some of my colleagues in this House for increased world attention to the plight of the Kashmiri Pandits. As I have gotten to know the Kashmiri-American community and have heard about the situation facing the Pandits, I have become increasingly outraged not only at the terrible abuses that they have suffered but at the seeming indifference of the world community. Mr. Speaker, India's government must work to provide conditions for the safe return of the Pandit community to the Kashmir Valley.

I also urge that our State Department continue to hold Pakistan accountable for provoking the current fighting in Kashmir by its support for the militants who have infiltrated India's territory.

Even before the current fighting, there has been a disturbing pattern of massacres of civilians carried out by the militants operating in Kashmir. While it is predominantly Hindus who have been the victims of these attacks, we have also seen attacks against Muslim residents of Jammu and Kashmir who have dared to assist the legitimate state authorities in putting a halt to the violence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is the true face of the insurgency in Kashmir. The militants have transformed a peaceful, secular state in India, one which happens to have a predominantly Muslim population, into a killing field as part of the goal of turning the state into an area under strict Islamic rule. From the standpoint of international stability, this would be a disaster. From the human standpoint, the militants' campaign has already been a disaster as the displaced Kashmiri Pandit community demonstrates. It is wrong to continue to ignore their plight. We must address their concerns and hopefully the Human Rights Commission will do so and reconsider some of the decisions that it has already made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hearafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hearafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hearafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hearafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SALUTE TO BRIANA SCURRY AND THE U.S. WOMEN'S WORLD CUP SOCCER TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly this evening to salute a constituent who is one of our Nation's newest sports heroes, Briana Scurry from Dayton, Minnesota. I also want to pay tribute to all the other members of our champion United States Women's World Cup Soccer Team who have made all Americans proud.

In the championship game Saturday, Mr. Speaker, in Pasadena, California, before more than 90,000 screaming fans, two great teams, one from the United States and the team from China, played to a scoreless tie in regulation time; then, two 15-minute sudden death overtimes, and still a dramatic, nail-biting 0–0 tie; a shootout and finally a world championship for our women's team, thanks to a diving save by our great world-class goalie, Briana Scurry.

Mr. Speaker, it was Briana Scurry, the Dayton, Minnesota, native who soared to deflect China's third penalty shot setting up the final victory. All of Minnesota celebrated with our Nation's sports fans as Briana ran to the stands following the game, slapping hands with the fans, the huge crowd as they chanted again and again, ''Scurry! Scurry! Scurry!''

Mr. Speaker, Briana Scurry has been the number one United States goalie for 6 years. They call her ''The Rock,'' they call her ''The Wall,'' and she is both, as she showed the world Saturday night. Today, we call Briana and her marvellous teammates World Cup soccer champions.

Briana Scurry, Mr. Speaker, is also a great role model for other young women in sports. She is a great leader both on and off the soccer field. Briana excelled in her political science studies in college at the University of Massachusetts and she also gave a great deal back to her community, working as a volunteer for AIDS education and awareness and also for the Make A Wish Foundation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America's team was in good hands in this World Cup. There is little to worry about when Briana is in the net. She gave up only three goals in the entire World Cup championships and one of those, by the way, was kicked into our net by one of our own players. Briana shut out opponents four times in six games in the tournament, four shutouts in the six games comprising the World Cup championship.

□ 2015

Briana Scurry's work ethic, her fierce competitiveness, her engaging personality, great dedication and amazing talent all have had a powerful impact on the young women of Minnesota. Hockey may be king in Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, but soccer is kicking at its heels thanks to Briana Scurry.

At Anoka High School, Briana led her team to the 1989 State championship, was named All-American and was voted the top female athlete in Minnesota her senior year.

At the University of Massachusetts, Briana was the top college goalkeeper in 1993 and won two national ''goalie of the year'' awards her senior year. She led her team to the NCAA Final Four as well as to Atlantic 10 titles. Briana had 37 shutouts in her 4 years and a career goals-against average, listen to this, soccer fans, career goals-against average of 0.56. What a tremendous record.

So today, Mr. Speaker, we salute Minnesota's own Briana Scurry and all her teammates on America's World Cup championship soccer team. They proved what teamwork, dedication, hard work and heart can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to our new World Cup champions. They are role models for all of us, and all Americans are proud of them.

CONDEMNING THE CULTURE OF HATE THAT FOSTERS VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, more than a week ago our Nation and my community in particular witnessed in horror the cruel and vicious consequences of the doctrine of hate. In a matter of days in the State of Illinois and Indiana a mad murderer full of rage and contempt for his fellow men took the lives of two innocent men and attempted to murder many more victims, including six Jewish men and two Asian students.

The spree of hate and violence began on Friday, July 2, just 2 days before we, citizens of this Nation of immigrants, celebrated Independence Day. It ended on July 5. I congratulate the efforts of law enforcement from the local level up to the FBI for so quickly identifying this individual, for its work with the community and for putting an end to his rampage. However, many questions still remain, including the role of white supremacist hate groups in fostering this attack.

In my district, where most of these attacks took place, my community breathed a sigh of relief when the killing spree came to an end. But we were left grieving for Ricky Byrdsong and his family; Woo-Joon Yoon, the Asian student from Bloomington, Indiana; and angry for the assault on Jewish men peacefully observing the Sabbath.

Ricky Byrdsong lived in Skokie, Illinois. He was a loving husband, a father, a leader in the community, a former basketball coach at Northwestern University, a man of deep religious faith and a constituent. He was murdered in cold blood. His only crime was the color of his skin. He was African American. Ricky Byrdsong was a proud American man who was living the American dream. He left an unmistakable and everlasting impression on all those who had the opportunity to meet him, and he positively touched the lives of countless youth during his lifetime.

He was committed to a cause. His cause was to help under-privileged youth reach their full potential and follow their dreams. He was working on his first book: Coaching Your Kids in the Game of Life. The book was scheduled to be released next year on Father's Day. At his funeral his pastor vowed that his book would be completed. Now his family will have to go on without him, his children will grow up without their father's guidance, his friends will no longer hear his infectious laugh, and the community, especially the children, has lost forever a leader.

I will never forget the look on the faces of the hundreds of people who attended his funeral last Wednesday. It was a look of disbelief, pain and yet inspiration because Ricky Byrdsong was truly inspiring. I never wish to attend another funeral of a victim of such hatred. Ricky Byrdsong has made our mission clearer than ever. The culture of hate has no place among us. We must educate and use the truth to counter the lies being spread by hatemongers, groups and so-called churches in our communities, schools, places of worship, neighborhoods and especially on the Internet to our youth.

As a society, we must not be intimidated by the few who refuse to live peacefully among us. We must stand firm and never ever be afraid. That is why I was so proud to join the Jewish

Family and Community Services, Jewish Children's Bureau and the Anti Defamation League, the rabbis and other leaders of the Jewish community in Chicago, particularly Mr. Michael Kotzin of the Jewish United Fund and the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago who showed such leadership, to join with them on the day after six Jewish men were shot to say that an attack on even one is an attack on all of us.

I wish to recognize the Jewish United Fund for opening a special fund to aid families affected by bigotry-related violence. The initial goal of the JUF Fund for Hate Crime Victims and Families will offer assistance to the family of Ricky Byrdsong for the children's higher education.

As the Sabbath came to a close last Saturday evening, we walked the streets of the Rogers Park neighborhood in solidarity. Rogers Park is the kind of community that haters hate the most. It is diverse, integrated, independent, peaceful and all-American. But in a perverse sense of Americanism during the 4th of July weekend a crazy person attempted to take that away, and he failed.

Our community is stronger than ever. We stood together at a time of great anxiety and grave danger. Now is the time for Congress to respond to the tragedies that took place on the 4th of July weekend and pass sensible gun safety legislation. Congress must act now to make it more difficult for individuals to obtain weapons in order to convert their hatred into terror and death.

Guns used by the assailant were bought from an illegal gun dealer. He recently purchased more than 60 guns for the sole purpose of selling them for a profit. Unfortunately, two of these guns were sold to a murderer, with complete disregard for the sanctity of life. We have a responsibility to protect the lives of our constituents. Congress must pass and the President must sign bills to limit the purchase of handguns to one per month and to require the registration of every handgun sold in the United States. Our constituents demand it, and our children deserve it, and we should also pass stronger hate crimes legislation so all of us will be safe in our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE HAILED AS LEADER IN ELECTRONIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, critics often hasten to draw attention to government agencies' failures, while ignoring successes if they notice them at all. Today I want to draw the House's attention to two prestigious awards and other accolades recently received by the Government Printing Office (GPO) for its leading role in electronic information dissemination through GPO Access, its acclaimed Internet information service (www.access.gpo.gov).

First, the Vice-President's National Partnership for Reinventing Government has honored the GPO and the Energy Department (DOE) jointly with a ''Hammer Award'' for the ''Information Bridge,'' a project which makes available thousands of unclassified DOE scientific and technical reports in electronic format.

Using the World Wide Web, users enter the DOE electronic dissemination system through GPO Access, where they can view over 30,000 DOE reports already on-line, with more becoming available every day. The Information Bridge eliminates the need to disseminate these reports to depository libraries in printed form, thereby saving production and distribution costs to the government, and processing and storage costs to the libraries.

This is GPO's second ''Hammer Award'' for GPO Access; the first came in 1997 for reengineering the Commerce Business Daily with the Commerce Department. In 1998 Vice-President GORE and Government Executive magazine named GPO Access one of the 15 ''Best Feds on the Web.''

In addition, the legal community has recently lauded GPO Access. Law Office Computing magazine's April/May issue named GPO Access one of the top 50 legal-research web sites for 1999. The magazine's top 50 web sites, which included only seven federal sites, were chosen as favorites of law librarians, attorneys and paralegals based on experience with the sites and their usability.

Further, the April 1999 issue of Chicago Lawyer magazine reports that the newsletter legal.online has selected GPO Access as both the ''best research site for laws'' and the ''overall best Government site.'' Finally, the GPO just received the first American Association of Law Libraries' ''Public Access to Government Information Award'' as the ''official, no-fee, one-stop public access point for the growing universe of web-based electronic Government information.'' These accolades follow GPO's selection in February by In-Plant Graphics magazine as the top in-plant operation in the country, and in March as a top technology innovator by PC Week magazine.

Public- and private-sector entities alike appreciate the leading role GPO is playing as we advance into the information age. Let's join in the applause for the dedicated professionals of the GPO.

COSTS THAT ILLEGAL NARCOTICS IMPOSE ON OUR SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again tonight to discuss the issue of illegal narcotics and the tremendous cost to our Nation. Over and over again it is important that I think we repeat the message that I have with me here today, and that is a simple one, that drugs destroy lives. And I believe if every Member of Congress takes a few minutes to look at the impact of illegal narcotics they will be absolutely startled as to the damage that it does to our society, the cost to countless families across this Nation and also the tremendous responsibility cast upon the Congress to finance the social, the judicial and other costs that illegal narcotics impose upon our society.

Tonight I want to talk for a few minutes about some of those costs and tell the Congress and the American people that there are some very specific and direct costs to illegal narcotics and what they have done to this Nation and to, again, families and young people. In fact, during the past year over 14,000 Americans lost their lives as a direct result of the misuse or abuse of illegal narcotics in this Nation.

I come from a beautiful area in central Florida. My district is between Orlando and Daytona Beach, a very peaceful, affluent, high employment, high income area. Even my area has been plagued with countless deaths. In fact, a recent headline in Orlando Sentinel newspaper blasted out that in fact the number of drug-related deaths had now exceeded the number of homicides. Drug overdose deaths now exceed homicides in central Florida.

So the statistics are not only bad in my area but across the Nation, with more than 14,000, and again we do not count in all of those that are in traffic accidents or in suicides or other unreported deaths that may have some other report of the demise of the individual which is not included in this 14,000 figure.

In 1995, we had almost 532,000 drug-related emergencies which occurred across this Nation, and that figure has been on the upswing particularly among our young people, which should be of concern again to every Member of Congress. In 1995 we also have a figure that is reported of a retail value of the illicit drug business being over $49 billion.

The cost goes on and on again to our society. Across the land tonight there are over 1.8 million, nearly 2 million, Americans incarcerated in our jails and prisons across the land. This is at incredible cost, the cost of the judicial system, the cost of the lost wages, the cost of social support for the families who have their loved ones incarcerated.

So the cost is not just 1.8 million people behind bars but in fact much greater cost. It is estimated out of the nearly 2 million in our jails, prisons and State facilities that 60 to 70 percent are there directly because of a drug-related offense, and these are not small offenses like possession of minor drugs, and these are not one time or misdemeanor occurrences or offenses. These are, in fact, we find from the hearings that we have conducted with our criminal justice drug policy subcommittee, these are, in fact, very serious felonies. And most of those people behind bars, again in studies, confirm this as recently as the hearings that we held today in our subcommittee, that these folks in most instances are violent offenders, that in fact those that are there because of drug-related crimes are there because they trafficked in drugs, they committed a murder, they committed a rape and an assault, a robbery while under the influence of illegal narcotics or in the pursuit of acquiring money or drugs.

□ 2030

So again, 2 million people behind bars is only the tip of the iceberg.

Drug-related illnesses in the United States and death and crime are estimated to cost Americans some $67 billion plus a year in the United States. This translates into very specific costs to every American who has to pay $1,000 a year to carry the costs of health care, extra law enforcement, car and automobile accidents, and crime and lost productivity due to drug abuse and use.

Eighteen percent of the 2,000 fatally injured drivers from seven States had drugs rather than alcohol in their systems when they died. Again, drugs do in fact destroy lives, and have a very specific cost impact to the American taxpayer, to every American citizen, in addition to just the incarceration cost and judicial cost.

Drug use and misuse and illegal narcotics also dramatically impact the productivity of America's workers. Seventy-one percent of all illicit drug users are 18 years of age or older, and they are also, interestingly enough, employed.

In a study by the U.S. Postal Service, the data collected showed that among drug users, absenteeism is 66 percent higher and health benefit utilization is 84 percent greater in dollar terms when compared against other workers. So in fact, the billions that we are talking about are only the tip of the iceberg when we translate this into lost productivity and absenteeism, and then the overutilization of our health benefit programs. Again, all of that does translate into extra costs for every citizen.

Again, drugs destroy lives, they cost us lives, and they cost every American in this Congress dearly.

Disciplinary actions are, interestingly, 90 percent higher for employees who are drug users as opposed to nonusers of drugs, another high price tag to pay for those who are involved in illegal narcotics or in drug use.

Let me talk tonight about how some specific drugs impact our society and young people in this Nation, and what the effects of some of these drugs are.

First of all, let me talk about crack and cocaine. The use and abuse of crack and cocaine, which also destroys lives, has somewhat evened out among the adult population. That is only because now we have an incredible supply of heroin, we have an unbelievable supply of methamphetamine.

So, for example, my area has a very substantial increase in heroin use and abuse and deaths, and the Midwest and some other areas have been impacted by methamphetamine, so crack and cocaine has leveled out. The supply availability and price of other drugs such as methamphetamines and heroin is available.

Even first-time crack or cocaine users can be subject to heart attacks which can be fatal. We heard testimony today from a wonderful lady, Mrs. Bennett, who testified before our subcommittee. She lost her young son, a first-time cocaine user who suffered a fatal reaction and died at a very young age. She brought his picture to our subcommittee, which conducted a hearing on the question of decriminalization and legalization of illegal narcotics.

She will tell the Members that drugs in fact destroy lives. They destroyed the life of her son, and this report that I have tonight about the use of crack or cocaine adding to your incidence of seizures or heart attacks is in fact very real. Even one hit of crack or cocaine can in fact kill one, because it can cause heart attacks, strokes, or breathing problems. This has medically been proven.

Crack and cocaine use are also connected, and abuse, are connected to car crashes, to falls, burns, drowning, and suicide, and sometimes, again, these go unreported. But my point again is that illegal narcotics, hard drugs like crack and cocaine do destroy lives.

The addiction we have not talked about, but that can ruin the physical and mental health of so many individuals, and often is not counted into the statistics that we report here. So again, we have an instance of one drug which has a devastating impact on so many lives, and does in fact destroy lives.

The other drug I will talk about for a few minutes is heroin. Heroin users are getting younger and younger. Since 1993, the use of heroin among our teenage population has risen some 875 percent in the United States. We have a tremendous supply of heroin coming into the United States. We have a reduction in price.

I will talk in a few minutes about how we are getting that tremendous supply coming in. But in fact, the people who are most subjected to heroin's deadly effects are our young people. Heroin users are getting younger. A recent survey indicates that kids are trying heroin at younger and younger ages.

For example, in 1995, this report that I have says that 141,000 people in America tried heroin for the first time. About a quarter of these first-time users were somewhere between the ages of 12 and 17. Even worse, more than half the people who were admitted to hospital emergency rooms for heroin-related problems were under age 18.

Again, the theme that we bring to the floor tonight is that drugs destroy lives, and drugs destroy young lives in an incredible number of instances. These statistics do indicate that we have a tremendous heroin abuse problem among our young people. Heroin is dangerous, and you have to be just totally irresponsible to put yourself using it.

We have also found in our studies and hearings that the heroin that is coming into the United States in 1998, 1999, today, is not the heroin that came in 10 or 15 years ago. The purity levels that were down in single digits are now 60, 70 percent pure. Young people and adults who try heroin have very deadly results, as I cited. Just in my local central Florida district and area, we now have heroin overdose deaths exceeding homicides. That picture is being repeated over and over across the land. In fact, we are now up to over 4,000 heroin deaths in the Nation, and the number is growing every year.

Most disturbingly, again, we see young people as the victims of heroin overdoses and heroin deaths. Drugs destroy lives. Again, let me cite some of the information that we found in our hearings on our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. Over half the crime in this country is committed by individuals under the influence of drugs.

In the hearing that we held today we had Tom Constantine, who is the immediate former director of our Drug Enforcement Agency of the United States, just retired in the last few days. He told us that over half of the individuals who had been arrested for Federal offenses are now testing positive for illegal narcotics.

We heard the sheriff of Plano County, the city of Plano and that area, testify before our subcommittee today. He also indicated that a very high number of those arrested for any offense in his jurisdiction also have some drug in their system.

The National Institute of Justice's ADAM, the drug testing program, it is referred to also as the Adam testing program, found that more than 60 percent of adult male arrestees tested positive for drugs.

It was interesting, in some of the information we obtained today, and this figure is very high for adult males, but I believe the figure was 71 percent of the women who were arrested tested positive for drugs, a startling statistic

that, although we have fewer female arrestees, that a greater percentage of them are involved with illegal narcotics and have them in their system when they are tested upon arrest.

In most cities, over half the young male arrestees are under the influence of marijuana. Importantly, the majority of these crimes result from the effects of the drug and did not result from the fact that the drugs are illegal.

According to a study of the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, 80 percent of the men and women behind bars, about 1.4 million inmates, are seriously involved with alcohol and other drug abuse. I am going to try to refer a little bit later, if we have time, to the results of that report from the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.

This is an absolutely fascinating report just released this morning, and it talks about marijuana. It is the most comprehensive study ever conducted, that highlights the critical distinction between non-medical marijuana, medical uses of marijuana, and what is going on with those who abuse this substance, and some incredible statistics about, again, the effect on those individuals and how many of them are now in some type of a treatment program, and the problems that are related to this. We will talk more about that.

The former Secretary, I believe, of one of the administrations, Joe Califano, was involved, he was a former HEW Secretary, with this study. He is now president of that organization. We hope to have him testify at a future hearing on the results of their study.

Again, it is a dramatic study that does show that we have an incredible number of young people who are the victims of marijuana, which many try to tout as a soft drug or a non-harmful narcotic. But again, all the studies, the reports, the information lead us to one simple conclusion; again, that drugs destroy lives.

According to a study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association last year, non-drug users who lived in households where drugs, including marijuana, are used are 11 times as likely to be killed as those living in drug-free households. So if a young person or an individual comes from a house where drugs are being used, this study by the American Medical Association said they increase their chances of being killed by 11 times. So again, these are more statistics that confirm that drugs destroy lives.

Drug abuse in a home increased a woman's risk of being killed, according to this study, by a close relative, some 28 times. So those that are concerned, and we heard testimony today about spousal abuse, an incredible statistic, some 80 percent of the spousal abuse cases involved methamphetamines in one jurisdiction that was studied, and that would be abuse, battery, assault of a woman, a wife, a spouse.

But in a home that has drug use, a woman's risk of being killed is increased by 28 times, according to this AMA study.

Additionally, to confirm again the message we bring tonight that drugs destroy lives, I have a study by the Parent Resources and Drug Information Center. This is also referred to as PRIDE, the organization, and this PRIDE organization reported some of these facts.

Of high school students who reported having carried guns to school, and certainly there has been a great deal of talk about guns in this Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives, this said students who were reported having carried guns to school, 31 percent used cocaine, compared to 2 percent of the students who never carried guns to school.

□ 2045

The same relationship was found among junior high school. So more than likely, the school violence and those involved with carrying lethal weapons such as guns to school are much more likely to be drug abusers, drug users. Nineteen percent of gang members reported cocaine use compared to 2 percent among youths who were not in gangs. So whether it is someone carrying a gun to school or someone involved in a gang, drugs destroy their lives. And, in fact, drugs contribute to the crime disruption of our public school system and education. Again, drugs destroy lives.

Today, the subcommittee which I chair, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, as I mentioned earlier, began another hearing to look into the question of drug legalization, drug decriminalization.

We heard from a number of witnesses, some on different sides of the issue. I try to always bring in a balanced approach. We heard one witness in particular in favor of legalization of marijuana, a representative from the NORMAL organization, it is called. We heard another individual report from a study who gave some of the comparisons that had been reviewed on marijuana use. And we heard from, again, a parent involved with a national organization. She had lost her son, as I mentioned, and was there testifying against decriminalization, against legalization.

We also heard from the police chief of Plano, Texas, also who spoke against legalization. We found also that we had some interesting testimony from our lead witness who was Tom Constantine, and as I mentioned he is the former head of the Drug Enforcement Agency. Mr. Constantine used several examples in his testimony to show how drugs drive demand.

A few years back, the Colombian drug cartels decided to enter the heroin market. Now 75 percent of the heroin sold in the United States is of Colombian origin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of these narcotics and what Mr. Constantine brought up and what we heard today. If I can, I would like to take this down and have the chart on the drug Signature program.

All these illegal narcotics come from some place. And, in fact, we know today through scientific studies and through programs such as the heroin Signature program exactly where illegal narcotics originate. This is not a guessing game. This is today a science just like DNA. They can trace DNA to individuals; they can trace illegal narcotics back to their source.

Mr. Constantine, again, former DEA director, talked a little bit today about the heroin problem that we have. This 1997 study that he also presented to our subcommittee in a previous hearing shows exactly where heroin, one of the most deadly drugs, is coming from. And we know that 75 percent of the heroin is coming today from South America. We know that 14 percent is coming from Mexico. And then we have about 5 and 6 percent from Southwest and Southeast Asia. So we know very specifically that 89 percent of the heroin is coming from either Colombia or Mexico.

Some 6 years ago, this chart would be quite different. Most of the illegal narcotics were coming in from, in this case, heroin, was coming in from Southeast Asia and from other sources. In fact, 6 years ago, there was almost no heroin produced in Colombia.

How did we get to 75 percent, as Mr. Constantine testified and this chart documents? It is a simple thing. It is the policy of this administration.

Let me review for a moment, if I may, what took place and how we got into this situation. I have heard repeatedly, and I hear it over and over again, the war on drugs is a failure. I have heard it in the media, and I have heard it recast that the war on drugs is a failure. They would have the public and the Congress believe that the war on drugs is a failure.

In fact, since 1993, there has not been a war on drugs. In 1993, the Clinton administration basically closed down the war on drugs. What they did was they began very systematically. The first thing they cut was almost 90 percent of the drug czar's office and operations. So the drug czar's office was cut first, demoted, really. They brought in a drug czar who really ignored the problem, ignored promotion of any antinarcotics programs either before the Congress or with this administration.

What else did this administration do? The first thing they did was hire so many recent drug abusers in the White House that the Secret Service insisted on a program to do drug testing of White House employees. And I sat on the Committee on Government Operations and heard testimony to that effect.

But again, first they closed down the drug czar's office very nearly, then

began hiring people who had very recent illegal narcotics use, forcing the Secret Service to force the White House to institute a drug testing program.

Next thing they did was hire probably the worst Surgeon General, the highest health officer, that this Nation had ever had and that was Joycelyn Elders. She sent a message to our young people that said just say maybe. And the statistics I cited tonight about heroin, about marijuana, about cocaine and about the increase in incidence among our young people I think can be traced from the beginning point of that policy of that closedown, of that shutdown, that ending of the war on drugs with a chief health officer of the United States of America saying to our young people just say maybe.

Then, if I can get the smallest charts here, again this is repeated over and over that the war on drugs is a failure. Let me have these charts here. These charts do not lie. They tell the truth. And I do not know if my colleagues can see them, but this shows drug spending on international programs. Now, international would be stopping drugs at their source, probably the most effective utilization of taxpayer dollars.

We know that in 1993 and prior to that time that nearly 100 percent of the cocaine was coming from Peru and from Bolivia, a little tiny bit from Colombia. We knew where cocaine was coming from then and coca could only be grown at certain altitudes in a certain terrain. There are not many places. It cannot be grown in Florida or North Carolina, to my knowledge. It can be grown only in that area.

In 1993, the next thing the Clinton administration did, and we have to remember they controlled the White House, they controlled the other body, the United States Senate, and they controlled a big majority of the House of Representatives. The first thing they did was cut these international programs, the source country programs.

The slashes here are incredible. Again, back under President Bush we had 660, and this is millions of dollars. We are not talking billions. But they slashed them to less than half by 1995–1996. This is where the Republicans took over the Congress.

In the last 2, 3 years we have really begun to restart the war on drugs. I sat on the Committee on Government Operations during that period when Mr. Brown was the drug czar, the drug czar in name. Even though I had requests from 130-plus Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, only one hearing was held during the Democrat domination of the Congress and the White House. Only one hearing as I was a member of that committee, and that was for less than an hour. It was almost farcical. So the war on drugs was closed down and specifically the most cost-effective part of the war on drugs was closed down.

The other chart that I had here showed Colombia now producing 75 percent of the heroin. Colombia was not even on the charts as producing heroin in 1992, 1993. This administration stopped funding, cut this in less than half the international program. So there was not funding to stop drugs at their source.

If we look at 1998 and 1999, and take that in 1991–1992 dollars, we are not even up to the levels of the end of the Bush administration. And again this is so cost effective because we know where the heroin is produced. We have the Signature programs that show us exactly where the heroin is produced.

Now in addition to cutting these programs, what this administration did through a very direct policy was to stop money going to Colombia. The results in Colombia are incredible. I read a Washington Post piece, which the reporter really did not research well, but if we go back and look at what this administration did with the cuts here, they totally cut off Colombia as far as receiving any resources, helicopters, assistance, because they were afraid that some of that money might be used to fight the Marxist guerrillas who were in the jungles there.

So what this administration's direct policy was, and it was in direct conflict with the requests for the last 4 years since we have taken over the House of Representatives with a new majority, we begged, we pleaded, we sent letters, get aid, get assistance, get resources to Colombia.

What has happened? Colombia now produces 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States since we closed down that program effectively. Seventy-five percent of the heroin coming in. No heroin produced in 1992, 1993, not even on the charts. Additionally, we could talk about Mexico, which is up to 14 percent. We get 89 percent of the heroin from the two of them, and that is part of another failed Clinton policy in certifying Mexico as cooperating.

But think about Colombia and what this policy has done. Not only do we have the heroin which was not there in 1992–1993, coming in in unbelievable quantities at a quality that is as deadly as can be, that is what is killing the kids in Plano. That is what is killing the kids in Orlando, Florida. That is what is destroying the lives again by the thousands, deadly high-purity heroin coming in through this policy.

But what is interesting is in 1992, 1993, Colombia produced almost no cocaine. It did process coca and it was a big producer. The coca which was partially processed was brought into Colombia and processed there and shipped out either directly to the United States or with their buddies and network through Mexico.

What has happened since that time, 1992, 1993, the last administration, is that in fact Colombia again is deprived of any assistance. We cut this program on source country in half, plus we completely decimated Colombia. Colombia is now the biggest producer of cocaine in the world. Tom Constantine testified today it is somewhere up in the 60 percent.

□ 2100

Fortunately, this new majority, under the leadership of first Mr. Zeliff, who began restarting the war on drugs, a former Member, and the former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice was the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), who is now Speaker of the House was chair and was responsible for restarting the war on drugs. So that is why we see those figures going up here.

But even the funds that were put in last year, and I checked this, because, again, a recent story in the Washington Post and repeated across the land is that so much of our foreign assistance is going to Colombia. Well, that is bull, and that is nutso. That is not the truth.

This past year, we appropriated somewhere in the neighborhood of $280 million for Colombia. My colleagues have got to remember, up to this date, almost no money went to Colombia in fighting illegal narcotics. In fact, this administration kept the resources, the helicopters, the ammunition from this country.

So I checked to see where the money is that we appropriated last year and that the press is talking about, saying the war on drugs is a failure, and that the third biggest foreign aid recipient after Israel and Egypt is Colombia. Well, that is true for this fiscal year that that money is appropriated. But so far, according to our staff investigation, somewhere between $2 million and $3 million has gotten to Colombia. So we have not had a war on drugs. This other side of the aisle has killed the war on drugs. They completely decimated the war on drugs.

This just international programs and, again, the dollars that were slashed, they were kept from Colombia. If my colleagues think that it is bad enough we have cocaine and heroin coming in in these incredible quantities through a direct failed policy of this administration and the other side of the aisle, what they did, stop and think about what is happening in Colombia.

Everybody gets upset about Kosovo. Over a million people have been displaced in Colombia by the Civil War, by the Marxist guerillas who are funded almost totally by illegal narcotics profits and illegal narcotics trafficking. Thirty-five thousand people have died in Colombia. Thousands of judges, thousands and thousands of policemen, elected officials have been murdered and slaughtered in Colombia. It has disseminated a great nation. The reason was we did not want any arms to get there.

Now, an area the size of Switzerland is in control, and the new president, and I have to admire him, is trying to

bring peace about, trying to negotiate with the guerillas. Some oppose that. Some of are in favor of it. But one cannot have a resolution to the problems with illegal narcotics which are funding the Marxist activities or a resolution of illegal narcotics transiting or being produced there, coming into the United States until we have peace plans.

So I have been supportive. I have met with President Pastrana. He has begged for our assistance. He has begged for our patience. He has begged for our understanding. He is trying to do anything.

He brought down the head of the New York Stock Exchange to talk to the guerillas to try to tell them that a free enterprise system is better than dogging it in the jungle and conducting war and slaughter of the Colombian people.

I say give peace a chance. I also say give a chance to restarting the war on drugs. These are the facts. What the newspapers have printed is bologna. It is not the truth about these international programs.

We have been able, through Speaker HASTERT, again, who chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, who had responsibility before my new Subcommittee of Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Relations inherited it, but the Speaker was successful.

I went down with him. We met with President Fujimori of Peru. We met with President Hugo Banzer of Bolivia. Those two presidents have cut drug production of cocaine with a little bit of help from their friend. We are only talking $20 million, $30 million out of billions and billions that we are spending on law enforcement, incarceration, and treatment. Those two presidents have acted with a little bit of help and the few dollars in the international programs which we have restarted and cut 50 percent of the cocaine production. That is why we see cocaine down and more difficult to get.

The latest figures I have is President Fujimori in Peru, through his hard line, through his assistance, through the small amount of dollars we have gotten there, has reduced 60 percent. Both of them have plans to eliminate that. So a little bit of help in these international programs can be so cost effective. Do not tell me any different. I have been there. I have seen it. These are the facts.

Again, we hear the comments that interdiction and the war on drugs does not work and that we are spending too much money on interdiction. Look at what the Clinton administration did. Again, during the last years of the Bush administration, we were in the $2 billion on interdiction, in that range. The war on drugs was killed as far as interdicting drugs.

The second most cost effective way to get drugs is to stop them as they are coming in. Once they get passed the borders, forget it, folks. It is harder and harder. Ask any policeman. Ask anyone who has dealt with law enforcement. It is tough.

But here is what they did. They killed the war on drugs. The Clinton administration, which does not like the military to begin with, took the military out of the war on drugs. Look. From 1991 to 1992, $2 billion level down to about $1 billion, cut in half.

This just shows the military. I have not brought up the Coast Guard which protects Puerto Rico, which protects our coast line. They slashed the budgets there.

So that is why we have Colombia as the major producer of heroin, we know where it is coming from, the major producer of cocaine. This is why we have a stream, a supply. That is simple economics. It is economics 101, my friends, that, in fact, as one has a tremendous supply, the price goes down, and it is available. It is available to who at a low price? Our young people.

That is why the statistics I quoted here tonight and the theme that I had here tonight that drugs destroy lives is so true. This is the policy. The war on drugs died in January of 1993 with this President, with this administration.

My colleagues can see that, in 1998, 1999, we are barely getting back to the level we were with the Bush administration. So we have not even been able to restart the war on drugs.

The next myth is that we have not spent enough money on treatment. I believe in treatment. I think anyone who has a problem, we should get treatment to them. We should spend whatever. If we could spend $3 billion in Kosovo in a few months, we can certainly spend money on those who are addicted to illegal narcotics in the United States of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is the next point that I want to make. If we look back in 1991, 1992, we were spending $1.8 billion, $2.2 billion on treatment. 1999, it is not quite double. But in fact they have been putting their eggs in the treatment basket, and some of it has helped. But this also should destroy a myth that we have not increased money for treatment.

What is interesting is, since the Republicans took over the Congress, we can see some pretty dramatic increases in money for treatment. So, again, the myth that all the money is going into planes and to source country programs and interdiction equipment is just that, it is a myth. It is not the truth.

So that is a little bit of an update on how we got into this situation, where we are on the war on drugs. It is nice to come up here and talk about this. But I must say that, rather than just talk about it, we have tried to act. We have tried to act by putting our dollars into these programs. We have tried to look at those that are most cost effective.

Treatment. Again, we have no problem with treatment. Education basically was not on the charts. If we look back here at the beginning of this administration, almost no money for education.

Under Speaker Gingrich and under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the Speaker, we put in $195 million into an education program. It is relatively new. It has not completed its first year. But that money is matched by donations and by equal contributions. So we should have almost a half billion dollars in resources towards an education program.

It takes education. It takes treatment. It takes, as I said, most effectively, source country programs to eradicate drugs where they are grown and where they come from. Then it takes interdiction and also takes enforcement. So it takes all of these activities.

That is why, if we go back and look at the Bush administration and back to the Reagan administration when we had the beginning of the crack and the cocaine problem in the early 1980s, we saw an actual decrease in the number of individuals involved with illegal narcotics, or we saw some of the activity coming down where we saw the seizures going up and again some dramatic changes.

The most dramatic change that we have experienced, though, is the end of the war in drugs in January of 1993. It is so difficult to start that back up again.

In addition to providing an update on the war on drugs and where we are in the war on drugs, I also wanted to talk tonight, as I conclude, a little bit about some of the things that our subcommittee has been doing, our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources.

Several weeks ago, we conducted a hearing at the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER). As my colleagues may know, I have been highly critical, and our subcommittee has held extensive hearings on the question of assistance in Mexico. Because if we look at Colombia and we have seen the results of what happens in our failed policy with Colombia, we see where illegal narcotics, the tough stuff like heroin, cocaine are coming from. If we looked at the rest of the picture to see where the rest of the drugs are coming from, probably the balance of the drugs and 60 to 70 percent of all the hard narcotics and marijuana and everything coming into the United States comes in through Mexico.

Mexico has not cooperated. This Congress asked over a year ago, 2 years ago now, for Mexico to extradite individuals, Mexican nationals, drug lords, those who have been indicted in the United States and for whom we are seeking extradition. They have not complied. I will talk a little bit more about that in just a second.

In addition, we asked Mexico to sign a maritime agreement. To date, they still have not signed a maritime agreement to cooperate in going after people

who are transiting and dealing in drugs in the high seas.

In addition, we asked Mexico to arm our DEA agents. They still have not allowed our DEA agents to protect themselves. My colleagues may say, why? Why? Because Enrique Camarena, one of our agents was tortured, an incredibly horrible death. We have a cap actually imposed by Mexico on the number of agents. We have a very small number. It is almost incredible for the size of the problem. But even so, those who are there are still put at risk, and Mexico still refused to help us.

□ 2115

Radar in the south. And I am getting some word that Mexico is beginning to cooperate in getting radar to the south so before the drugs come into Mexico, and we know they are coming from Colombia and Panama and other locations, that we could stop those illegal narcotics. But that is still not in place.

And then enforcing the laws that are passed. Now, we have gotten Mexico to pass some laws, and the laws are on the books, but there is not the enforcement. They have a corrupt judicial system; they have a corrupt law enforcement system from the guy on the beat or the gal on the beat all the way to the President's office. And that has been documented with the former President Salinas and his family, with those in incredible positions of power, with incredible amounts of money that they have skimmed off of the drug trade, including one Mexican general who tried to place $1.1 billion that he had gotten. We know he had gotten it through illegal narcotics proceeds, and he tried to place it in legitimate financial institutions. But we have not had cooperation.

I started with extradition. And let me say that several weeks ago, as I began to mention, our subcommittee, at the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), conducted a hearing on one of the 275 extradition requests that we have. This was a case relating to the murder of Mrs. Bellush, a young mother of about five or six young children in Florida in Sarasota who was murdered several years ago. She was shot and then stabbed to death and left to die, with her young baby children left in the pool of her blood until the family members came home and found her.

We held a hearing to protest and to look into and investigate why Mexico had refused to extradite Mr. Del Toro.

Mr. Del Toro was not a Hispanic citizen. He was a citizen of the United States, born in the United States to parents who are United States citizens; and he helped commit this incredibly horrible crime and then fled to Mexico and has for the past several years used the Mexican judicial system to avoid coming back and facing justice in the United States. Thank goodness last night the Attorney General called me and said that the Mexican Supreme Court had ruled in favor of extradition and Mr. Del Toro is on his way back to face justice.

It is small compensation, small condolence to the Bellush family, but it is one extradition. Unfortunately, there are 274 other extradition requests on some 40 major drug dealers, Mexican nationals, who have been involved in illegal narcotics. Now, I believe we have had one Mexican national who has been extradited, but I have brought to the floor again some of the mugshots of these individuals.

Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza. He is wanted on conspiracy to commit armed robbery and highly involved in illegal narcotics trafficking and kidnapping and aggravated assault. He is a fugitive, has not been arrested and one of the individuals who we are trying to get back to the United States. Again I bring up the Amezcua brothers, who we also would like extradited to face justice in the United States.

So we have succeeded in one small case. We have some 200-plus requests for extradition of these individuals. I do not believe that Mexico, who has always been a close ally, and we have millions of Mexican-Americans in the United States, I do not believe these friends that we have had or Mexican-Americans agree with Mexico's current stance to thumb their nose at the United States and refuse to extradite these individuals who have been involved in murder, illegal narcotics, and trafficking.

So we will continue to put pressure on Mexico, which is now a major producer of heroin, but also the source of 60 to 70 percent of the illegal narcotics transiting into the United States. We will do everything possible.

We did introduce, just before we went into recess, a resolution which we hope to bring up on the floor which does praise Mexico for some of the small steps that they have taken, but also holds Mexico's feet to the fire to produce on extradition, to produce on a maritime agreement, to produce on assisting our DEA agents, to produce on enforcing the laws that they have passed rather than thumbing their nose at the United States.

So until we start working with the programs that do work, that are cost effective and at the source, in cooperation with these countries and as a cooperative partner, getting them the resources through these programs, we will not be successful.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I am pleased to sum up tonight with the message that I started out with and that is that drugs destroy lives. Over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year, almost 100,000 since the beginning of the end of the drug war, which was January 1993. And again the statistics show and the facts show and prove that the war on drugs ended with the beginning of this administration, and it is so difficult to start it up and that there has been so much damage to our Nation, to our young people, and so many families across this land.

Mr. Speaker, since I have some time left, I would like to provide a little update as to what is going on as far as narcotics around the world. If my colleagues think the United States is tough, the headlines in one of the recent newspapers is, ''Three Beheaded in Saudi Arabia For Drug Trafficking.''

This is a report of Friday, May 8. ''Three convicted drug traffickers were beheaded in Saudi Arabia on Friday. Saudi Arabia's Islamic courts imposed death sentences for murder, rape and drug trafficking. So far this year, 21 people have been executed, 29 put to death.''

''China executes 58 to mark world anti-narcotics day.'' In China, they have a different approach to illegal narcotics. ''China marked world anti-narcotics day by executing 58 drug traffickers.'' So just a little update on the news in China and how they treat drug traffickers.

Then this report from today's Financial Times. ''Caribbean court will speed hangings.'' And this deals with drug trafficking which has prompted crimes. Let me read from this: ''Many islands have witnessed rapid increases in murders and other violent crime over the past decade. Murders in Jamaica last year averaged 2.6 a day, twice the level of 10 years ago. Murders have doubled in Trinidad and Tobago over the past 5 years, with many of those linked to narcotics smuggling, say officials.''

So they have a treatment, and the treatment really cuts down on recidivism, and that is hanging, which is being demanded by these nations that have also felt this scourge of illegal narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, I like to provide Members of Congress and the American people with little updates on what is going on in the war on drugs and how others from time to time approach this serious problem. Not that I recommend any of these procedures or remedies that I have reported here tonight. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence, and I will return again next week.

TITLE IX AND WOMEN'S SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting sporting events of all time took place in Pasadena's famed Rose Bowl. Over 90,000 spectators, a record attendance for a women's sports contest, saw the United States women's soccer team defeat China on penalty kicks. Many millions more around the world saw this thrilling match on television. In this country television ratings were higher than for the National Hockey League finals and most of the National Basketball Association playoffs.

I congratulate all the wonderful young women who participated, not just those from the victorious U.S.

team but also the fine athletes from the Chinese squad and representatives from the other 14 nations that participated in this wonderful Women's World Cup. Marla Messing and Donna de Verona deserve everyone's gratitude for staging this magnificent tournament.

I would also like to praise ABC and ESPN for showing every match in its entirety, without commercial interruption, and live, except when two contests were being played at the same time.

The opportunity for the American public to see the action is something I have long fought for. When the American women's soccer team won the world championship in 1991 in China by defeating Norway 2 to 1, the final was only seen in this country by tape delay several weeks later. In contrast, the same match was shown live on two stations in Norway.

Consequently, I protested strongly when Americans were denied the right to see on television any of the soccer or women's softball matches in the 1996 Olympics. This was inexcusable, particularly since both American teams won the gold medal. I also objected at the poor treatment received by television viewers who wished to watch the U.S. men's and women's hockey teams at last year's winter Olympics. Since the U.S. Olympic committee is chartered by Congress, I am urging the House of Representatives' Committee on Government Reform, of which I am a member, to exert strong oversight so that the American public will receive better treatment at next year's Olympics. I know that Americans are anxious to see their beloved soccer team perform once more, and I am sure they will also enjoy our wonderful women's softball athletes when they get the opportunity to see them in action.

I think it is important to call attention to the important role that Title IX, enacted into law in 1972, played in preparing our women's team for the World Cup, and I congratulate my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for having authored and enacted that law in this House.

Prior to the enactment of Title IX, female athletes in this country had limited chances to compete. I know when I was in school if I wished to be involved in athletics the only opportunity was to be a cheerleader. Donna de Verona, an Olympic gold medalist in swimming in the 1964 Olympics, was unable to obtain an athletic scholarship at an American University despite her considerable outstanding talent.

We must not heed those who complain that Title IX is responsible for the elimination of college men's basketball, wrestling and other so-called nonrevenue sports teams. In fact, we must find ways of extending the philosophy of Title IX to other areas where women are discriminated against in the sports world. In this regard, I refer to professional sports.

In this respect, 27 years after the introduction of Title IX, women are drastically discriminated against in the professional sports world. As of now, the women who won the world championships for the United States in women's soccer have no opportunity to play as professionals in this country. On the other hand, the members of the men's soccer team that finished last in France at the Men's World Cup last year have ample opportunities to play professionally in the United States and abroad. I do not wish to demean our American men's soccer athletes. I am confident they will do much better at the next world cup.

I think it is important to point out that virtually all men's professional sports teams receive significant government assistance in the form of subsidies and substantial tax breaks for whatever venue they play in. Many of the stadiums are actually constructed by municipal governments and either turned over to a team or leased at a very low rent. I believe that we must see that these facilities and tax breaks are available to women's professional teams on an equal basis.

□ 2130

THE DEBT AND THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about fiscal responsibility, the budget deficit and hopefully paying off the debt.

We have a very promising situation right now where we are finally headed towards balancing the budget. It was not too long ago when that seemed like an impossible dream. I remember in 1990 when we looked at budget deficits growing on a yearly basis, stacked on top of an already multi-trillion dollar debt, it seemed impossible to think that we would ever dig our way out of that hole, but thanks to a strong economy, the private sector kicking in and some good decisions made by both sides of the aisle and by President Clinton's administration, we are to the point where we almost have a yearly balanced budget. Now, we still have a $5.6 trillion debt to deal with, but we are headed in the right direction, for the moment.

That is why I rise to speak this evening, because the ''for the moment'' part could change. As we head into the budget negotiations that are starting in earnest in both chambers and at the White House, we need to be very careful not to lose the progress that we have gained and not to, in essence, snatch defeat from the jaws of victory which we still have plenty of time to do.

I think there are a couple of ways this might happen. The first way is when we start throwing numbers around of the surplus. We have heard the numbers in the trillions of dollars about how much money we have got lying around. I want to try this evening to clarify exactly what we are talking about, because there are a number of variables in these numbers that often do not come with the rosy scenarios that various politicians are laying out for people to hear.

We have heard, for instance, that we have and will run up, as currently projected, $6 trillion in surpluses over the course of the next 15 years. There are a number of problems with this scenario. First of all, of that $6 trillion, better than half, almost, I think it is like $3.1 trillion, will be ran up in the Social Security trust fund. Any surplus that we have in the Social Security trust fund is not money that we can spend because it is money that we borrow from that trust fund with a promise to pay it back plus interest so that we can meet the obligations of the Social Security trust fund. If we were to take that money and treat it as a surplus and spend it, we would in essence—not in essence, we would—be spending money twice. That is exactly the sort of thing that got us in trouble in the 1980s. If you spend money twice, you wind up in debt because you do not have it when you need it.

So right away we lose half of that 15-year figure, better than half of that 15-year figure. You could still look at that and say, ''Gosh, $2.9 trillion over 15 years, that is still a lot of money.'' It is, but it presumes that our existing budget of all spending will be reduced by 20 percent. Not only will it not increase but we will make cuts of 20 percent. This was part of the 1997 balanced budget agreement that occurred before our economic situation got rosier and more money poured into the coffers. I do not want to be one to predict the future, but having been around this place for the last year or so and listening to people talk about all the various programs, from defense to education to you name it that people feel are underfunded, much less in need of a 20 percent cut, I find it very hard to believe that over the course of that 15 years we are actually going to have that 20 percent reduction. So if we assume that again, we are going to get in trouble. That puts us in a position where you realize there is not that much money there.

Lastly, and most importantly, these are projections, estimates. Now, we have to do projections and estimates. You have to sort of guess, if you will, at what your budgets are going to look like so you can plan for the future. That is acceptable, but I would not count our chickens before they hatch. Because that 15-year projection is based on 15 years of continued growth and low inflation. Now, granted the growth that is projected is lower than we have had in the last year or two, as we have had the long peacetime expansion, the longest that we have had in a while, but still there are times when revenues go down instead of up, when

estimates get worse instead of better. I know this as every Member of this Chamber ought to know. Those times happened throughout the 1980s and into the early 1990s. We had projected balanced budgets at, gosh, I do not know how many times throughout the 1980s and 1990s, but the numbers always came in worse than expected, many times far worse than expected, dramatically growing the deficit instead of reducing it.

So if we assume that this 15-year period is going to produce continued growth, continued low inflation, we are asking for trouble. I would suggest that a more modest approach is at most let us assume that maybe half of that is going to happen and if the other half happens, fine, when it happens, then we can use it for tax cuts or needed spending, but let us not spend it before we get it.

And, fourth, the final point, we should not forget the $5.6 trillion debt that we have hanging over us. It would be nice to use a lot of this money to pay down that debt, to get us back to the point where we can have the fiscal responsibility that we need in this country. We spend over $200 billion, somewhere around $220 billion a year, in interest on the debt. That is money that cannot go for any program, cannot go for any tax cut, it is merely servicing our debt. If we were to pay down that debt, we could reduce that amount and have even more money and a more fiscally responsible budget.

Let me suggest that now is the time to do this, at a time when we have between 4 and 6 percent growth depending on the quarter, at the time when we have virtually nonexistent inflation. These are unprecedented times, at least unprecedented in the last 40 or 50 years in this country, and if we do not seize this opportunity at a time when unemployment is 4.2 percent, to be fiscally responsible, we will never do it when times turn bad. Because when times turn bad is precisely when you need to spend more money on things like education and infrastructure, when you need to give tax cuts to help people who are struggling due to the tough economic times. Now is the time to be fiscally responsible.

I want to touch on one more point on that. We have recently heard a lot of talk about tax cuts. Truthfully there are not many politicians who do not like tax cuts. We would love to be able to give as many of them as possible and in as many places as possible, but only in my opinion if they do not jeopardize fiscal responsibility.

The plan that has been rolled out by the majority Republican Party in recent days calls for $850 billion, or $875 billion, depending on whose figures you believe, over the next 10 years. Right away, please note that they estimate over the next 10 years, whereas the surplus figures that have been thrown around in the newspapers estimate over 15 years. So over 15 years, that $850 billion is even more. In fact, if you take that $850 billion, put it over the 10 years like it is, then take our projected surpluses back over 10 years, and that is the chart that I have with me today, you will see that we have a figure here that shows that the combined surpluses over those two periods are somewhere around $1 trillion.

If you then also add into it the fact that if you spend the $850 billion or if you give it to tax cuts basically, you will not be able to pay down the debt at all, you jack up your interest payments by almost $200 billion and you completely exhaust this projected surplus in 10 years. So we better do absolutely as well every single year and we better be prepared to cut the budget 20 percent or we can forget about fiscal responsibility. The number is simply too high. Yes, we ought to do tax cuts. I completely support that. I completely agree with that. We ought to target it to the middle class, target it to the people who maybe have not necessarily benefited as much from the recent economic boon as others. But we should not exhaust the entire projected surplus on these tax cuts, putting ourselves in a position where we cannot even begin to pay down the debt and probably will not be able to have a balanced budget if the numbers come in worse than they are currently projected. That is not fiscally responsible.

Let me throw one other frightening statistic at you as we are looking at these happy numbers of the projected surpluses. We project out 15 years, which is an interesting time frame to pick particularly when you factor in positive economic projections, because it is right about at that time period, the year 2014, when the costs of Medicare and Social Security are really going to accelerate. If you project it out a few more years, you would see how much that starts to hurt us as the baby boom generation starts to retire in earnest. We are going to be in big trouble.

All of these factors and statistics need to be considered. The fact that half the money is in the Social Security trust fund, the fact that right at the end of our projections we get hit with a huge bill for Medicare and Social Security. These are things that mitigate how much money we have. My grave concern, and I have seen it already, and had people come up to me, program after program, tax cut after tax cut is thrown at us and everyone says, ''Well, gosh, you ought to be able to do it. You've got this multi-trillion dollar surplus that everybody keeps talking about.'' I hope in my remarks I have explained a little bit tonight that we do not have that multi-trillion dollar surplus in the bank by any stretch of the imagination.

I really think that the single best thing this Chamber can do for the people of our country right now in these strong economic times is balance the budget and pay down the debt. Then if we hit tough economic times, we will have a little leeway to borrow some money, help prime the pump, help get the economy back going again, but not if we cannot do it now. If we cannot do it now in these prosperous times, we will never do it. And God help us if it gets to the point where actually the projections go down, if we experience a year of negative growth, which by the way does happen, if inflation ticks back up closer to double digits than just one or two, then we will really be in a fix. Now is the time to prepare for the future.

I would like to close by just making one other point. This is tough. I recognize that. I am not going to stand here and say that fiscal responsibility is easy. Because we have a lot of needs in this country. I could tick off a dozen off the top of my head, defense spending, education spending, veterans, health care for seniors and children, environmental protection programs, and that is just a few. We also could have a tremendous need for a lot of tax cuts that would be tremendously helpful to the middle class and others. I know that. Every day in my office a number of people come in the door and request one of those programs. But the obligation and the responsibility of this Congress is to recognize that we are not the last people in this country who are going to need those things and if we spend all the money now, if we basically have no discipline and simply want to pass out the goodies to make as many people happy as is humanly possible, then 10, 20, 30 years from now our children, our grandchildren, those of us who are still around, are not going to have anything for these same programs. In the year 2020, 2050, they are going to need education and transportation and health care and defense spending every little bit as much as we need it now but they will not have it because we in our fiscally irresponsible way will have spent their money.

I grew up in the 1970s and the 1980s when prior Congresses were in essence spending all of my money. I did not much like it and I darn sure do not want to do it to future generations because I do not have the discipline to do what is right and what is best for this country and what is responsible.

Do not let rosy scenarios and pie in the sky numbers fool you about where the budget is going and what is going to happen. Demand fiscal responsibility from this Congress, demand that the budget gets balanced and we pay down the debt.

BLUE DOG VIEW OF FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized to control the remainder of the minority leader's time.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my colleague for requesting this hour this evening. I very much appreciate the opportunity to participate. I will assure the Speaker, I do not intend to take the full remaining part of the time tonight. If some other colleagues do show up, I will yield to them under the rule.

Let me sort of begin where the gentleman from Washington just ended and on the chart that he has in the well and point out, contrary to a lot of rhetoric in this body over the last few days, there is no budget surplus this year. When we look at the year 2000, the off-budget surplus is $5 billion projected. In the year 2001, it is $24 billion projected. Therefore, I would hope that this body would resist the temptation that is prevalent today to talk in terms of an $850 billion tax cut over the next 10 years when, according to all arithmetic today that is conservative, you will find that it will have to be done with borrowed money.

Now, the people that I represent do not get excited about a tax cut that is paid for with borrowed money. The first thing they assume is that if you borrow $850 billion, the least you are going to pay for interest is about 5 percent, maybe 6 percent, because it is the government doing the borrowing, but then they understand that if that is done with borrowed money, there is a pretty good chance that the Federal Reserve is going to involve itself in our decisions.

I ask my colleagues tonight, what did the Federal Reserve do a couple of weeks ago? If memory serves me correctly, they increased interest rates by .25 percent. Why did the Federal Reserve and the wisdom of Alan Greenspan increase those interest rates? Because they were afraid the economy was about to start overheating, inflation was going to begin moving up and they wanted to nip it in the bud. Now, let us move ourselves back to the subject of tax cutting.

Why would we want a tax cut? Obviously because it is a politically popular thing to do. It makes good political rhetoric to say we are going to leave this money that has been accumulated by overtaxing the people and sending it back to you, but by the same breath, tax cuts stimulate the economy. Now, the problem that I have with this $850 billion tax cut is that if on the one hand we are going to stimulate the economy and that stimulation of the economy is going to cause interest rates to go up, who is going to benefit best? I would submit to you tonight, the best tax cut that this Congress can give to all of the American people is to act fiscally responsible and to make certain that interest rates do not go up, in fact can come back down. That is something we had better think about, because we are not in control of the Federal Reserve and it is predictable based on what Chairman Greenspan has been saying what will happen if in fact the economy starts to overheat. But I go back to my first comment and point out again, there is no budget surplus.

□ 2145

Now I have a little further problem with this chart and all of these guesstimations because that is what they are.

I have been around here a few years, and I remember the debate in this body not too many years ago in which we argued for hour after hour as to whether or not we could project 2 years, 3 years. Now all of a sudden we are accepting 15-year projections.

Now who among us can predict tomorrow, much less 15 years from today? Who among us can make these kind of decisions? And that is why the Blue Dogs, as we are affectionately called by some, in the budget proposal that we made earlier this year suggested, let us stop this business; yes, Mr. President, you, and to the leadership of this body, let us stop this business of taking 15-year numbers and acting like this $700 billion is going to occur, and let us go back to 5-year numbers. Let us be conservative. Let us use 5-year numbers and let us not get carried away either with our desire for cutting taxes or our desire on the part of some for spending more money.

Now, again, let me repeat, there is no budget surplus. Most of these surpluses are dealing with Social Security. When you look at the off-budget or the on-budget surplus, you do have projected over the next 5 years 231 billion. What is it about this that should bother us when we take a 231 billion projected surplus over the next 5 years and suddenly use that as justification to have an $850 billion tax cut?

And what ought to really bother this body is that when you look at that other number on this chart and you look at that 2414 number, that is when we have major problems dealing with Social Security. That is why another part of the Blue Dog budget has said: Let us devote 100 percent of the Social Security trust funds to solving the Social Security problem, and let us do this by paying down the debt. Let us pay down the debt with all of the Social Security trust funds. And we go further in saying let us take half of the non-Social Security surplus funds and pay down the debt with them. And then let us use the other half of that projected surplus to deal with the concept of tax cuts and the concept of increased funding, particularly for defense.

We find over the weekend the Pentagon began to raise concerns, and rightfully they did. Because when anyone looks at an $850 billion tax cut over the next 10 years and then sees how it literally explodes about 2014, that becomes a problem for the military, it becomes a problem for our veterans programs, it becomes a problem for Medicare and Medicaid, but it even more seriously becomes a major problem for Social Security in 2014 because that is the year in which the Social Security trust funds begin not to, or the amount of taxes we are all paying on Social Security, begin not to cover the expected outgo of 2014.

In other words, the current situation we have in which Social Security is bringing in more than we are paying out begins to turn the other way as the baby boom generation begins to retire. It ought to bother us, and it ought to say to this body and to those as we speak who are marking up this tax bill in extreme haste tonight: Now is the time for us not to be liberal with our thinking but to be conservative with our thinking and to realize that these are projections, and no one responsibly spends projections like it is real money.

Let me give my colleagues a few numbers in backing up. There is no budget surplus this year. For the first 8 months of fiscal year 1999, October through May, the Treasury reported a cumulative surplus of 40.7 billion, but it is composed of an off-budget surplus of 78.8 billion minus an on-budget surplus of 38.1.

There is no surplus, and yet we keep talking like there is one.

Let me read an editorial that was printed in today's San Angelo Standard Times. This is the way it went:

Washington's Budget Discussions Annoying. It is surreal to listen to Washington politicians arguing about how they ought to spend tax cuts on new programs, a projected budget surplus of $5.9 trillion over the next 15 years. There are two niggling problems with such talk. One is that it is the wrong policy; the second is that not only is the amount of money being discussed little better than a blind guess, there is not even any assurance that there will be any surplus.

Consider that the new projections are $1 trillion higher than the one made just this past February. Then consider that just 10 months ago the projected surplus was about one-third the numbers being tossed around now. And finally consider that just 18 months ago we were still talking about deficits. Can anyone really have enough confidence in such inexact calculations to make any plans that rely on their accuracy? Is it not obvious that if economic conditions can improve so rapidly, they can worsen just as rapidly? In fact, would not the smart money say that after 98 months of economic expansion, the longest during the peacetime in the Nation's history, a downturn is vastly more likely than 15 more years of uninterrupted growth and that future plans ought to reflect that probability?

The only good thing about the current budget blabbering is that the $5.9 trillion figure is in the ball park of the amount owed on the national debt. Would it not be nice if that image, paying off the debt and not dollar signs begging to be given, this political barter, was the one that filled the politicians' heads? Would it not be nice if the trillions of dollars that have been and will be paid in interest on the debt could be used in some more productive way?

Making the current talk even more frustrating is that doing the right thing is not even a difficult political choice. Polls have consistently shown that, given the options, Americans want Congress and the President to get

the Nation's fiscal house in order before doing anything else with extra money.

Maybe the glorious projections being tossed around will turn out to be right or maybe the surplus will wind up being even twice as large, three times as large. That would be splendid. But it is foolish and irresponsible to base policy on dreams and wishes. Washington should take care of the priorities first, the money owed and the money that will be owed to future Social Security and Medicare recipients before committing any budget surplus elsewhere.

I could not have said it better myself, and as we go into tomorrow's continued markup in the Committee on Ways and Means and then next week having an $850 billion tax cut on the floor, many of us are going to be reminding this body time and time again: If you really mean it when you say let us lock up the Social Security trust funds and not use them, if you really mean it when we talk about saving Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, if you really mean it, that we are going to keep our Nation's fiscal house in order. We must not succumb to the temptation to spend this surplus that may or may not even be realized for any purpose, and that includes the cutting of taxes. Because if we make that mistake, let us remember what happened the last time when we were not able to meet the spending needs in the 1980s. We borrowed $3 trillion, almost $4 trillion. We borrowed because we could not and would not make the difficult decisions right here in this body.

Again, my plea to the leadership of this House: Let us make the tough decisions first, let us settle the appropriations battle, let us acknowledge that if in fact we do have a need to build up our Nation's military, and we do, that there is no way on this earth we will be able to meet those numbers unless we deal with them responsibly in the budget by making that decision first. Let us acknowledge, all of us, that if you are concerned about Social Security, you cannot wink at 2014, you cannot say we are going to pass that on to the future congresses, we do not care about what is going to happen then, oh, we care, but we have got a plan, and the plan is yet to be materialized.

Why would it not be the most responsible thing for us to have a Social Security bill on the floor? Why would it not be the most responsible to have a bill for Medicare reform on the floor and have honest to goodness projections?

Why do we have our hospitals in town this week again concerned, as my hospitals are here, as I met with them, hospital administrators from about 20 in my district who are concerned about having to shut down because the budget decisions that were made in the 1997 balanced budget agreement went too far. And as I point out to them, it did not go near as far as some folks in this body would have liked to have seen. But why not have an open and honest debate about how we are going to deal with health care first? Why do we postpone that until after we have a vote on spending the entire surplus that may or may not be a real one?

These are some of the questions that I think we are going to have to ask and to answer over and over and over again.

Remember: When anyone talks about an $852 billion surplus that is not Social Security; remember the highway bill that this body passed last year overwhelmingly? Look at the money that we voted to spend there that busted the hound out of the caps, but nobody saying, oh, we were not busting them because that was just part of the highway bill.

Look at this year, when we passed an airport bill not too many days ago and folks were standing up on the Committee on the Budget and saying we are busting the caps. No, we are not, because the total has not been busted yet, but that old bucket is filling up, and as it fills up, we are going to have some extremely interesting times, and I do not want, I hope, to be part of another Congress that for political reasons absolutely and totally disregards the future of our children and grandchildren. That is what we will do if we choose to have a tax cut for self-gratification today. We will be saying to our children and grandchildren we do not give a rip about you. Because the urgency is what the polls that we have to be looking at this year, and that is somebody somewhere is saying we need a tax cut.

I agree we need a tax cut, but not with borrowed money. That is the significant thing that we are going to have to somehow get over, hopefully to a majority of this body, that it does not make economic sense for us to waste this opportunity of fiscal responsibility, the first time in many, many years that we have got 2 years in a row in which when you take Social Security trust funds and off-budget, on-budget, all of this malarkey that we talk about here, that we do have a surplus. If we apply it to the debt and honestly use this opportunity to deal with the long-term problems of Social Security, we can do something that our grandchildren will look back on. And I happen to have two. I should say my wife, Cindy, and I happen to have two.

And I have resolved, and many people asked me why I have been so involved as I have in the Social Security question. I am not on the Committee on Ways and Means. I have been working with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my colleague. We have bipartisan support now for a proposal on Social Security that does what we say it will do. And people say, well, what do we say it will do? It goes a long way towards solving the long-term problems of Social Security, better than any other proposal out there.

And people say, ''Well, CHARLIE, why are you so involved in Social Security?''

And I say two reasons. Their names are Chase and Cole. It is mine and my wife's 4-year-old and 2-year-old grandsons. I do not want them to look back 65 years from today and say, if only my granddad would have done what in his heart he knew he should have done when he was in the Congress, we would not be in the mess we are in today.

□ 2200

We have a wonderful opportunity, if we can find the bipartisan political courage to deal conservatively with this surplus, to avoid the temptation that some have today to spend the money, whether it be on tax cuts or whether it be on spending for new programs.

Members will see me up at this mike and at other mikes and using every possible opportunity over the next several days to encourage a majority of my colleagues to take this surplus and pay down the debt. Listen to what the American people are telling us in district after district. They are saying, pay down the debt.

Any small business man or woman knows what happens to their business when they get more debt than they can pay back. When the interest cost becomes insurmountable, an insurmountable problem to them, they understand. Why is it so difficult for Members of Congress to understand?

That is the message the Blue Dogs will be bringing. That is the message I hope we will find bipartisan support for.

URGING HOUSE LEADERSHIP TO BRING MANAGED CARE REFORM TO THE FLOOR FOR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARY MILLER of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

COMMONSENSE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BUDGET, THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT, AND MEDICARE

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself agreeing with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) on many of the issues that he has talked about regarding the budget. We are dealing primarily with what looks like a projected $1 trillion surplus. That is assuming that we do not have a recession over the next 10 years, that the economy continues to be as strong, and that we stay within budget caps related to the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

But as my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, rightly points out, I think we will need to go back and do some adjustments on the Balanced Budget Act, particularly as it relates to health care.

I have a lot of rural hospitals in my district, and there is a large teaching hospital in my State, just like there is in Texas, just like there is in every State in the country. Those rural hospitals and teaching hospitals over the

next 4 or 5 years are going to lose millions and millions of dollars, and they will be in the red. We need to do something to adjust the payments, and we are not just talking about reductions in the rate of growth for their reimbursement, we are talking about a decrease, a real decrease and cuts from today.

For instance, the average rural hospital in the State of Iowa, my home State, currently gets paid by Medicare about $1,200 for their costs for a patient who has a cataract operation. That is projected to decrease to about $950 under the Balanced Budget Act. That is a real cut, that is not a reduction in the rate of growth. I could go through one procedure after another.

So when we look at the total budget, we have to also look at some adjustments that we are going to have to make in terms of Medicare. We are going to have to look at some real adjustments we are going to have to make in order to get our appropriations bills passed.

We cannot bring to the floor and expect it to pass a bill that would cut spending for the FBI by 20 percent. We cannot bring to the floor and expect the bill to pass if we would reduce funding for the immigration service, the INS, by 15 to 20 percent. That is a cut, not just reduce the rate of growth in their cost of living allowance. These are some real facts we are going to have to deal with.

Just like my friend, the gentleman from Texas, I think we ought to have a tax cut as well. But I cannot support an $870 billion tax cut that we are talking about here in the House, not $870 billion out of $1 trillion in terms of the surplus.

I think it would be much more reasonable for us to sit down, reach across the aisle, reach down Pennsylvania Avenue, and come to an agreement. Let us do some adjustments on that Balanced Budget Act, maybe one-third of that surplus. Let us maybe do one-third of that surplus for a tax cut. That is still a hefty tax cut.

And let us do something that all of my constituents say we ought to do. For once, and it would probably be the first time in 50 or 60 years, let us actually reduce the Nation's debt. Let us do some real deficit reduction. I got elected in 1994 and took office in 1995. The debt has increased every year since I have been in Congress. We have an opportunity this year to actually reduce the national debt.

What would be the benefit of that? Well, it would help reduce interest rates for everyone in the country. That makes a big difference if one is paying for a house or buying a car. By reducing that total debt that the country has, which is over $5 trillion, by reducing that now, it gives us some cushion for what we will have to spend later on when the baby boomers retire.

Those are just some commonsense recommendations to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk primarily tonight about managed care reform. So I find myself standing on the floor yet again calling for comprehensive patient protection to be debated on the floor of the House of Representatives as soon as possible.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, do Members know the difference between a PPO, an HMO, and the PLO? At least, Mr. Speaker, with the PLO, you can negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, the clock continues to tick on our legislative calendar. So I ask, for the hundredth time, when are we going to debate comprehensive managed care legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives, and will the debate be fair? And when will the House Committee on Commerce mark up a managed care reform bill?

The decision was made to let the Committee on Education and the Workforce take up the comprehensive patient protection legislation first, but they are stalled. Nothing has happened in the Committee on Commerce, and nothing is happening in the other committees.

How can any of us say that we are making a strong effort to address managed care reforms when the Committee on Commerce, the committee of primary jurisdiction, has yet to hold a markup session on a managed care bill?

Before I go any further, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), for their strong advocacy of strong patient protection legislation in the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

My colleagues have pointed out that the bills of the Committee on Education and the Workforce that were touted to be comprehensive managed care bills were, in reality, nothing more than an assurance of business as usual for the HMOs. Actually, they were not even business as usual, as those bills from the Committee on Education and the Workforce actually make it harder for patients to fight HMO abuses under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on this floor about how important it is for patients to have care that fits what are called ''prevailing standards of medical care.'' This issue is being debated here on Capitol Hill this week by the other body. It is a very, very important issue. So I want to spend a little bit of time to talk to my colleagues about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, many health plans devise their own arbitrary guidelines and definitions for ''medical necessity.'' For example, one HMO defines ''medical necessity'' as the cheapest, least expensive care, without any qualification ensuring that patients will still receive quality health care coverage.

We might ask, how is it that HMOs are allowed to do that? That is not the case for the majority of insurance companies who sell to individual people. They have to follow State insurance laws. Under current Federal law, if you or a member of your family is insured by your employer in a self-insured plan, your employer can define ''medical necessity'' as anything that they want to. Furthermore, they are not liable for their decisions, except insofar as to give care that could be denied.

ERISA was originally designed as a consumer pension bill. It was designed to make pension plans uniform for employees, to make it easier for employers to issue pensions. It got extended to health plans sort of by a quirk 25 years ago. It was not even hardly debated here on the floor.

It did not make that much difference for a long time, when most health plans were traditional indemnity insurance plans. Then along came managed care. What happened? Those companies started making medical decisions. Then we started to run into the problems and the complications of those medical decisions.

Listen to some words that a former HMO reviewer gave as she testified before Congress. It was May 30, 1996, when this small, nervous woman testified before the Committee on Commerce. Her testimony came after a long day of testimony on the abuses of managed care.

This woman's name was Linda Peeno. She was a claims reviewer for several health care plans. She told of the choices that plans are making every day when they determine the medical necessity of treatment options.

I am going to recount her testimony: ''I wish to begin by making a public confession.'' This is this HMO medical reviewer's words. ''In the spring of 1987, I caused the death of a man. Although this was known to many people, I have not been taken before any court of law or called to account for this in any professional or public forum. In fact, just the opposite occurred. I was rewarded for this,'' she said. ''It brought me an improved reputation in my job and contributed to my advancement afterwards. Not only did I demonstrate that I could do what was expected of me, I exemplified the good company medical reviewer. I saved the company half a million dollars.''

As I was watching this lady testify, I could see that she was anguished. Her voice was husky. She was tearful. I looked around the room, and the audience shifted uncomfortably. They drew very quiet as her story unfolded. The industry representatives, the HMO representatives who were in that committee room, they averted their eyes.

She continued: ''Since that day, I have lived with this act and many others eating into my heart and soul. For me, a physician is a professional charged with the care of healing of his or her fellow human beings. The primary ethical norm is do no harm. I did worse. I caused death.''

She continued, ''Instead of using a clumsy, bloody weapon, I used the cleanest, simplest of tools: My words. This man died because I denied him a

necessary operation to save his heart. I felt little pain or remorse at the time. The man's faceless distance soothed my conscience. Like a skilled soldier, I was trained for the moment. When any moral qualms arose, I was to remember, I am not denying care, I am only denying payment.''

She continued: ''At that time, that helped me avoid any sense of responsibility for my decisions. Now I am no longer willing to accept the escapist reasoning that allowed me to rationalize that action.''

□ 2215

I accept my responsibility now for that man's death as well as for the immeasurable pain and suffering many other decisions of mine caused.

Well, at that point Ms. Peeno described many ways managed care plans deny care, but she emphasized one in particular: The right to decide what care is medically necessary. She said, quote, ''There is one last activity that I think deserves a special place on this list, and this is what I call the ''smart bomb'' of cost containment, and that is medical necessity denials. Even when medical criteria is used, it is rarely developed in any kind of standard traditional clinical process. It is rarely standardized across the field. The criteria are rarely available for prior review by the physicians or the members of the plan. And we have enough experience from history to demonstrate the consequences of secretive unregulated systems that go awry.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, the room was stone quiet. The chairman of the committee mumbled ''thank you.'' This medical reviewer could have rationalized her decisions as so many have done. She could have said, ''I was just working within guidelines'' or ''I was just following orders.'' We have heard that one before. Or, ''We have to save resources.'' Or, ''Well, this is not about treatment, it is really about benefits.''

But this HMO reviewer refused to continue this type of psychological denial and she will do penance for her sins the rest of her life. And to atone for that she is exposing the dirty little secret of HMOs determining medical necessity.

Mr. Speaker, if there is only one thing my colleagues learn before voting on patient protection legislation, I beg them to listen to the following: before voting on any patient protection legislation, keep in mind the fact that no amount of procedural protection or schemes of external review can help patients if insurers are legislatively given broad powers to determine what standards will be used to make decisions about coverage. As Ms. Peeno so poignantly observed, insurers now routinely make treatment decisions by determining what goods or services they will pay for.

Let me give an example of how they can arbitrarily determine medical necessity. There is a health plan out there that determines medical necessity by defining it as: The cheapest, least expensive care as determined by us. So well, what could be wrong with that? What is wrong with the cheapest, least expensive care?

Well, before I came to Congress and in some surgical trips that I make abroad I still do this, I took care of a lot of children with cleft lips and palates. Let me show the birth defect of one of these children. This is a little baby born with a complete cleft lip and palate. This occurs about one in 500 births, so it is pretty frequent. A huge hole right in the middle of the face. Imagine being a mom or dad and giving birth to a little baby with this birth defect, and then think of that HMO that defines medical necessity as the cheapest, least expensive care.

Mr. Speaker, the prevailing standard of care, a standard that we have used in this country for over 200 years, would say the prevailing standard of care to fix this defect in the roof of this child's mouth is a surgical operation to fix that. I have done hundreds of those operations. That is the standard care everywhere in the world. However, that HMO, by its contractual language, can say but the cheapest, least expensive care would be to use what is called a plastic obturator. It would be like an upper denture plate. That way the food will not go up into the roof of the mouth, up into the nasal passages so much.

Of course, with that little plastic device which would be the cheapest, least expensive care, the child will probably never speak as good as if the child had a surgical correction of this birth defect. But so what does the HMO care? They are increasing their bottom line, their profits. And furthermore, under Federal law they can define it any way they want to by their contractual language if one happens to get their insurance from an employer.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a tragedy. I think that is a travesty. Congress created that law 25 years ago never expecting that this type of behavior would be done by HMOs. Yet 50 percent of the reconstructive surgeons who take care of children with this birth defect have had HMOs deny operations to surgically correct this condition by calling them, quote, ''cosmetic operations.''

This is not a cosmetic operation. Cosmetic operations are repairing baggy eyelids or a face lift. This is a birth defect. Prevailing standards of care would say surgical correction, not a piece of plastic shoved up into the roof of a patient's mouth with food and fluid coming out of their nose.

Who would do that, some would ask? Well, it happens. And we need to fix the Federal law that keeps that happening. What else about that Federal law needs to be fixed? Well, over the last few days I have watched the debate up here on the Hill in the other body. There was an amendment that dealt with who would be covered by patient protection legislation. The GOP bill would only cover about one quarter of the people in this country. There was an amendment to make it cover everyone in this country, these patient protections. Getting up and arguing against it were my GOP colleagues by saying, hey, we should not interfere with the States's ability, States's rights, let the States decide this. The only problem with this is that it is Federal law that has exempted State regulation and State oversight.

I want to see in a few days if my colleagues will talk the same tune when we are talking about liability. It was Federal law that gave a liability shield to HMOs so that if they do negligent, malicious behavior that results in injury, loss of limb, or death that they are not responsible.

Let me give an example of what I am talking about in terms of what HMOs have done. This is the case of a little 6-month-old boy. A little 6-month-old boy in Atlanta, Georgia, actually lives south of Atlanta, Georgia, woke up one night crying about 3:00 in the morning and had a temperature of 104 and looked really sick. His mother thought he needed to go to the emergency room. This is this little boy tugging on his sister's sleeve before his HMO health care. So his mother phoned the 1–800 number and she is told, ''We will authorize you to go to an emergency room, but we will only let you go to this one hospital a long ways away. And if you go to a nearer one, we will not cover it.''

So Dad gets in the car, Mom wraps up little Jimmy and they start on their trek. About halfway through the trip, they pass three hospital emergency rooms. Mom and Dad are not health professionals. They know Jimmy is sick but they do not know how sick, but they do know if they stop without an authorization, they could get stuck with thousands of dollars of bills because their HMO will not pay for it. So they push on to that one authorized hospital.

What happens? En route, little Jimmy's eyes roll back in his head, he stops breathing, he has a cardiac arrest. Picture Mom and Dad, Dad driving like crazy, Mom trying to keep her little infant alive to get to the emergency room. Somehow or other they manage to get to the emergency room. Mom holding little Jimmy leaps out the car screaming, ''Help my baby, help my baby.'' A nurse comes out and starts to give mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. They bring out the crash cart and get him intubated and get the lines going and give him medicines and somehow or other this little baby lives. But he does not live whole.

Because he has had that cardiac arrest en route to the hospital, the only one authorized by that HMO which has made that medical decision, he ends up with gangrene of both hands and both feet and both hands and both feet have to be amputated.

Here is little Jimmy today. I talked to his mom about 6 weeks ago. Jimmy

is learning to put on his leg prostheses with his arm stumps. He still cannot get on his bilateral hook prostheses for his hands by himself. Jimmy will never play basketball. He will certainly never wrestle. And some day when he gets married, he will never be able to caress the face of the woman that he loves with his hand.

Mr. Speaker, under Federal law if one's little baby had this happen to them and their insurance was from their employer who had a self-insured plan and their plan had made that decision, that negligent decision which had resulted in this disaster, under Federal law that plan would be liable for nothing other than the cost of the amputations.

Is that fair? Is that the way it is if one buys insurance as an individual from a plan that is covered by State regulation? No. So, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues, my colleagues in the other body and my colleagues in this body, when we get a chance to vote on whether health plans ought to be liable for decisions that they make that result in this type of negligence, a judge reviewed this case. A judge looked at the case. He said that the margins of safety by this HMO were, quote, ''razor thin.'' I would add to that, about as razor thin as the scalpels that had to remove little Jimmy's hands and feet.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle and in the other body, when we get a chance to vote on whether a health plan should be responsible for their actions that result in this type of injury, think, especially my fellow Republicans, think about how we always say as Republicans, hey, people should be responsible for their actions. Do not we say that? If somebody is able-bodied and they can work, they ought to be responsible for providing for their family? Do not we say that if somebody kills somebody or is a rapist that they ought to be responsible for their criminal behavior?

How can we then say that an HMO which makes this type of decision that results in this type of injury should not also be responsible? There is no other entity, no other business, no other individual in this country that has that type of legal protection. It is wrong. It should be fixed.

The State of Texas fixed this 2 years ago. They made their health plans liable. Now, of course this is being challenged because of the ERISA law. But since that time there has not been an explosion of lawsuits. There has only been one. I will read about it in a few minutes. But why has there not been? Because health plans suddenly realized that they cannot cut corners like they did with this little boy or they are going to be liable. They are going to be responsible.

□ 2230

Did it significantly increase premiums in Texas? No. Premiums in Texas have not gone up any higher than they have anywhere else in the country. Did it mean that managed care would die out in Texas? No. Several years ago, there were 30 HMOs in Texas. Today, there are 51. That law is working. It did not result in a huge number of lawsuits, and it has not resulted in a big increase in premiums like all the HMOs would have us believe.

Let me read today an editorial from USA Today. The title of this is, ''Why should law protect HMOs that injure patients?''

Last July, Joseph Plocica's health plan discharged him from a hospital, against the advice of his psychiatrist, who said the Fort Worth resident had suicidal depression requiring continued help, according to a lawsuit. That night, Plocica proved his doctor right and his health plan wrong. He drank a half-gallon of antifreeze and died 8 days later.

As terrible as this story is, at least Plocica's bereaved family has more rights than most. A sweeping 1997 Texas law let them sue Plocica's health plan for malpractice.

That's a right denied to the roughly 120 million other Americans who receive their health care through work. This week, the federal law that protects those health plans from lawsuits is the focus of a contentious Senate debate over patients' rights.

The central question: Should HMOs, which often make life and death decisions about treatments, be legally accountable when their decisions go tragically wrong?

Like Mr. Plocica who drank antifreeze or little Jimmy here who lost his hands and feet.

''Right now'', the USA Today editorial continues,

the answer is no, although that is a luxury no doctor, and no other business, enjoy.

The provision might have made sense when it was passed by Congress in 1974 as part of a law designed to protect workers' pensions. Most employees were covered by old-style fee-for-service insurance plans and payment disputes took place after health care had been delivered. So a law limiting recovery to the cost of care did not hurt anybody. But today, more than 80 percent of workers are in managed care plans that actively direct what treatments parents received.

Unfortunately, despite efforts in Texas and a few other states to find ways around this law, the gaping liability loophole is not likely to be closed nationwide any time soon

unless Congress acts.

Insurance and business groups have mounted an aggressive fight against a version of the Patients' Bill of Rights that allows patients to sue. They say opening up HMOs to lawsuits will result in a flood of litigation and kill cost control by doing little too improve quality care.

But in Texas, where these same groups made all the same arguments, the reality is far from different.

No flood of lawsuits. Only a handful of cases have been filed against HMO plans in Texas since the challenge to the law was overturned last fall. This is due, in part, to another feature of that 1997 law, which requires swift independent review of disputes.

Rates have not shot up. In the two years since the law was passed, HMO premiums in the state are almost exactly where they stood in 1995. Cost increases in Dallas and Houston were below the national average last year.

Quality may be improving. News accounts from Texas suggests that HMOs, now accountable for their decisions, are more careful making

those decisions.

Doctors report health plans are less likely to drag their feet, for instance, and less likely to deny treatments doctors believe are needed.

There's no reason to believe a national law would produce any different results,

continues this editorial.

Studies by the Congressional Budget Office and the nonprofit Kaiser Family Foundation find HMO liability would produce negligible premium hikes. Only industry-sponsored studies find otherwise.

Lawmakers would do well to look at the facts before leaving this critical patient right on the cutting room floor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should hesitate about having HMOs be responsible, despite the fact that the HMO industry has spent more than $100,000 per Congressman lobbying against a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. Surveys show that, despite all that advertising, that money spent on advertising by the insurance and HMO industry for the last 2 years, there has been no significant change in public opinion about the quality of HMO care.

Despite tens of millions of dollars of advertising, a recent Kaiser survey shows no change in public opinion: 77 percent favor access to specialists, 83 percent favor independent review, 76 percent favor emergency room coverage, 70 percent favor the right to sue one's HMO. Other surveys show that 85 percent of the public think Congress should fix these HMO abuses.

If these concerns are not addressed, I think the public will see examples like this, and they will ultimately reject the market model as it now exists. However, if we can enact true managed care reform such as that embodied by my own Managed Care Reform Act of 1999 or the Dingell or the Norwood bills, then consumer rejection of a market model will be less likely.

Common sense, responsible proposals to regulate managed care plans are not a rejection of the market model of health care. In fact, they are just as likely to have the opposite effect. They will preserve the market model by saving it from its own most irresponsible and destructive tendencies.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass real HMO reform. Let us learn from States like Texas. After all, is it not Republicans who often say that the States are the laboratories of democracy? Yes, let us have some insurance tax incentives. But let us be very careful about repeating some mistakes that have been made with ERISA in the past that led to fraud in regards to association health plans.

Finally, the Speaker of the House told me before the July 4th recess that it was his intent to have HMO reform legislation on the floor by the middle of July. Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are. According to my watch, it is now the middle of July, and we have no date yet even for a full committee mark-up

in the House of Representatives. Why? Well because it is not clear that another HMO protection bill could make it through committee. Too many Republicans and Democrats of each committee want to see some real reform to prevent this type of tragedy, real reform, not a fig-leaf piece of legislation.

I think there are even majority votes in both the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Commerce for strong medical necessity and enforcement measures. Maybe that is the reason why the committee chairmen are not moving ahead. Maybe that is why the leadership of this House is not telling them to get their act in order, get this to the floor.

Well, the Senate is debating HMO reform this week. So let us see what happens there.

I think today the Washington Post called it about right when it referenced the GOP Senate bill. It said, ''The Republican bill professes to provide many of the same protections, but the fine print often belies its claims. Among much else, it turns out to apply only to some plans and to only about one-fourth as many people as the Democratic bill would cover.''

The Post then talked about the GOP criticisms of the Democratic bill, ''Critics say that the Democratic bill, by weakening the cost-containment industry, would drive up costs.'' The Post continues, ''Our contrary sense is that, in the long run, it would strengthen cost containment by requiring that it be done in a balanced way'', exactly the sentiments that I expressed a few minutes ago.

Today the Washington Post closed that editorial by saying, ''The risks of increased costs tend to be exaggerated in debate. The managed care industry says that, by and large, it already does most of the modest amount this bill would require of it. If so, the added cost can hardly be as great as the critics contend.''

Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about the cost for a strong Patients' Bill of Rights, we are talking about something in the range of $36 per year for a family of four. Is that not worth it to prevent an HMO tragedy like happened to this little boy?

Mr. Speaker, please keep your promise. By next week, we should have debated HMO reform in full committee, and we should be headed to the floor. Is that going to be the situation? Or is it the Speaker's intention to try to limit debate on this important issue by putting it right up against August recess, when Members have planned vacations with their families, in order to limit debate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, it will be seen for what it really is, a cynical abuse of scheduling because the leadership of this House really does not want a full debate on protecting patients. Mr. Speaker, I hope that is not the case. The victims of managed care and their families are watching.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARY MILLER of California). The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from references to the Senate including the characterization of Senate action and the urging of the Senate to take certain action.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BALDWIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 5:30 p.m. and Wednesday, July 14 when on account of illness in the family.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. THURMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes on July 20.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes on July 14.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes on July 14.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On July 12, 1999:

H.R. 4. To declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 14, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2984. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Facilities Grant Program (RIN: 0575–AC10) received June 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2985. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification that the Secretary has approved the retirement of Lieutenant General George A. Fisher, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2986. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Single Family Mortgage Insurance; Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure Notice [Docket No. FR–4411–F–02] (RIN: 2502–AH30) received June 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2987. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year 1999 for New Awards under the Assistive Technology Act Technical Assistance Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2988. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations [FRL–6377–5] (RIN: 2060–AH96) received July 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2989. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Zapata, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–133 RM–9314] received June 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2990. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Guides for the Watch Industry—received June 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for defense articles and defense services to Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 111–98], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2992. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the export of defense services to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 5–99], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing and Technical Assistance Agreement for the export of defense services under a contract to the Netherlands and Germany, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective May 23, 1999, the danger pay rate for Sierra Leone is designated at the 25% level, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

2995. A letter from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting notification that since a report on February 25, 1999, the U.S. Department of Commerce has issued additional export licenses for commercial communications satellites and related items under the Department's jurisdiction; to the Committee on International Relations.

2996. A letter from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General of the Peace Corps for the period beginning October 1, 1998 and ending March 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2997. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 1998 CFOA Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2998. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of vacancy; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2999. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the twentieth Semi-annual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up, covering the period from October 1, 1998, to March 31, 1999, pursuant to Public Law 100–504, section 106(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3000. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN–145–FOR; State Program Amendment No. 98–1] received June 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3001. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1997 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, and reporting on the nationwide federal law enforcement effort against public corruption, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3002. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants—Passport and Visa Waivers; Deletion of Obsolete Visa Procedures and other Minor Corrections [Public Notice 3048] received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3003. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled ''Report of Denial of Visas to Confiscators of American Property''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3004. A letter from the Executive Director, Special Designee of the Governor, State Properties Commission, transmitting notification that the States of Georgia and South Carolina have agreed upon the location of the Georgia-South Carolina boundary from Savannah to the lateral seaward boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3005. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Virginia Beach Weekly Fireworks Display, Rudee Inlet, Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Atlantic Ocean, Coastal Waters, between 17th and 20th Street, Virginia Beach, Virginia [CGD 05–99–041] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3006. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Salvage of Sunken Fishing Vessel CAPE FEAR, Buzzards Bay, MA [CGD01 99–078] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3007. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Des Allemands, LA (CGD08–99–040) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3008. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Regulations: Hackensack River, NJ [CGD01–99–059] received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3009. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Hackensack River, NJ [CGD01–99–084] received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3010. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Glen Cove, New York Fireworks, Hempstead Harbor, NY [CGD01–99–042] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3011. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Regulations: Skull Creek, Hilton Head, SC [CGD07–99–037] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3012. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Cocos Lagoon, Guam [COTP GUAM 99–011] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3013. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Clamfest Fireworks, Sandy Hook Bay, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey [CGD01–99–071] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3014. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; 4th of July Celebration Ohio River Mile 469.2–470.5, Cincinnati, OH [CGD08–99–041] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3015. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Sag Harbor Fireworks Display, Sag Harbor Bay, Sag Harbor, NY [CGD01–99–072] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3016. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Heritage of Pride Fireworks, Hudson River, New York [CGD01–99–056] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 245. Resolutions Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1691) to protect religious liberty (Rept. 106–229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 535. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System (Rept. 106–230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2490. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending Septmber 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 2488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income tax rates, to provide marriage penalty relief, to reduce taxes on savings and investments, to provide estate and gift tax relief, to provide incentives for education savings and health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 2489. A bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 2490. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the

President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; House Calendar No. 132. House Report No. 106–231.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 2491. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to authorize trusts to hold memberships in nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations that own properties with mortgages insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. LAZIO):

H.R. 2492. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise Medicare payment policy with respect to home health services furnished under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 2493. A bill to declare as citizens of the United States certain women who lost citizenship solely by reason of marriage to an alien prior to September 22, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California):

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a religious exemption from providing identifying numbers for dependents to claim certain credits and deductions on a tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2495. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to limit the number of pieces of carry-on baggage that a passenger may bring on an airplane; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 2496. A bill to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 2497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale or exchange of farmland which by covenant is restricted to use as farmland and to exclude the value of such farmland from estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding the placement of automatic external defibrillators in Federal buildings in order to improve survival rates of individuals who experience cardiac arrest in such buildings, and to establish protections from civil liability arising from the emergency use of the devices; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STARK, Mr. KING, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the operation of certain aircraft not complying with stage 4 noise levels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 2500. A bill to establish demonstration projects to provide family income to respond to significant transitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COOK:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Federal funding for elementary and secondary teacher training be used first for activities to advance science, mathematics, and engineering education for elementary and secondary teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MASCARA (for himself, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that urgent action is needed to limit the hardship endured by senior citizens when meeting their prescription drug needs; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Federal funding for elementary and secondary teacher training be used first for science scholarships for elementary and secondary teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. COOK, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 244. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to the United States Women's Soccer Team and its winning performance in the 1999 Women's World Cup tournament.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Geert Botzen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Puerto Rico Bar Association Board of Directors, relative to Resolution No. 34 petitioning the President of the United States to cease the target practices of the United States of North America at the island of Vieques and adjacent water bodies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

34. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, relative to Resolution No. 208 petitioning Congress to enact legislation prohibiting the physical destruction of the American Flag by Constitutional Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1691

OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Religious Liberty Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF RELIGIOUS EXERCISE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a government shall not substantially burden a person's religious exercise—

(1) in a program or activity, operated by a government, that receives Federal financial assistance; or

(2) in any case in which the substantial burden on the person's religious exercise affects, or in which a removal of that substantial burden would affect, commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, or with Indian tribes;

even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A government may substantially burden a person's religious exercise if the government demonstrates that application of the burden to the person—

(1) is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest; and

(2) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

(c) REMEDIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the United States to deny or withhold Federal financial assistance as a remedy for a violation of this Act. However, nothing in this subsection shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General or the United States or any agency, officer, or employee thereof under other law, including section 4(d) of this Act, to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

(a) PROCEDURE.—If a claimant produces prima facie evidence to support a claim alleging a violation of the Free Exercise

Clause or a violation of a provision of this Act enforcing that clause, the government shall bear the burden of persuasion on any element of the claim; however, the claimant shall bear the burden of persuasion on whether the challenged government practice, law, or regulation burdens or substantially burdens the claimant's exercise of religion.

(b) LAND USE REGULATION.—

(1) LIMITATION ON LAND USE REGULATION.—

(A) Where, in applying or implementing any land use regulation or exemption, or system of land use regulations or exemptions, a government has the authority to make individualized assessments of the proposed uses to which real property would be put, the government may not impose a substantial burden on a person's religious exercise, unless the government demonstrates that application of the burden to the person is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

(B) No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that does not treat religious assemblies or institutions on equal terms with nonreligious assemblies or institutions.

(C) No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation that discriminates against any assembly or institution on the basis of religion or religious denomination.

(D) No government with zoning authority shall unreasonably exclude from the jurisdiction over which it has authority, or unreasonably limit within that jurisdiction, assemblies or institutions principally devoted to religious exercise.

(2) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—Adjudication of a claim of a violation of the Free Exercise Clause or this subsection in a non-Federal forum shall be entitled to full faith and credit in a Federal court only if the claimant had a full and fair adjudication of that claim in the non-Federal forum.

(3) NONPREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall preempt State law that is equally or more protective of religious exercise.

SEC. 4. JUDICIAL RELIEF.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—A person may assert a violation of this Act as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain appropriate relief against a government. Standing to assert a claim or defense under this section shall be governed by the general rules of standing under article III of the Constitution.

(b) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the Religious Liberty Protection Act of 1998,'' after ''Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993,''; and

(2) by striking the comma that follows a comma.

(c) PRISONERS.—Any litigation under this Act in which the claimant is a prisoner shall be subject to the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (including provisions of law amended by that Act).

(d) AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES TO ENFORCE THIS ACT.—The United States may sue for injunctive or declaratory relief to enforce compliance with this Act.

(e) PERSONS WHO MAY RAISE A CLAIM OR DEFENSE.—A person who may raise a claim or defense under subsection (a) is—

(1) an owner of a dwelling described in section 803(b) of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3603(b)), with respect to a prohibition relating to discrimination in housing;

(2) with respect to a prohibition against discrimination in employment—

(A) a religious corporation, association, educational institution (as described in 42 U.S.C. 2000e–2(e)), or society, with respect to the employment of individuals who perform duties such as spreading or teaching faith, other instructional functions, performing or assisting in devotional services, or activities relating to the internal governance of such corporation, association, educational institution, or society in the carrying on of its activities; or

(B) an entity employing 5 or fewer individuals; or

(3) any other person, with respect to an assertion of any other claim or defense relating to a law other than a law—

(A) prohibiting discrimination in housing and employment, except as described in paragraphs (1) and (2); or

(B) prohibiting discrimination in a public accommodation.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) RELIGIOUS BELIEF UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any government to burden any religious belief.

(b) RELIGIOUS EXERCISE NOT REGULATED.—Nothing in this Act shall create any basis for restricting or burdening religious exercise or for claims against a religious organization, including any religiously affiliated school or university, not acting under color of law.

(c) CLAIMS TO FUNDING UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall create or preclude a right of any religious organization to receive funding or other assistance from a government, or of any person to receive government funding for a religious activity, but this Act may require government to incur expenses in its own operations to avoid imposing a burden or a substantial burden on religious exercise.

(d) OTHER AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS ON FUNDING UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall—

(1) authorize a government to regulate or affect, directly or indirectly, the activities or policies of a person other than a government as a condition of receiving funding or other assistance; or

(2) restrict any authority that may exist under other law to so regulate or affect, except as provided in this Act.

(e) GOVERNMENTAL DISCRETION IN ALLEVIATING BURDENS ON RELIGIOUS EXERCISE.—A government may avoid the preemptive force of any provision of this Act by changing the policy that results in the substantial burden on religious exercise, by retaining the policy and exempting the burdened religious exercise, by providing exemptions from the policy for applications that substantially burden religious exercise, or by any other means that eliminates the substantial burden.

(f) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—In a claim under section 2(a)(2) of this Act, proof that a substantial burden on a person's religious exercise, or removal of that burden, affects or would affect commerce, shall not establish any inference or presumption that Congress intends that any religious exercise is, or is not, subject to any other law.

(g) BROAD CONSTRUCTION.—This Act should be construed in favor of a broad protection of religious exercise, to the maximum extent permitted by its terms and the Constitution.

(h) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or of an amendment made by this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE UNAFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, interpret, or in any way address that portion of the first amendment to the Constitution prohibiting laws respecting an establishment of religion (referred to in this section as the ''Establishment Clause''). Granting government funding, benefits, or exemptions, to the extent permissible under the Establishment Clause, shall not constitute a violation of this Act. As used in this section, the term ''granting'', used with respect to government funding, benefits, or exemptions, does not include the denial of government funding, benefits, or exemptions.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM RESTORATION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 5 of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb–2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a State, or subdivision of a State'' and inserting ''a covered entity or a subdivision of such an entity'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''term'' and all that follows through ''includes'' and inserting ''term 'covered entity' means''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking all after ''means,'' and inserting ''any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief, and includes (A) the use, building, or conversion of real property by a person or entity intending that property for religious exercise; and (B) any conduct protected as exercise of religion under the first amendment to the Constitution.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6(a) of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb–3(a)) is amended by striking ''and State''.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term ''religious exercise'' means any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief, and includes (A) the use, building, or conversion of real property by a person or entity intending that property for religious exercise; and (B) any conduct protected as exercise of religion under the first amendment to the Constitution;

(2) the term ''Free Exercise Clause'' means that portion of the first amendment to the Constitution that proscribes laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion and includes the application of that proscription under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

(3) the term ''land use regulation'' means a law or decision by a government that limits or restricts a private person's uses or development of land, or of structures affixed to land, where the law or decision applies to one or more particular parcels of land or to land within one or more designated geographical zones, and where the private person has an ownership, leasehold, easement, servitude, or other property interest in the regulated land, or a contract or option to acquire such an interest;

(4) the term ''program or activity'' means a program or activity as defined in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–4a);

(5) the term ''demonstrates'' means meets the burdens of going forward with the evidence and of persuasion; and

(6) the term ''government''—

(A) means—

(i) a State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity created under the authority of a State;

(ii) any branch, department, agency, instrumentality, subdivision, or official of an entity listed in clause (i); and

(iii) any other person acting under color of State law; and

(B) for the purposes of sections 3(a) and 5, includes the United States, a branch, department, agency, instrumentality or official of

the United States, and any person acting under color of Federal law.

H.R. 1691

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Religious Liberty Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF RELIGIOUS EXERCISE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a government shall not substantially burden a person's religious exercise—

(1) in a program or activity, operated by a government, that receives Federal financial assistance; or

(2) in any case in which the substantial burden on the person's religious exercise affects, or in which a removal of that substantial burden would affect, commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, or with Indian tribes;

even if the burden results from a rule of general applicability.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A government may substantially burden a person's religious exercise if the government demonstrates that application of the burden to the person—

(1) is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest; and

(2) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

(c) REMEDIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the United States to deny or withhold Federal financial assistance as a remedy for a violation of this Act. However, nothing in this subsection shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General or the United States or any agency, officer, or employee thereof under other law, including section 4(d) of this Act, to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

(a) PROCEDURE.—If a claimant produces prima facie evidence to support a claim alleging a violation of the Free Exercise Clause or a violation of a provision of this Act enforcing that clause, the government shall bear the burden of persuasion on any element of the claim; however, the claimant shall bear the burden of persuasion on whether the challenged government practice, law, or regulation burdens or substantially burdens the claimant's exercise of religion.

(b) LAND USE REGULATION.—

(1) LIMITATION ON LAND USE REGULATION.—

(A) Where, in applying or implementing any land use regulation or exemption, or system of land use regulations or exemptions, a government has the authority to make individualized assessments of the proposed uses to which real property would be put, the government may not impose a substantial burden on a person's religious exercise, unless the government demonstrates that application of the burden to the person is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest.

(B) No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that does not treat religious assemblies or institutions on equal terms with nonreligious assemblies or institutions.

(C) No government shall impose or implement a land use regulation that discriminates against any assembly or institution on the basis of religion or religious denomination.

(D) No government with zoning authority shall unreasonably exclude from the jurisdiction over which it has authority, or unreasonably limit within that jurisdiction, assemblies or institutions principally devoted to religious exercise.

(2) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—Adjudication of a claim of a violation of the Free Exercise Clause or this subsection in a non-Federal forum shall be entitled to full faith and credit in a Federal court only if the claimant had a full and fair adjudication of that claim in the non-Federal forum.

(3) NONPREEMPTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall preempt State law that is equally or more protective of religious exercise.

SEC. 4. JUDICIAL RELIEF.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—A person may assert a violation of this Act as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain appropriate relief against a government. Standing to assert a claim or defense under this section shall be governed by the general rules of standing under article III of the Constitution.

(b) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the Religious Liberty Protection Act of 1998,'' after ''Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993,''; and

(2) by striking the comma that follows a comma.

(c) PRISONERS.—Any litigation under this Act in which the claimant is a prisoner shall be subject to the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (including provisions of law amended by that Act).

(d) AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES TO ENFORCE THIS ACT.—The United States may sue for injunctive or declaratory relief to enforce compliance with this Act.

(e) PERSONS WHO MAY RAISE A CLAIM OR DEFENSE.—A person who may raise a claim or defense under subsection (a) is—

(1) an owner of a dwelling described in section 803(b) of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3603(b)), with respect to a prohibition relating to discrimination in housing;

(2) with respect to a prohibition against discrimination in employment—

(A) a religious corporation, association, educational institution (as described in 42 U.S.C. 2000e–2(e)), or society, with respect to the employment of individuals who perform duties such as spreading or teaching faith, other instructional functions, performing or assisting in devotional services, or activities relating to the internal governance of such corporation, association, educational institution, or society in the carrying on of its activities; or

(B) an entity employing 5 or fewer individuals; or

(3) any other person, with respect to an assertion of any other claim or defense relating to a law other than a law—

(A) prohibiting discrimination in housing and employment, except as described in paragraphs (1) and (2); or

(B) prohibiting discrimination in a public accommodation.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) RELIGIOUS BELIEF UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any government to burden any religious belief.

(b) RELIGIOUS EXERCISE NOT REGULATED.—Nothing in this Act shall create any basis for restricting or burdening religious exercise or for claims against a religious organization, including any religiously affiliated school or university, not acting under color of law.

(c) CLAIMS TO FUNDING UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall create or preclude a right of any religious organization to receive funding or other assistance from a government, or of any person to receive government funding for a religious activity, but this Act may require government to incur expenses in its own operations to avoid imposing a burden or a substantial burden on religious exercise.

(d) OTHER AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS ON FUNDING UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act shall—

(1) authorize a government to regulate or affect, directly or indirectly, the activities or policies of a person other than a government as a condition of receiving funding or other assistance; or

(2) restrict any authority that may exist under other law to so regulate or affect, except as provided in this Act.

(e) GOVERNMENTAL DISCRETION IN ALLEVIATING BURDENS ON RELIGIOUS EXERCISE.—A government may avoid the preemptive force of any provision of this Act by changing the policy that results in the substantial burden on religious exercise, by retaining the policy and exempting the burdened religious exercise, by providing exemptions from the policy for applications that substantially burden religious exercise, or by any other means that eliminates the substantial burden.

(f) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—In a claim under section 2(a)(2) of this Act, proof that a substantial burden on a person's religious exercise, or removal of that burden, affects or would affect commerce, shall not establish any inference or presumption that Congress intends that any religious exercise is, or is not, subject to any other law.

(g) BROAD CONSTRUCTION.—This Act should be construed in favor of a broad protection of religious exercise, to the maximum extent permitted by its terms and the Constitution.

(h) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or of an amendment made by this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE UNAFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, interpret, or in any way address that portion of the first amendment to the Constitution prohibiting laws respecting an establishment of religion (referred to in this section as the ''Establishment Clause''). Granting government funding, benefits, or exemptions, to the extent permissible under the Establishment Clause, shall not constitute a violation of this Act. As used in this section, the term ''granting'', used with respect to government funding, benefits, or exemptions, does not include the denial of government funding, benefits, or exemptions.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM RESTORATION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 5 of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb–2) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a State, or subdivision of a State'' and inserting ''a covered entity or a subdivision of such an entity'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''term'' and all that follows through ''includes'' and inserting ''term 'covered entity' means''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking all after ''means,'' and inserting ''any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief, and includes (A) the use, building, or conversion of real property by a person or entity intending that property for religious exercise; and (B) any conduct protected as exercise of religion under the first amendment to the Constitution.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6(a) of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb–3(a)) is amended by striking ''and State''.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term ''religious exercise'' means any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief, and includes (A) the use, building, or conversion of real property by a person or entity intending that property for religious exercise; and (B) any conduct protected as exercise of religion under the first amendment to the Constitution;

(2) the term ''Free Exercise Clause'' means that portion of the first amendment to the Constitution that proscribes laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion and includes the application of that proscription under the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

(3) the term ''land use regulation'' means a law or decision by a government that limits or restricts a private person's uses or development of land, or of structures affixed to land, where the law or decision applies to one or more particular parcels of land or to land within one or more designated geographical zones, and where the private person has an ownership, leasehold, easement, servitude, or other property interest in the regulated land, or a contract or option to acquire such an interest;

(4) the term ''program or activity'' means a program or activity as defined in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–4a);

(5) the term ''demonstrates'' means meets the burdens of going forward with the evidence and of persuasion; and

(6) the term ''government''—

(A) means—

(i) a State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity created under the authority of a State;

(ii) any branch, department, agency, instrumentality, subdivision, or official of an entity listed in clause (i); and

(iii) any other person acting under color of State law; and

(B) for the purposes of sections 3(a) and 5, includes the United States, a branch, department, agency, instrumentality or official of the United States, and any person acting under color of Federal law.

H.R. 2415

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 14, line 23, strike ''$17,500,000'' and insert ''$12,000,000''.

H.R. 2415

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 15, strike lines 19 and 20, and insert ''$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 2000.''.

H.R. 2415

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 21, line 25, strike ''such sums as may be necessary'' and insert ''$8,000,000''.

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MS. SLAUGHTER

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 71, line 19, insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)'' after the dollar figure.

Page 87, line 19, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)'' after the dollar figure.

Page 88, line 18, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)'' after the dollar figure.

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 87, line 19, insert ''(reduced by $2,087,500)'' after the dollar figure.

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 87, line 25, insert the following before the period:

, except that 95 percent of such amount shall be allocated among the States on the basis of population for grants under section 5(g) notwithstanding sections 5(g)(3) and 11(a)(1)(A)(ii) of the Act

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill add the following:

TITLE —STUDY OF FORT KING, FLORIDA

SEC. ___01. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Second Seminole War, 1835–1842, is an important period of conflict in the history of the Nation and lasted longer than any other armed conflict in which the Nation participated, except the Vietnam War;

(2) Fort King, in central Florida, played an important historic role in the Second Seminole War as the site of the outbreak of hostilities between the United States Government and the Seminole Indians of Florida, who were led by Seminole Indian Chief Osceola;

(3) Fort King represents a unique site for exploration and interpretation of the attack that ignited the Second Seminole War on December 28, 1835; and

(4) Fort King and the surrounding area contain materials and artifacts used in the attack and in the life of the Seminole Indians.

SEC. ___02. REQUIREMENT OF STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this title referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall conduct a study to identify potential means to preserve, develop, and interpret Fort King, in central Florida, and the surrounding area. As part of the study, the Secretary shall propose alternatives for cooperation in the preservation and interpretation of Fort King and shall provide recommendations with respect to the suitability and feasibility of establishing Fort King as a unit of the National Park System.

SEC. ___03. FINDINGS INCLUDED IN STUDY.

The study required by section ___02 shall contain, but need not be limited to, findings with respect to—

(1) the role played by Fort King in the Second Seminole War;

(2) identification of the historical, cultural, and archaeological material found in Fort King and the surrounding area relating to life at the time of and preceding the Second Seminole War;

(3) the types of Federal, State, and local programs that are available to preserve and develop Fort King and the surrounding area and to make the fort and the surrounding area accessible for public use and enjoyment; and

(4) the potential use of, and coordination with, Federal, State, and local programs to manage, in the public interest, the historical and cultural resources found at and around Fort King.

SEC. ___04. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

The Secretary shall submit a report detailing the results of the study required by section ___02 to the committees of jurisdiction of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MR. WELDON

AMENDMENT NO. 20: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds made available under this Act may be expended to approve class III gaming on Indian lands by any means other than a Tribal-State compact entered into between a State and a tribe.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the terms ''class III gaming'', ''Indian lands'', and ''Tribal-State compact'' shall have the meaning given those terms in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

H.R. 2466

OFFERED BY: MR. WU

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 57, line 8, after the period add the following: ''Of the funds made available by this paragraph, $196,885,000 shall be for timber sales management, $120,475,000 shall be for wildlife and fisheries habitat management, and $40,165,000 shall be for watershed improvements.''.

OFFERED BY: MR. HOEFFEL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 97, after line 13, insert the following:

STUDY ON USE OF ANTIQUES FIREARMS IN CRIME; REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. ___. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) recent events in Norristown, Pennsylvania have focused the region's attention on the issue of antique firearms and their use in violent crimes;

(2) antique firearms are not subject to the same laws that regulate conventional firearms; and

(3) statistics on the use of antique firearms in crime are not consistently gathered, and crime perpetrated with antique firearms is not tracked.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall collect statistics on the use of antique firearms in crime, and shall conduct a study on the use of antique firearms in crime. For purposes of this section, the term ''antique firearms'' has the meaning given the term in section 921(a)(16) of title 18, United States Code.

(c) REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a written report on the statistics collected and the results of the study conducted under subsection (b).

H.R. 2490

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

AMENDMENT NO. 2. At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any sanction imposed unilaterally by the United States on private commercial sales of food or any other agricultural product (excluding Federal direct or guaranteed credit transactions) to a foreign country.

H.R. 2490

OFFERED BY: MR. TIAHRT

(Page & line nos. refer to Full Committee Print)

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 97, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 647. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used by the United States Postal Service to implement, administer, or enforce the provisions of part 111 of title 39 of the Code of Federal Regulations (relating to delivery of mail to a commercial mail receiving agency), other than as last in effect before April 26, 1999.