

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1891

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1891.

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

There was no objection.

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. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XXIII, 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. 4193.

□ 1236

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. 4193) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, 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 Illinois (Mr. YATES) 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, I want to introduce my statement with a quote from the Indian lore, from the Native Americans, and I think it sums up what this bill is all about. I quote: "We do not inherit this land from our ancestors; we borrow it from our children." That is a profound truth, and that is what we have tried to keep in mind as we have dealt with this legislation. I like to call this bill the "Take Pride in America" bill, because we can take pride in what has happened in this great land of ours, in the preservation of our great natural resources.

Several members of our committee had an opportunity to tour some of the parks in the system this last month, and I think we agreed that we found great pride on the part of the people that staff these facilities. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would agree. He was part of our delegation, and saw that people in the land agencies are proud of their work and they put in a lot of extra time. We saw this in Yosemite where the storm damage has been repaired, a lot of it on time donated by members of the Park Service staff.

I also think that the record of volunteers in the land agencies is enormously impressive, and something we can all take pride in. Mr. Chairman, 94,000 people volunteered to work in our national parks without any compensation, but because they care about the land, they care about the parks. Mr. Chairman, there are 112,000 volunteers in the Forest Service; 28,000 volunteers in Fish and Wildlife; 17,000 volunteers in the Bureau of Land Management; and we of course are talking about a total of 617 million acres of the United States, about 30 percent of the land area.

We get a lot of foreign visitors. In our meeting with park officials, we learned that people come here from all over the world to view the national treasures, to view the unique ecological characteristics of our national parks, forests and other facilities.

We have extended the recreation fee program for two. We will talk more about that in general debate. It is anticipated to generate \$500 million over a 5-year period. This is additional money, in fact, and the public has accepted it. One of the superintendents told me on our trip that people often want to give more. They say, "That is not enough," \$2 to visit a park or \$20 for a car load of people. They say, "We would like to contribute more." The same park people said that vandalism has been reduced because people become stakeholders. We can take pride in that.

We can take pride in the fact that as a Nation we commit almost \$8 billion to programs for the Native Americans, not all in our bill, but across the board in many different bills.

Now, this has been a remarkable success story. I do not mention this in terms of just today, but I want to say it is there because of the leadership over the years of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE). They are both going to leave the committee, and I think that is something we should note.

I could say a lot about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and his leadership. I have served 24 years with him. We have been partners, and as partners often will, we may have disagreed on policies, but never in a disagreeable way. He served on this committee for 48 years, 20 years as chairman.

Just to illustrate his leadership, I will give my colleagues a couple of in-

stances. I remember the hearing on the National Endowment for the Arts when the gentleman brought in a group from Jessup, Iowa. Now, that is not exactly New York City; Jessup, Iowa is a pretty rural community. These young people came to our subcommittee and testified on how a string quartet had been sent there for a 6-month period, funded one-half by the National Endowment for the Arts, the other half by the local community. Obviously, this would not be a wealthy community, and yet they were willing to put up half the money to bring this cultural experience to their students. We had one of the students testify from Jessup about what an impact this grant, along with what his own community had spent, had made on the students in Jessup, Iowa.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) brought many examples such as this one during our period on the committee. Likewise, in terms of our natural resources, the redoing of the minerals management system was leadership that the gentleman provided. He really has truly lived and personified in his role on this subcommittee of the Indian saying, that we borrow this land from our children, and I know that he has always had a concern for it.

Likewise, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), who has been a member of this committee for 20 years. He always brought to the committee a desire to enhance the natural heritage that is a legacy for all of us and has given us wonderful service. We will miss these two individuals a great deal in terms of the subcommittee and the leadership they have provided over the years.

Also, we have had the thoughtful work of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), our friend who always brings to this committee intellectual curiosity. He always says, "is this the right thing to do?" and always I felt challenged as a chairman. Many times, after reflecting on what he had to say, I might disagree, but always he made a very good point in bringing a concern that he might have for some of the activities of our subcommittee.

Well, we could spend a lot of time on the three Members who have done so much to contribute to the strength of our committee and to the good work that it has done. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be missed from the committee's thoughtful deliberations.

Finally, I have some of charts, which will illustrate what we have done on the Native Americans. I think it outlines it very well. We do not have a lot of time to spend on the various activities of the bill.

□ 1245

I would say at the outset, we were given \$14 billion-plus in budget authority and \$13 billion-plus in outlays. We have tried to manage our resources carefully. In fact, we are spending \$2

million less this year than last. And that in the face of enormous backlog maintenance problems, in the face of great needs to expand the programs within the parks.

One item I would like to mention is that we have included the money to complete the Appalachian Trail, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a leader for many years. Here we have a trail that is over 2,000 miles long and, thanks to the gentleman's leadership and follow-up as my partner, our team effort, this will be the last payment in the Appalachian Trail which is one of the great resources of the trails program in this Nation, and it will be totally public in terms of its land access.

I want to mention the recreation fee program in more detail. We extend it for 2 years, because we have had great support from the public, from the park leadership. Over a 5-year period, it will provide \$500 million which will be used to enhance the visitor experience and will be used to deal with some of the backlog maintenance problems.

In terms of management, we are changing the structure somewhat. We do not want any more Delaware Water Gap outhouse projects. I say that because it is debilitating to the public support for the parks. And, therefore, we need to manage the construction programs in a way that people have confidence in the continued leadership.

Thanks to Members on both sides of the aisle on the Forest Service issue, we have eliminated the Purchaser Road Credit. This was always a problem in the past. This year we will not have any amendments on Purchaser Road Credit, because we took it out.

I must say these things were something that, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) always called me "a partner," and I likewise call him a partner, and it is just that we have agreed on that for good management.

With regard to SPR oil, we are no longer going to create money. We are not going to go in and invade the SPR oil account and sell oil just to provide us some additional funding. And, of course, because of that, in part, we are funding this bill with a reduced amount of money.

The "crown jewels," the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone and Yosemite, are being protected. We are recognizing their needs. But also, I think in the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, we recognize the potential there for recreation. I would urge all Members to see the section in the report dealing with recreation. This is a new section, and it is a recognition that there has been an explosion of recreation usage by the public.

We often think of the Forest Service in terms of America's lumber needs. But in reality, the Forest Service has the largest number of visitor days, and the reason being that they offer a wide variety of opportunities to hunt, fish, snowmobile, camp, bird watch, whatever the desire might be in the use of

public lands. And they have 192 million acres in federal land.

I think we have tried to have a responsible harvesting of fiber in the national forests. About 20 percent of the lumber used in the Nation comes from the national forests. And so I think it is important that we manage this resource carefully. We have vastly reduced the cut. About 7 years ago, the allowable cut was 11 billion board feet. We have reduced it to 3.6 billion, because we recognize the public is concerned about the environmental impact of heavy cutting.

But I would point out that we are growing 20 billion board feet every year. So even though we might harvest 3 billion-plus board feet, we are getting an additional 17 billion added to the stock of our national forests.

So this is important as we talk about reducing CO₂. There is no better way to reduce CO₂ than to have a tree, because it takes in the CO₂, and gives off oxygen. And that is part of what the Kyoto Agreement is all about, to reduce CO₂. I think we need to continue the expansion of our national forests.

The BLM lands get very little attention, but they had 65 million visitor days last year. One-third of the Nation's coal supply comes from BLM lands. That is from the public lands. Also, they preserve a lot of our recreation, natural historical and cultural resources, and they do have a very broad scope of land opportunities.

Something that I am very pleased to see happen is that our agencies are working together. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are consolidating their activities at the field level. They realize we all serve the same taxpayers, we all have the same mission, which is to preserve our public lands, and the public does not know whether this has a tag on it that says BLM or Forest Service. They just want this land to be taken care of.

In terms of saving money, this is terrific, I think, that they work together. And, likewise, the Department of Agriculture and Interior are coordinating their efforts on the Joint Fire Science Plan. This is good management, and it is good for the way in which we use our public lands.

Revenues, this is one of the few bills that produces revenues. Sale of the resources from our public lands totals about \$8 billion. And that goes into the Treasury, helping defer the cost of providing the services that are part of our land usage.

I have mentioned the recreation fee program and we are getting a growing land usage. One of the things that we observed when we were visiting the parks this summer as a committee is the pressures that are growing for parking space, for traffic management, for the use of the facilities.

One of the things that we hope to address prospectively is ways in which we can better enhance the visitors' experience and avoid some of these problems of too many people loving their parks

too much. We want to manage the parking problem. We want to manage the traffic problem so that the visitors can get the maximum amount of enjoyment out of their asset, the national public lands.

We looked at some of the construction needs of our parks. Housing is one that requires attention so that we can give the employees of the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the other land management agencies, an opportunity to live in a comfortable way.

We are changing the way in which we manage construction. Historically for the parks, the Denver Service Center has done this and their fees have come from overhead on the project. That does not provide a desirable accountability. So we are going to reduce the numbers of employees there.

We found that there are 500 people at Denver, whereas the other land management agencies have about 25 people each. We are putting them on-line, so that their budget will be part of the line-item budget and will have accountability for what they do.

These changes are the result of recommendations from the National Academy of Public Administration, who did an extensive oversight of the way in which we manage construction project. Again, this is an effort to stretch our dollars. Prospectively, we will require the Park Service to contract out 90 percent of construction projects to local architectural and engineering firms. Hopefully, we will get more efficient use of these construction dollars.

I mentioned the Purchaser Road Credit, we have eliminated it. But I want to point out also that we have included \$91 million for road maintenance and decommissioning. That is to eliminate these roads which are of concern to people.

We put an increase of \$6 million for road reconstruction and \$93 million also as part of the road reconstruction program. This is an increase over last year, a statement that we recognize that these roads are important to the recreation user and we want them to be able to get in and out of the forest in a safe way. We only have \$1 million for new roads and we provided \$5 million for road obliteration. I think that is a positive direction in terms of those who are concerned about the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned about the amount of board feet that come out of the national forests, part of our resources, which allows us to reduce housing costs. In terms of fire, we heard discussion on the fire issue in the debate on the rule, but we had put in additional money fire suppression and fire science so that we can deal with fire in the best possible way. There is a substantial amount of money left over from previous years, and I think we have very adequately taken care of our fire needs.

\$2 million from the Department of Agriculture bill has been added to this bill to help with volunteer fire companies, recognizing that in communities

where they have volunteer firefighting units, they need a little help, and they, in turn, can help the forestry people in dealing with fires. And we had \$21.5 million in fire assistance to the States, places like Florida.

I think it should be pointed out that the Florida fires are pretty much on State lands, but nevertheless the Federal Government is helping as much as possible.

On Native Americans, I was disappointed in the administration's request. They reduced the amount on Indian Health Services and had we funded at the administration's level, only 25 percent of the Indian population would have dental services. This is from testimony from the American Dental Society.

We have tried to correct this gross inequity, and we have increased Indian Health Services by \$147 million. And we have increased \$50 million for facilities, clinics and so on and recognized our responsibility.

Some of you will remember some years ago we transferred the Biologic Resources Program to U.S. Geological Survey and I think they are doing a remarkably efficient job of providing science to all the land agencies. We tried to meet their budget needs, as well.

In Ecological Services of the Fish and Wildlife Service, we have included funding for the Endangered Species Act, to administer it. I hope the administration will come up with a bill to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act. It is not authorized. It needs reauthorization, and I would hope that we can get a bill from the administration, along with others that have offered bills, to deal with this problem because we have to just appropriate in light of the absence of an authorization program.

Energy programs. Obviously to meet the needs of the parks and the forests and the other agencies, we did cut back on the amount of funding in energy. And I might mention at this point that one of the things that we have emphasized in our programs is matching funds. We have said to those who want to have experimental programs in energy, for those who want to have other programs, "Okay, we will put up a dollar, but you have to put up a matching dollar from the private sector, or from a State, or whatever it might be." Therefore we have maximized considerably the amount money that we have had available to do energy programs.

Obviously, everyone who goes to the gas pump know that energy prices are relatively low. Part of this is the result of efficiency in the production of gasoline. I think the fact that we have low energy costs contributes very substantially to our strong economy.

We have to keep this success going. It is not a given. We are importing over half our petroleum. And, therefore, it is important that we maintain the SPR oil. And I think it is important that we maintain the programs that will give a

more efficient use. I was struck by the fact that for every barrel that is extracted from wells, two barrels are left there. And if we can develop technology to get at least part of that extra two barrels, we will tremendously expand our domestic resources of petroleum.

Again, we have emphasized partnerships in these programs in terms of energy efficiency. We have increased energy efficiency funding 14 percent since 1996, and we recognize that energy efficiency is important in terms of using the resources to the best possible advantage.

In terms of weatherization, we have flat-funded it. The Federal Energy Management Program has got an increase because, again, this is a partnership that has been very effective in working with Federal agencies.

□ 1300

National Endowment for the Arts. We will have plenty of opportunity to debate the NEA later on, so I will not take time on it now, other than to say to all the Members that they will have an opportunity to vote up or down on whether they think it is a proper function of the United States Government to provide funding for the cultural heritage of this Nation, for the enhancement of it, for the expansion, for the education of young people in terms of what they have as a cultural heritage.

We will have that vote, and I will mention at that time the fact that we have changed the NEA. We have six Members of the Congress that serve on the Council. We put a cap on funds that can go to any one State. Forty percent of the funding goes for set-aside programs for State grants. We have reduced the administrative funds. We have established priorities for grants for education, particularly in music.

And I would point out also that the obscenity restrictions adopted in 1990 are still part of the law. The Supreme Court, most recently in the Finley decision, upheld these obscenity restrictions. And we have eliminated grants to individuals for seasonal support and subgranting.

I think I can say categorically that there will be no more Maplethorps; that there will not be a "Corpus Christi," as has been alleged. That cannot happen under the restrictions that we have put on the National Endowment for the Arts. And I think one of the Members on our side that has been appointed as one of the three appointees will have something to say on the functioning of this.

Very briefly I would like to highlight the cultural agencies. We have funded the Smithsonian. We have tried to address backlog maintenance as much as possible. But what I really find pleasing, and this is the result of our subcommittee members working together, is that our cultural agencies are expanding their outreach. Secretary Heyman, from the Smithsonian, testified that their web site gets over 12

million hits per month from all over the world. People are benefiting from the scientific research that is done there, and benefiting from the cultural dimensions of this institution.

In tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) have all been strong proponents of these programs. This wonderful, asset is more than an asset for the District of Columbia. It is a world asset because of the outreach that they are doing. Twelve million hits per month. Imagine how many lives and how many individuals are being touched by that. Twenty percent of these internet hits are from overseas.

Likewise, the Kennedy Center has developed an outreach program called the Millennium Stage. They provide a free performance each day in the Kennedy Center. I think it is at 6 o'clock in the evening. Because we forget that the Kennedy Center is more than just the opera house and the film institutes. The Kennedy Center is a monument, in addition to other things. When people go there, most of them do not go to any performance, they go to just see the Kennedy Center. In fact, they wear out the carpeting with so many visitors, and we have to provide for that.

And, again, these are things that were brought about under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) much more than myself or others on this subcommittee.

Last year 130,000 visitors to this city, as well as people who live here locally, went to the free performances at the Millennium Stage, and at the anniversary in March, they had 10,000 people. I do not know how they got 10,000 people in that hallway for this Millennium program, but I think it is wonderful that these agencies are reaching out to the people all across the Nation. And I know they too have a web site where people can plug in.

The National Gallery of Art and the Holocaust Museum both offer extensive outreach programs, and, of course, the Holocaust Museum was directly there as a result of the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois. I guess when it is all said and done, we know he will be sorely missed because he has been such an important part of providing a legacy for future generations.

Over 23 million people receive services of the National Gallery's extension programs. They loaned over 150 different programs on the Gallery's permanent art collection. The Holocaust Museum has a traveling exhibition. They were in Canton, Ohio, recently, attracting an enormous crowd.

Canton, I might mention, is in the 16th District, and many of my colleagues already know about the Pro Football Hall of Fame, but we do have other things. We have a great art institute. We have a great symphony. We have a lot of strong cultural enrichment programs.

The Holocaust Museum brought "The Nazi Olympics: Berlin 1936," to Canton.

People came from all over Ohio and even from other States to view this exhibit. The Holocaust Museum has four traveling exhibits going around the Nation telling the story to remind people of how important the message is.

This is a good bill. It is fair. We had input from every member of the subcommittee. We had the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois and other Members on the minority side. We had

the challenges of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), did yeoman's service in solving the problem of the timber and the purchaser road credit so we do not have that issue this year. On balance, I would urge the Members to support this bill.

And let me just close again with a quote from our Native American friends. This is repetitious but it bears

repeating: "We do not inherit this land from our ancestors. We borrow it from our children." And I want to say that the members of our subcommittee live that every day as we deal with the challenges of this committee. This truly is a bill in which we can take pride in America.

At this point I would like to submit a table detailing the various accounts in the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources.....	582,082,000	660,310,000	596,425,000	+ 14,343,000	-63,885,000
Wildland fire management	280,103,000	298,353,000	286,895,000	+ 6,792,000	-11,458,000
Central hazardous materials fund	12,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-2,000,000	
Construction	5,091,000	4,175,000	6,975,000	+ 1,884,000	+ 2,800,000
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000		
Land acquisition	11,200,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	-1,200,000	-5,000,000
Oregon and California grant lands	98,906,000	98,966,000	98,407,000	-499,000	-559,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	9,113,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+ 887,000	
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	8,706,000	8,055,000	8,055,000	-651,000	
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000		
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	1,136,001,000	1,233,659,000	1,155,557,000	+ 19,556,000	-78,102,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service					
Resource management	594,592,000	675,828,000	607,106,000	+ 12,514,000	-68,722,000
Construction	76,636,000	37,000,000	66,100,000	-10,536,000	+ 29,100,000
Land acquisition	62,632,000	60,500,000	60,000,000	-32,632,000	-30,500,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	14,000,000	17,000,000	15,000,000	+ 1,000,000	-2,000,000
National wildlife refuge fund	10,779,000	10,000,000	10,779,000		+ 779,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	11,700,000	14,700,000	12,700,000	+ 1,000,000	-2,000,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	800,000	800,000	800,000		
Multinational species conservation fund	1,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	+ 1,000,000	
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	772,539,000	818,228,000	744,885,000	-27,654,000	-73,343,000
National Park Service					
Operation of the national park system	1,234,004,000	1,320,828,000	1,333,328,000	+ 99,324,000	+ 12,500,000
National recreation and preservation	44,259,000	46,575,000	41,939,000	-2,320,000	-4,636,000
Historic preservation fund	40,812,000	100,812,000	40,812,000		-59,800,000
Construction	222,769,000	175,000,000	149,000,000	-73,769,000	-26,000,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000		
Land acquisition and state assistance	143,290,000	138,087,000	69,000,000	-74,290,000	-69,087,000
Urban park and recreation fund		2,000,000			-2,000,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,655,134,000	1,753,102,000	1,604,079,000	-51,055,000	-149,023,000
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	760,358,000	806,883,000	774,838,000	+ 14,480,000	-32,045,000
Minerals Management Service					
Royalty and offshore minerals management	144,196,000	222,402,000	216,402,000	+ 72,206,000	-6,000,000
Additions to receipts		-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	
Oil spill research	6,118,000	6,118,000	6,118,000		
Total, Minerals Management Service	150,314,000	128,520,000	122,520,000	-27,794,000	-6,000,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement					
Regulation and technology	94,937,000	93,265,000	93,074,000	-1,863,000	-191,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	500,000	275,000	275,000	-225,000	
Subtotal.....	95,437,000	93,540,000	93,349,000	-2,088,000	-191,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) (By transfer)	177,624,000 (3,163,000)	183,416,000	185,416,000	+ 7,792,000 (-3,163,000)	+ 2,000,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement...	273,061,000	276,956,000	278,765,000	+ 5,704,000	+ 1,809,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Operation of Indian programs	1,529,638,000	1,638,681,000	1,558,425,000	+ 28,787,000	-80,256,000
Construction	125,279,000	152,054,000	121,695,000	-3,584,000	-30,359,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	43,352,000	38,396,000	28,396,000	-14,956,000	-10,000,000
Indian guaranteed loan program account	5,000,000	5,005,000	5,001,000	+ 1,000	-4,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+ 25,067,000)	
Indian land consolidation pilot		10,000,000			-10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,703,269,000	1,844,136,000	1,713,517,000	+ 10,248,000	-130,619,000
Departmental Offices					
Insular Affairs:					
Assistance to Territories	39,794,000	38,555,000	38,455,000	-1,339,000	-100,000
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000		
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories	67,514,000	66,275,000	66,175,000	-1,339,000	-100,000
Compact of Free Association	8,545,000	8,445,000	8,545,000		+ 100,000
Mandatory payments	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000		
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association.....	20,545,000	20,445,000	20,545,000		+ 100,000
Total, Insular Affairs	88,059,000	86,720,000	86,720,000	-1,339,000	
Departmental management	58,286,000	60,871,000	58,286,000		-2,585,000
Office of the Solicitor	35,443,000	37,304,000	37,304,000	+ 1,861,000	

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued**

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Office of Inspector General	24,500,000	25,684,000	24,499,000	-1,000	-1,185,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	1,000,000			-1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	38,557,000	42,000,000	39,499,000	+942,000	-2,501,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund	4,228,000	8,100,000	4,482,000	+284,000	-3,608,000
Total, Departmental Offices	250,073,000	260,679,000	250,800,000	+727,000	-9,879,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,700,749,000	7,122,163,000	6,844,961,000	-55,788,000	-477,202,000
Appropriations	(6,730,749,000)	(7,152,163,000)	(6,674,961,000)	(-55,788,000)	(-477,202,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+25,067,000)	
(By transfer)	(3,163,000)			(-3,163,000)	
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
Forest and rangeland research	187,796,000	198,122,000	197,444,000	+9,648,000	-678,000
State and private forestry	209,178,000	162,900,000	156,167,000	-53,011,000	-6,733,000
National forest system	1,357,744,000	1,417,708,000	1,298,421,000	-59,323,000	-119,287,000
Wildland fire management	566,559,000	554,437,000	564,737,000	-21,822,000	+10,300,000
Emergency appropriations		102,000,000			-102,000,000
Reconstruction and construction	166,015,000	160,914,000	271,444,000	+105,429,000	+110,530,000
Land acquisition	52,976,000	56,057,000	30,000,000	-22,976,000	-26,057,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000		
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210,000	210,000	210,000		
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	3,811,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	-511,000	
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	92,000	92,000	92,000		
Midewin national tallgrass prairie restoration fund	100,000			-100,000	
Total, Forest Service	2,565,550,000	2,656,809,000	2,522,884,000	-42,666,000	-133,925,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Clean coal technology:					
Rescission	-101,000,000			+101,000,000	
Deferral		-40,000,000			+40,000,000
Subtotal	-101,000,000	-40,000,000		+101,000,000	+40,000,000
Fossil energy research and development	362,403,000	383,408,000	320,558,000	-41,845,000	-62,850,000
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-1,500,000	-1,300,000	-1,300,000	+200,000	
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	107,000,000	22,500,000	14,000,000	-93,000,000	-8,500,000
Energy conservation	611,723,000	808,500,000	630,250,000	+18,527,000	-178,250,000
Economic regulation	2,725,000	1,801,000	1,801,000	-924,000	
Strategic petroleum reserve	207,500,000	180,120,000	180,120,000	-47,380,000	
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)			(-207,500,000)	
Energy Information Administration	66,800,000	70,500,000	68,000,000	+1,200,000	-2,500,000
Elk Hills school lands fund		36,000,000			-36,000,000
Total, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	1,255,651,000	1,441,529,000	1,193,429,000	-62,222,000	-248,100,000
Appropriations	(1,356,651,000)	(1,481,529,000)	(1,193,429,000)	(-163,222,000)	(-288,100,000)
Rescission	(-101,000,000)			(+101,000,000)	
Deferral		(-40,000,000)			(+40,000,000)
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)			(-207,500,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Indian Health Service					
Indian health services	1,841,174,000	1,843,873,000	1,932,953,000	+91,779,000	+89,080,000
Indian health facilities	257,538,000	274,476,000	313,175,000	+55,637,000	+38,699,000
Total, Indian Health Service	2,098,712,000	2,118,349,000	2,246,128,000	+147,416,000	+127,779,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation					
Salaries and expenses	15,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development					
Payment to the Institute	4,250,000	3,188,000		-4,250,000	-3,188,000
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	333,408,000	357,300,000	346,449,000	+13,041,000	-10,851,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,850,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+650,000	
Repair and restoration of buildings	32,000,000	40,000,000	44,500,000	+12,500,000	+4,500,000
Construction	33,000,000	18,000,000	2,000,000	-31,000,000	-16,000,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	402,258,000	419,800,000	397,449,000	-4,809,000	-22,351,000
National Gallery of Art					
Salaries and expenses	55,837,000	57,938,000	57,938,000	+2,101,000	
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	6,192,000	6,311,000	6,311,000	+119,000	
Total, National Gallery of Art	62,029,000	64,249,000	64,249,000	+2,220,000	

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued**

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts					
Operations and maintenance	11,375,000	13,000,000	12,187,000	+ 812,000	-813,000
Construction	9,000,000	20,000,000	9,000,000	-11,000,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	20,375,000	33,000,000	21,187,000	+ 812,000	-11,813,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars					
Salaries and expenses	5,840,000	6,040,000	5,840,000	-200,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and administration	81,240,000	120,500,000	81,240,000	-39,260,000
Matching grants	16,760,000	15,500,000	16,760,000	+ 1,260,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	98,000,000	136,000,000	98,000,000	-38,000,000
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and administration	96,800,000	122,000,000	96,800,000	-25,200,000
Matching grants	13,900,000	14,000,000	13,900,000	-100,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	110,700,000	136,000,000	110,700,000	-25,300,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services/ Office of Museum Services					
Grants and administration	23,280,000	26,000,000	23,405,000	+ 125,000	-2,595,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	231,980,000	298,000,000	232,105,000	+ 125,000	-65,895,000
Commission of Fine Arts					
Salaries and expenses	907,000	898,000	898,000	-9,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs					
Grants	7,000,000	7,500,000	7,000,000	-500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation					
Salaries and expenses	2,745,000	3,000,000	2,800,000	+ 55,000	-200,000
National Capital Planning Commission					
Salaries and expenses	5,740,000	6,212,000	5,954,000	+ 214,000	-258,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council					
Holocaust Memorial Council	31,707,000	32,607,000	31,707,000	-900,000
Presidio Trust					
Presidio trust fund	39,913,000	39,913,000	+ 39,913,000
Total, title II, related agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,709,744,000	7,146,094,000	6,784,543,000	+ 74,799,000	-361,551,000
Appropriations	(6,810,744,000)	(7,084,094,000)	(6,784,543,000)	(-26,201,000)	(-299,551,000)
Emergency appropriations	(102,000,000)	(-102,000,000)
Rescission	(-101,000,000)	(+ 101,000,000)
Deferral	(-40,000,000)	(+ 40,000,000)
(By transfer)	(207,500,000)	(-207,500,000)
TITLE V - PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES					
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges	699,000,000	-699,000,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	14,109,493,000	14,268,257,000	13,429,504,000	-679,989,000	-838,753,000
Appropriations	(14,240,493,000)	(14,236,257,000)	(13,459,504,000)	(-780,989,000)	(-776,753,000)
Emergency appropriations	(102,000,000)	(-102,000,000)
Rescissions	(-131,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(+ 101,000,000)
Deferral	(-40,000,000)	(+ 40,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(34,615,000)	(59,682,000)	(59,682,000)	(+ 25,067,000)
(By transfer)	(210,663,000)	(-210,663,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Land Management	1,136,001,000	1,233,659,000	1,155,557,000	+ 19,556,000	-78,102,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	772,539,000	818,228,000	744,885,000	-27,854,000	-73,343,000
National Park Service	1,655,134,000	1,753,102,000	1,604,079,000	-51,055,000	-149,023,000
United States Geological Survey	760,358,000	806,883,000	774,838,000	+ 14,480,000	-32,045,000
Minerals Management Service	150,314,000	128,520,000	122,520,000	-27,794,000	-6,000,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	273,061,000	276,956,000	278,765,000	+ 5,704,000	+ 1,809,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,703,269,000	1,844,136,000	1,713,517,000	+ 10,248,000	-130,619,000
Departmental Offices	250,073,000	260,679,000	250,800,000	+ 727,000	-9,879,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,700,749,000	7,122,163,000	6,644,961,000	-55,788,000	-477,202,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES					
Forest Service	2,565,550,000	2,656,809,000	2,522,884,000	-42,666,000	-133,925,000
Department of Energy	1,255,651,000	1,441,529,000	1,193,429,000	-62,222,000	-248,100,000
Indian Health Service	2,098,712,000	2,118,349,000	2,246,128,000	+ 147,416,000	+ 127,779,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	15,000,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	4,250,000	3,188,000	-4,250,000	-3,188,000
Smithsonian Institution	402,258,000	419,800,000	397,449,000	-4,809,000	-22,351,000

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4193)—Continued**

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
National Gallery of Art.....	62,029,000	64,249,000	64,249,000	+2,220,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	20,375,000	33,000,000	21,187,000	+812,000	-11,813,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	5,840,000	6,040,000	5,840,000	-200,000
National Endowment for the Arts.....	98,000,000	136,000,000	98,000,000	-38,000,000
National Endowment for the Humanities.....	110,700,000	136,000,000	110,700,000	-25,300,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services.....	23,280,000	26,000,000	23,405,000	+125,000	-2,595,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	907,000	898,000	898,000	-9,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs.....	7,000,000	7,500,000	7,000,000	-500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.....	2,745,000	3,000,000	2,800,000	+55,000	-200,000
National Capital Planning Commission.....	5,740,000	6,212,000	5,954,000	+214,000	-258,000
Holocaust Memorial Council.....	31,707,000	32,607,000	31,707,000	-900,000
Presidio Trust.....	39,913,000	39,913,000	+39,913,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies.....	6,709,744,000	7,146,094,000	6,784,543,000	+74,799,000	-361,551,000
TITLE V - PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES					
Priority land acquisitions and exchanges.....	699,000,000	-699,000,000
Grand total.....	14,109,493,000	14,268,257,000	13,429,504,000	-679,989,000	-838,753,000

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

Mr. Chairman, once again we are here to consider the Interior appropriations bill, for fiscal year 1999. I have come before this House many times to present the Interior bill, for a number of years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, and for the past several years as the ranking member. However, this time it is a little different, because it is the last time that I will take the floor on behalf of the Interior bill.

I want to say that I have been on the subcommittee, I would guess, for about 30 or 32 years, and I was chairman for about 20 years during that time. So much for term limits, Mr. Chairman.

I was asked by a reporter whether I favored term limits, and I told him I did not favor a constitutional amendment for term limits, except perhaps if I could designate the number of terms that a Member might be limited to 24 terms. And that, Mr. Chairman, is about what I will have at the conclusion of this session of the Congress.

And it has been a happy time, Mr. Chairman, over all the years. It has been happy because of the character and quality of the Members of the House of Representatives. I think when I first came down here there were three women who were Members of the House, one Democrat and two Republican Members. One was from Ohio, from Cleveland. I forget her name. Perhaps the chairman would remember it. And there was another lady from New York.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think the woman the gentleman was thinking of was Frances Bolton.

Mr. YATES. Yes. Her son Oliver subsequently became a Member of the House when she retired. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of that.

I do not know how many women Members there are of the House at the present time, but I think there must be about 50. And I believe that the House has made and the country has made progress in that respect, because I consider that the women Members are among the ablest Members of the House and they make a real contribution.

I think the speech that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) made last week on female contraceptives was one of the great speeches I have heard during my career in the House of Representatives. And I am pleased that if the Republicans want to follow the rule that the Committee on Rules voted out, that they had the good sense to select the gentlewoman from Connecticut to offer the funding for the NEA amendment, because I think she is so eminently qualified in so many respects.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RALPH REGULA), what can I say about the cur-

rent chairman? His eloquence, of course, was just made visible when he presented the bill. He and I have been thinking alike since he became a member of this subcommittee. When I was chairman, I considered the gentleman, and I have told him so, as cochairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, and we brought the bill to the floor in that spirit.

We had our differences, and those are represented, of course, in the bills that have come up since he became chairman. He and I differ on omitting the funds for NEA. And over the years when I was chairman, I would talk to the gentleman about his interest in the arts.

I think basically he is a lover of the arts. I do not think there is any doubt about it. He takes such pride in the Canton Symphony, and I think that extends even to the point that he goes to see the Cleveland Symphony on occasion. I remember that even on one occasion he went to New York and was a guest at the Metropolitan Opera, he and my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JACK MURTHA), who is also a member of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is a very persuasive teacher.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman very much.

I remember the line from Gilbert and Sullivan. Does the gentleman remember it? I think it was from "Patience." "If you are looking for to shine in a transcendental line, as a man of culture rare." And the rest of the song goes on. I think the gentleman is almost qualified for that right now.

Certainly he is qualified to handle this bill, not only for the cultural aspects of it, which I think are, indeed, a most important part of the bill, but as well for the natural resources part of the bill, because he has really developed all these programs and made his presence felt. And it has been a good presence, it has been a fine presence, because the gentleman has the great qualifications of mind and of instinct that are so necessary in a good chairman.

I want to commend also the other members of the Subcommittee on Interior, who are really outstanding members of this House. It was a pleasure to serve with them and to work with them, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOE MCDADE), who joins me in retirement this year. The House will surely miss him because he has been an outstanding chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations.

I will vote for the Johnson amendment as it takes shape later in the bill, after one of the opponents of NEA funding will have taken the floor to make a point of order against the bill. I think we can bet that is going to happen.

□ 1315

I am sorry that the Committee on Rules did not support the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I call the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) who loves the arts, who is a great lover of music, a legislative maestro. I think he is a legislative maestro because he has such a keen interest in the legislation. And I cannot think of what the Committee on Appropriations would be like without the great strengths that he possessed as chairman of the committee and now possess as ranking member. His service to the House and to the country has been outstanding.

I can understand his great interest in the milk price legislation, coming from Wisconsin as he does, but I am not sure I always understood the purport of that legislation as it came to the floor and traveled through the House.

I leave the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) with a great sense of loss, because he and I have been such great friends through the years, both on and off the committee. And I will say that about every member of the Committee.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) I think is an outstanding constitutional expert. His touch was always present in connection with the legislation as we came forward. He was always a gentleman and he took onto himself, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the indomitable task, the practically impossible task of trying to bring the Members of the House together as brothers and sisters. I think perhaps he has succeeded to a far greater extent than seems apparent, because I think the sense of camaraderie in the House has in some measure overcome what I have felt was a cloud of partisanship that has seized the House on occasion.

At any rate, I have been ruminating, Mr. Chairman, and I am sorry that I have taken the time to try to express a few feelings on this occasion. I have not given the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) all the credit that he deserves. I think he is one of the great Members of the House in being able to bring people together. And I surely have not said the nice things I should be saying about the Republican members of our committee, who are very, very able members and good people. It was a pleasure to work with them.

I want to return for a few seconds to NEA. We have received letters from opponents of NEA. And I notice, Mr. Chairman, that contrary to what I thought was the agreement that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I had, there will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), I am told. And I have a copy of it, which reads as follows:

The amounts otherwise provided by this act are revised by increasing the amount for land acquisition and state assistance under the heading National Park Service to provide the funds for State assistance programs

and reducing the amounts for grants administration under the National Endowment for the Arts by \$50 million.

Of course, that is not nickel-and-diming, as some of the amendments would have, but this is a major program cut, and I would hope that the chairman would stand by his agreement and oppose the Pappas amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the names go first. We always make a mistake when we try to specify people. I momentarily forgot the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

I do want to laud my colleague for his service to the committee, as I should. But as Justice Leonard Hand said, the names go first. Then he said the knees go. Then he said the nouns go. And then we go.

At any rate, I want to close by acknowledging the great friendship that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and I have had over the years and his many, many contributions not only in the field of national defense but in the Interior bill.

Because of time limitations, I have not covered a number of the items I wanted to cover. But with that, Mr. Chairman, I say thank you, thank you to the Members of the House for the privilege of having associated with them over the years, and those who have come and those who have gone.

It was a very, very wonderful experience. Public service is a great vocation. I do not understand why anybody would impose term limits, as they try to do in various parts of the country. Public service is a great tradition and a great opportunity to serve the public, and I am very grateful for having had that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to especially congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for the fine work that he has done here on behalf of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Service and the Denver Service Center and the reforms that are written into this bill. It is a major accomplishment.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your willingness to work with me to secure funds for projects on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and the Walkkill River National Wildlife Refuge. These will bring greater use and expand the opportunities for all people who use these park facilities.

As you know, Congressman JOSEPH MCDADE and I share in the benefits of one of the most beautiful recreation areas in the country, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (DWGNRA). Unfortunately, recent media reports have highlighted the National Park Service's expenditure of \$800,000, waste if not fraud, for a single restroom facility at the Ramondskill Falls site on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware Water Gap.

I know we agree that there was simply no justification for this scandalous squandering of

taxpayer dollars. I am proud to have worked with Chairman REGULA to include provisions in this bill that are designed to put an end to the scandalous waste in the National Park Service.

This bill includes major reforms for the National Park Service's Denver Service Center. The Denver Service Center is an arm of the National Park Service which assists all regions with planning and support. A recent report commissioned by Chairman REGULA proved that the Denver Service Center is inefficient and wasteful of taxpayer dollars. There is little accountability for the costs of the projects it designs and little, if any, oversight of the design and construction process. Rather than creating standardized designs that would be expected of a central design office, the DSC needlessly reinvents the wheel over and over again.

The reforms included in this bill make sense. First the DSC will be required to adopt standard practices common to the private sector and other government agencies. Second, they will be required to consult outside experts and give more control to local park superintendents. Finally, the DSC must cut its staff in half and contract out 90 percent of construction projects to local architectural and engineering firms.

Despite the problems with the Denver Service Center and the \$800,000 toilet, there are many worthwhile projects in the DWGNRA that should be funded. In the past, New Jersey has not gotten its fair share of the money for projects in the Delaware Water Gap. I had hoped that the Committee would agree to divide the money for Delaware Water Gap on a more equitable basis between New Jersey and Pennsylvania. However, I do appreciate the \$300,000 included in this bill for much needed maintenance work on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap.

I was disappointed that we were unable to include funding for the rehabilitation of the Depew Recreation Site and money for the long-awaited Weygadt Visitors Center. Unfortunately, we still do not have a formal boat ramp on the New Jersey side, and many of the New Jersey recreation sites do not have modern restroom facilities. Chairman REGULA has agreed to work with me as this bill moves through the legislative process to see if we can secure additional funds to address these fundamental needs on the New Jersey side of the Delaware Water Gap. Delaware Water Gap is a national treasure, not just a Pennsylvania treasure.

Finally, I want to thank you for, once again, recognizing the significance of our wildlife refuges and specifically the Walkkill River National Wildlife Refuge by including \$1 million to ensure the future preservation of the valuable resource.

Since its establishment, the refuge has received appropriations through your subcommittee to begin protecting the most critical habitat within its borders, especially along the Walkkill River itself. Funding has allowed for the acquisition of undeveloped frontage along the Walkkill River, as well as riparian wetlands, meadows and upland areas, all of which support large populations of numerous wildlife. In addition to enhancing habitat protection, acquisition of additional property enhances the refuge's effort to open up to the public. The natural resources found at the refuge lend themselves to environmental education programs

that would benefit local school districts as well as other visitors to the refuge. By ensuring that a large manageable block of critical habitat is created at the refuge, acquisition of willing-seller lands will significantly enhance the refuge's programmatic goals and help bring the refuge closer to the public.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the very distinguished legislative maestro.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At a later point, I will make the appropriate comments concerning my own views of the shortcomings of this bill and the administration's views of the shortcomings of this bill. For a moment, I would simply like to say something about our good friend the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (SID YATES).

As everyone understands, he came to this House in 1948. And were it not for the fact that he ran for the Senate and lost by 1 percent and so had 2 years of interrupted service before he returned to this body, were it not for that fact, he would be recognized as the Dean of the House today.

He has served this House with extraordinary skills on at least two subcommittees. Since the beginning of the Marshall Plan, he has been involved in foreign policy. Sid was one of the Members here who helped shape the Marshall Plan in its early years. And also, on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, he gave a lifetime of effort to assure the national security of the State of Israel. He recognized that the United States, having been a party to the creation of that country, that we had undertaken a long-term obligation to defend the security of that country, and he has done so with fervor and grace in all the years that he has been a Member of this Congress.

At home he has been a champion of civil liberties. He has understood that the Constitution's most important provision is that it guarantees citizens the right to be wrong; it even guarantees Members of Congress the right to be wrong. And I can think of few Members whose passion for individual liberty and whose passion for constitutional rights have been more fervent.

I would also say that more than any Member I have known, SID has been a champion of what he felt to be sensible budget priorities, almost without exception putting the needs of regular working people, putting the needs of education, putting the needs of health care, putting the needs of the environment before the needs of wasteful weapons systems or aid to foreign dictators or other provisions of money that did not as well reflect our national values.

He has served this subcommittee as chair for 20 years, and in the last two Congresses as ranking Democratic member; and in that time there has been no greater defender of the public

interest in terms of protecting the environment, in terms of protecting public lands, in terms of recognizing our obligations to Native American tribes.

And he also has, in my view, been the single best debater I have ever seen in the years I have been in this House. He has stood for a decent and just society. And in connection with this bill, most of all, he has been the quintessential champion of Federal support for and funding for the arts and humanities, recognizing that even with their occasional faults those programs make a great contribution to giving society the grace notes that make this society a little better and a little more human society in which individuals can function.

So I am grateful for the years of service he has provided here, as we all are, and we wish him Godspeed in his retirement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) who will join me in retirement at the conclusion of this Congress and whose loss will be felt very deeply by the House and by the country.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) both for the yielding of time and his kind thoughts.

I want to begin by expressing my respect and affection for our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and my appreciation for all the consideration he has given to me and all the members of the subcommittee in putting the bill together, and thanks and appreciation to staff on both sides as well. It has been a great pleasure and privilege to have worked with everybody associated with this subcommittee.

But I, too, wish primarily to say a word or two about SID YATES. I was 5 years old when SID came to Congress, and I wish I knew then how much I should have appreciated what he was already doing for this country. There are many issues that come before us in which I think each Member yearns for a special eloquence to be able to express how they feel. But, we love you, SID.

□ 1330

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I join him in the expression of friendship that he has exhibited. I will not go beyond that because I will probably react the same way the gentleman did.

Mr. SKAGGS. Trying to regain my composure, and I thank the gentleman for interrupting me, perhaps just a couple of quantitative observations will capture how we are blessed and graced with the gentleman from Illinois being really an example of living history among us.

While commenting on the fact that he has graced the planet for 40 percent of the existence of the Republic may make him feel old, he is indomitably young at heart. He has served this

country in Congress for nearly 25 percent of the Congresses of the United States. And so we applaud and cherish the gentleman from Illinois and his service to this place.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I want to start by thanking the gentleman from Ohio again for his great cooperation and support on a whole host of issues that are beneficial to the Pacific Northwest, the region of the country that I have the honor of representing. I also want to congratulate the staff. This staff is one of the very best. I appreciate the fact that they work with all the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. That is a good standard.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to say a few words about the gentleman from Illinois. We have had a few differences of opinion over the years. The gentleman from Wisconsin talks about his great debating skills going back to the days of Eddie Boland. I had the misfortune at that time to be the assistant for Senator Magnuson of the other body at the time who was the great author of the SST. So the gentleman from Illinois' great eloquence cost us dearly because ultimately he won. But I will say this. The day after that great victory for the gentleman from Illinois and Senator Proxmire from the gentleman from Wisconsin's home State, a senior member of the Boeing Company came in and said, "Those two guys saved the company because if we had built the SST, we would have been in deep trouble."

So the gentleman's judgment was good. It was correct, and I have learned a great deal from him. Our styles are probably, some people would say, completely different. But I would say to a young political science student, if you want to have a history of somebody who has been what I consider the best subcommittee chairman I have ever seen in this House, it was the gentleman from Illinois. He was fair to every witness that came before our committee and respected the individuals that came before the committee and treated them with dignity.

Also he had tremendous passion and concern for the issues, such as the National Endowment for the Arts. He and I have been on this floor defending the Endowment over the last 20 years. What has happened is we would have the greatest hearings in our committee on the Endowment, and one day I got a call from the gentleman from Illinois. He said, "I need you to cover me this afternoon on the hearing for the Endowment for the Arts." He forgot to tell me it was the opposition to the Endowment for the Arts. So I had to come in and be the acting subcommittee chairman. There were quite a list of very interesting individuals. The gentleman was good at handing things off when he did not particularly want to

have to listen to all these people who were in opposition.

But the main thing is that I think he has left behind on our committee a whole series of members who have had the ability to see him and how he handles situations, and I think it has built a camaraderie on the Interior subcommittee. I agree with our chairman, this is a committee where we care about the culture of our country, we care about the natural resources, we care about the tribes, and the gentleman from Illinois has been the real glue on our committee. We are going to miss him. He has done a great job for the country and a great job for the Interior subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will allow me to pay my tribute to him by speaking in support of something that he has fought for his whole career and, that is, full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. We must allow the Endowment to continue its exercise of national leadership towards our goal of making the Nation's artistic resources available to all.

A civilized society as the gentleman from Illinois has taught us for many years must include art and cultural enrichment, and I believe it is one of the responsibilities of government to support that aspect of our civilization. We simply cannot rely exclusively on the good will of a few private individuals to fund the arts. It is impractical and unreasonable to expect a single city or an individual State to support the national availability of important cultural resources. It is the duty of all of us.

The NEA can act to sustain and increase funding for the arts by providing incentive funding to other government levels. I see it in my own city of San Diego. I see it around the country. NEA helps to build alliances between the arts and related interests such as community revitalization, downtown development and historical preservation. That is what is occurring in San Diego. It is occurring all over this Nation.

The collaboration of NEA with other agencies to contribute to national goals is paramount. Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois has taught us again, we are judged by the heritage we leave our children. I hope we leave them more than soap operas and talk shows, attack submarines and assault rifles, gangs and drugs. By supporting the NEA, we ensure that the arts will continue to be here helping to build our economy and trade opportunities, helping to keep our youth from misbehavior, helping to increase public awareness and understanding of culture, not just for those with money, not just for the elite but

for all of us. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for keeping this inspiration alive for so many years for all of us to keep it going.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I want to concur with the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) on his comments on the NEA to say I hope to speak on that shortly when it comes up, but I want to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois.

One of the things that has not really been emphasized in the long career that the gentleman from Illinois has had in this House is his steadfast stewardship over the trust responsibility that this government has to our Native Americans, our first Americans. Whenever issues came up with respect to this government fulfilling its obligations to provide for our Native Americans, the gentleman from Illinois was there, long before others ever stood on behalf of Native Americans. I think for those of us today who are carrying on the fight, we need to look no further for an example of what kind of person we need to emulate than the gentleman from Illinois when it comes to standing up for our Native Americans.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, many people have remarked about how long the gentleman from Illinois has served in this esteemed body. I would like to say for me it gives me a great deal of pleasure to serve with such a titan of legislators like the gentleman from Illinois given the fact that he served in this House of Representatives with my uncle, John F. Kennedy, when he was a Member of the United States Congress in 1948. To think that I would have the opportunity to serve with someone who served with President Kennedy in the House of Representatives is truly something that I will always cherish and remember.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I will tell the gentleman that he is carrying on the great tradition of his uncle and of his father.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation proposes \$7.8 million for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program and I commend the gentleman from Ohio, RALPH REGULA, for seeking to accommodate the request I and others have made in this matter.

Indeed, this year I spearheaded a Coalfield Jobs, Environmental Justice and Trust Campaign to increase appropriations from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.

This is a trust fund with about \$266 million a year in receipts and a balance approaching

\$1.5 billion. Yet, during this decade, appropriations for State Reclamation Grants have averaged only \$140 million a year.

The purpose of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program, obviously, is not to collect fees assessed on coal production so they can sit idle in a government trust fund.

Rather, it is to make these funds available for the reclamation of abandoned coal mine lands thereby mitigating health, safety and environmental threats to coalfield citizens while creating jobs and bringing these lands back to productive uses.

Joining me in the effort to liberate a greater amount of the reclamation funds this year are the Associated General Contractors of America, the United Mine Workers and the Citizens Coal Council.

With that stated, I do want to express concern over bill language included in this appropriation measure that would authorize \$7 million from the balance of interest earned on the Fund for the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative.

There is more than a sufficient unappropriated balance in the Federal share of the Fund to provide for this \$7 million appropriation without tampering with the accrued interest.

Specifically, interest payments to the Fund are reserved, in part, for transfer payments to the United Mine Workers Combined Fund. In light of a recent Supreme Court decision, I am loathe to see any diversion of these interest payments to new endeavors.

While I had contemplated offering an amendment on this matter, in light of the great degree of cooperation Chairman REGULA has shown on the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program this year I would rather work with him and his Senate counterparts to address this issue during conference.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4193, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999, includes funding for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Clean Coal Technology, Fossil Energy and the Energy Conservation Research and Development programs.

Without the benefit of the increased revenues from a non-existent tobacco settlement, and notwithstanding the very tight budget caps, the Appropriations Committee has maintained or increased spending on important energy research and development programs.

I am particularly pleased that the Committee has included report language directing the DOE to address in its FY 2000 budget, the House Science Committee's recommendation in H.R. 1277, the Civilian Energy Research and Development Act of 1997, with respect to peer-reviewed, cost-shared research.

I also want to express my strong support for the bill's report language prohibiting any funds from being used to implement the Kyoto Protocol. This language is consistent with the Administration's assurances that Senate ratification must precede actions to implement the Kyoto Protocol. Given the obvious problems with this unfunded, unsigned, and unratified Protocol, such a limitation is essential and timely.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Congressman RALPH REGULA, for putting this bill together and conducting the business of this subcommittee in a spirit of bipartisanship and cooperation. I know that his interest is en-

suring that, within current budget allocations, programs are funded in a way to help protect our environment and preserve our natural resources. It has also been a distinct privilege to serve on this committee with our distinguished ranking member, Congressman SIDNEY YATES. His passion for the things in which he believes, including the National Endowment of the Arts, is a testament to what a man of principle can do through the force of his convictions. It is truly by the force of his intellect, and in many instances, the strength of his wit, that the NEA has survived attack after attack through all of these years.

As a member of this subcommittee, I will miss SID YATES, and the spirited debate, as well as humor, he injects into our hearings. As an individual with tremendous respect for this institution and those who have served in it, I can think of no better example of selfless dedication and commitment to public service embodied in SID YATES. This institution is a reflection of those who serve in it. Congressman YATES brings an air of dignity, of civility, of goodwill to this body that is in short supply. We will be weaker for his loss, but hope that we can attempt to live up to the high standards he has set for individual leadership and conduct in this body.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the primary funding mechanism for our nation's natural resources. Together, the four primary land management agencies funded under this bill—the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management—manage approximately 628 million acres of public land. Our nation's commitment to protection of animals, plants and mineral resources is largely carried out through this bill. In addition, our commitment to Native Americans is carried out through funding of the Indian Health Services and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Finally, research to improve our energy efficiency, and identify better renewable energy sources, are also included in this bill.

While I clearly support certain funding priorities included in this bill, I remain concerned about others. This bill contains only \$139 million of the \$900 million authorized funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, with no funding for state matching grants. As the primary funding source for conserving our natural resources, protecting open space, and enhancing recreation opportunities, this fund should be a priority in our federal budget. I know that amendments will be offered to increase funding for the LWCF and I believe they deserve serious consideration.

Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. FOX will offer an amendment to increase funding for energy efficiency programs. Despite the success of these programs in conserving energy and saving money, the bill includes damaging cuts for building technology, the Federal energy management program, and transportation, among other programs. The amendment helps to restore funds to these important programs that actually result in cost savings, through reduced energy bills, and environmental protection through decreased energy use. I support this amendment and hope it will be approved.

In addition, I remain concerned about providing appropriate funding to support recreation activities on our public lands. The total economic benefit to the economy from outdoor recreation exceeds \$100 billion and includes more than 2.5 million jobs. Yet, the funding we

pour into our forest system, for example, is tilted largely in favor of timber production, rather than conservation. While the agreement to end the purchaser road credit is an important step in reducing the dominance of money losing timber programs, it is only one program among many that deserve scrutiny and reconsideration. Currently, only one percent of the forest service budget is spent on watershed restoration and compared to the economic investment generated, a very small portion of the budget is spent on recreation.

Congresswoman FURSE will offer an amendment that would redirect more Forest Service funds to watershed improvements and recreation management. This is an important amendment and it should be approved.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about some of the legislative provisions that have been added to this bill. I offered an amendment at full committee which was accepted by Chairman REGULA to reduce the size of the road through the Chugach National Forest that was authorized in this bill. While I appreciate the Chairman for accepting this language, it would be even better if this language were not in the bill at all because it circumvents an ongoing process between the stakeholders to determine the best location for the road. In addition, I am concerned that this bill may allow for new road construction on the Tongass National Forest and allows the use of K-V funds for administrative overhead expenses, which encourages timber salvage activities on federal lands. I hope that these issues can be addressed as we move toward conference in this bill.

In addition, I hope that the wisdom of the Chairman in not including certain damaging provisions in this bill will maintain through conference. The Administration has already threatened a veto of several provisions included in the Senate version which are, thankfully, not included in this bill. The Interior Appropriations bill should not be used as a vehicle for failed ideas and proposals that did not have enough support to pass out of the authorizing committee.

Mr. Chairman, putting a bill together of this scope and magnitude is a tremendous task. I want to thank Chairman REGULA, Mr. YATES and the committee staff for the important work they have done in putting this bill together and hope that we can continue to work to ensure that we have a bill that has the support of Congress and this administration.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the work of the members of this subcommittee today led by Chairman REGULA, who throughout his service has been a conscientious worker on the substance of these Interior Appropriations.

Without question, the principal advocate for this measure has been SIDNEY YATES, a member who will complete his service of 48 years in Congress this year, one of the longest and most able members of the House—who has set the standards and positive temperament in which this measure has been shaped and the key programs that it funds. We will miss him. But SID YATES has made a big difference and an indelible positive mark on these key programs. He indeed has given generously and without reserve to this service. We should also acknowledge JOSEPH MCDADE, a long time in service as a ranking member and key participant regarding the topics before this subcommittee, again retiring. He will be missed.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I rise with significant concerns regarding the substance, funding and policy embraced in this 1999 Interior Appropriations bill. This provides 3% less funding than the 1998 measure, and that translates into less funding for many of America's most well-known and revered assets: our national parks, forests and public lands. This means that construction of needed facilities and partnerships will not be accomplished, and that key land parcels that will become available will not be purchased, and inholdings and problems will occur, depreciating these key land parcels.

One good measure continued is the fee demonstration program in the absence of authorization and limited funds. This helps in numerous ways to augment the shortfall of funding. Numerous measures are included, which hamstringing the land management agencies and the implementation of policy based upon professional land management practices and solid study and science in which it is rooted. Hopefully, the amendments to reject these limits where it is possible to change these appropriation riders will be positively acted upon.

I am also interested in the curtailment of the timber roads policy, the timber road credits, that has been included in this measure and the emphasis upon road closure and maintenance, this is positive and much-needed, and I hope to be able to vote for additional limits on timber roads. I'm concerned about the projected 3.6 billion board foot target number included in the measure. The tendency to include legislated numbers or quotas for timber harvest have had the effect historically of distorting the use and mission of our national forests and result in the loss of the forest and taxpayer dollars.

Timber harvest should be left to the varied management plans and process, rather than attempting to superimpose a political judgment upon our nation's forest eco-systems.

While this rule for consideration of this measure has attempted to make a virtue of what is and isn't authorized this measure has gone to extraordinary lengths to permit repeated votes on pet projects and protect others from votes and help to special interests—all at the expense to our natural resources, parks, wilderness and the legacy of future generations, such as the Chugach Road, which mandates a twenty-six mile long, 250-foot wide easement through an Alaska wilderness and spurns the current negotiations to resolve this matter. And proceeds with this road notwithstanding the result.

Mr. Chairman, the reduced role of the N.P.S. Denver Service Office is being advanced as a panacea, as if it alone were responsible for the high cost of construction, and of some celebrated projects like the Delaware Water Gap "outhouse." The fact is when we look behind these projects, we will find in many instances the U.S. Congress as advocate, not the N.P.S. Denver Service Office who was cast to do the bidding of those in public office.

The Denver Service Office has been a whipping post for a lot of projects that have been costly, and perhaps the employment of some private sector incentives and professionals will help, but this will bear close oversight to be certain as to quality and standards which today have been the prerequisite for the N.P.S. will be attained.

Mr. Chairman, I support the moratoria included in this measure on patenting of new

mining claims, which literally provide for the give-away of our public land to special interests, often fragmenting the ecosystems and undercutting logical management of our public lands, and the moratoria on further leasing of the oil and gas leases on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Congress needs to address these long-term problems with law, not these yearly moratoria. But until we have permanent policy, these actions and moratoria are essential.

I am certainly concerned that the appropriation process has been focused in numerous measures to undercut the Kyoto agreement, a treaty which hasn't even been voted upon. The purpose in these bills appears to prevent objective scientific research, monitoring and analysis, to in essence interfere with the non-partisan attainment of facts to stop the progress to disarm the advocates of such a needed global agreement. This effort is improved and reflects badly on this Congress. We need such information and work now more than ever.

Mr. Chairman, finally, no doubt today this chamber will ring with arguments against funding the National Endowment for the Arts. Interestingly enough, one argument offered by those opposed to funding is how insignificant the federal commitment is. At less than one percent of the total \$9 billion spent on the arts in America—and less than one hundredth of one percent of our total federal budget—they argue the money won't be missed. They try to minimize the action and effort to cut and its adverse impact.

Since the NEA figures are relatively small, I can understand some of the temptation to minimize the NEA's importance. The NEA works as the catalyst in each state, providing cultural activity throughout the nation. Non-profit arts organizations depend on a partnership of multiple sources for funding. Private funding sources are more willing to match funding when a federal commitment is present. When the federal commitment backs out, often private funding dries up.

The arts are important to Americans. In my home state of Minnesota, one million children were served by non-profit arts organizations last year. In 1994, by investing \$255 million of total arts spending by Minnesota arts organizations, we saw a \$900 million economic impact in our communities, both rural and urban. Only about \$5 million of that money came from the NEA, but the message was clear that the federal commitment was there as the foundation and endorsement of state, local and non-profit participation.

Money from the NEA enables organizations to provide services that would otherwise not exist. It is important to communities without a philanthropic or corporate funding base for cultural activities. The less visible arts such as a "poet in residence" in a small town or visiting a school are greatly empowered by the NEA. Since NEA funding to Minnesota was cut in half in 1996, many small and mid-sized organizations are not receiving funding—and unfortunately none in rural areas.

In 1996, all NEA funding for a program in St Paul called COMPAS was cut. COMPAS is an organization that sponsors hands-on arts activities that strengthen communities and individuals through creative self-expression. Their program include Writers and Artists in the Schools, arts projects at Battered Women's Shelters, urban neighborhood arts projects,

and programs to support creative expression among the elderly through writing, just to name a few. These programs stimulate important parts of the brain and provide tools for better communication skills in special needs populations. According to COMPAS, getting money from the NEA is like a Good House-keeping seal of approval—it validates their function so they can secure other funding sources. Without the NEA funding, other prospects for funding are actually diminished—not enhanced as some NEA critics maintain!

Many may not realize that the NEA sponsors grants to Public Radio International. Prairie Home Companion, the weekly radio broadcast out of my hometown in St. Paul, was started through funding from the NEA. Top-notch, world-class arts organizations like the Minnesota Orchestra, the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, the Minnesota Opera and the Guthrie Theater suffered serious setbacks from 1996 NEA funding cuts. And many may not realize that the Fourth of July celebration on the Mall here in Washington was entirely sponsored by the NEA. Half a million people won't hear the Blues & Roots show and the National Symphony next year if NEA funding is eliminated.

Successful programs today that are proven may achieve alternative funding and be commercially viable, but what about the nourishment for tomorrow's American creativity that would be lost without NEA funding? It's time to recognize some of the ways so many Americans will be affected if this small amount of money is defunded. What some portray as a negligible amount is one of America's most profitable investments in itself. The NEA is a great bargain at \$0.36 per person, both culturally and economically, with immeasurable returns. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the NEA and to reject the bogus argument to defund the NEA.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman REGULA and his colleagues on the Appropriations committee on their efforts to prepare this appropriations bill.

While the Subcommittee was not able to fund this project, I wanted to take this opportunity to draw everyone's attention to the efforts going on to provide an interpretive center for the Upper Mississippi. The Upper Mississippi River is a national treasure because of its unique ecological and historical value which is shared by no other part of the world. An interpretive center would allow visitors to explore the social, economic and environmental history of the Upper Mississippi in an integrated and compelling way. This truly is a great-American venture which would benefit the entire nation and provide an educational and cultural base for future generations. There currently is no other project or facility along the Upper Mississippi River which celebrates this rare heritage.

On March 3 of this year, Mayor Terry Duggan, Jerry Enzler, Teri Goodmann and other Mississippi River Museum officials testified before your Subcommittee about their efforts to create a world-class interpretive center that will provide visitors a unique view of the Mississippi River. I commend the entire Mississippi River Museum staff and all of the many people in Iowa, along the Mississippi and around the country for all their hard work and efforts for this noble project.

The other body of this Congress has decided to provide funding for this project at a

level of \$1.2 million. As the appropriations process continues, I hope the benefits of the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge Interpretative Center will be fully considered.

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.

The amendments printed in part 1 of House Report 105-637 are adopted.

If an unprotected provision is stricken on a point of order, the Committee of the Whole shall immediately consider the amendment printed in part 2 of that report, if offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) or her designee. That amendment shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The amendment printed in part 3 of the report may be offered only by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) or his designee, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, 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 or she 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 the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so only to make clear to the House what the concerns are of the administration as we move into the consideration of this bill. The Statement of Administration Policy indicates that on the committee bill as modified by the rule and associated motion, if it were presented to the President, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill at this point.

They do so for a number of reasons. First of all, they obviously object to the rule which has put at risk the fund-

ing for the arts. Secondly, they object to the shortchanging of a variety of programs in the jurisdiction of this bill because of the inadequate allocation to the subcommittee which results in a serious shortfall of funds in a number of key programs. They specifically object to, for instance, the fact that funds are reduced by more than half of the \$270 million administration request for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They object to the fact that there is provided no funding for the millennium program protecting artifacts of our national heritage. They object to the fact that the bill denies most of the requested \$128 million increase for Interior and the Forest Service to implement the Clean Water Action Plan. They object to the lack of adequate funding to deal with the Year 2000 computer problem. And they object to a number of legislative riders in the bill, as well, as they affect various environmental programs.

□ 1345

They also object to the fact that the administration's requested increase in energy conservation for development of technologies to improve industrial transportation and building efficiencies and to reduce carbon emissions are also significantly reduced.

So I would simply say, as we move into this debate, this bill has a long way to go before it reaches a condition in which it would receive a Presidential signature. I think the committee needs to recognize that point today.

I would also question the earmarking of several projects in this House that are a very low priority given the very deep reductions that were made in the overall accounts in which those same projects are found.

It seems to me that, for a variety of reasons, this bill, at this point, despite the best efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee, the bill is not in the condition at this point that it would receive a Presidential signature. I urge the House to correct that as it moves through the process if it wants to avoid yet another appropriations bill which seems to be headed for a confrontation with the White House rather than a compromise.

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

I just want to comment in response to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the points that he makes. We have increased the Everglades restoration effort up to \$20 million. Park Operations are up \$99 million, which is the administration's request. The Bureau of Land Management is up \$20 million. These are all increases. BIA tribal priority allocations are up \$14 million. The National Wildlife Refuge account is up \$18 million. This is all over last year's bill. BIA education and law enforcement, \$20 million. In the Indian Health Services, where the administration was requesting less than last year, we have increased it \$147 million.

We have fully funded wildland fire fighting.

I think the steps that we have taken in management with the Denver Service Center will allow us to have additional funds in the future for construction.

So I am simply saying it may not be perfect by some definitions, but we have made a lot of very substantial increases and improvements over management in the past years.

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

Mr. Chairman, we ran out of time in the general debate, because I wanted to lend my words of respect and admiration to not only our chairman of our subcommittee, who has done such a wonderful job of putting this bill together, but certainly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for all of his service and humor and wisdom in our subcommittee.

But, also, I think the fact that he made the statement that the members of the subcommittee are of high character and quality is personified, not only in him, but in the chairman of our committee as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and other Members on our side, especially the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), who worked so hard on the Democrat side to make this committee a success.

Mr. Chairman, I do support this bill. It is a good bill, crafted well. When many Americans think of the natural beauty of our country, they think of the area as managed by the agencies funded by this bill, our national parks, our forests, our monuments, our cultural treasures. The bill also provides funding for Native Americans through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

I am pleased that our chairman, along with our subcommittee, have made Native American health a priority in this bill. The lowest life expectancies in this country exist among Indian populations, and they are the lowest of any nation in this hemisphere except Haiti.

Despite the President's emphasis on health care, this is an area that was miserably overlooked in the President's request to Congress. He really shortchanged the Indian population and their health needs. The Indian Health Service received the lowest funding increase in the Department of Health and Human Services budget request at less than 1 percent, while the overall funding request for HHS averaged a 7 percent increase.

In the area of diabetes, the chairman has included language tightening reporting requirements for Native American tribes receiving funds for diabetes prevention and treatment to monitor the usage and effectiveness of the program. Also in the bill is \$1 million for an innovative diabetes program to be administered by the Joslin Diabetes Center, a leading center in diabetes research in our country.

I also want to bring Members' attention to the provisions in the bill addressing the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project. There may be an amendment to modify or strike the provisions contained in this bill through the subcommittee and then again through the full committee.

This project started as a simple scientific assessment of the public lands in eastern Washington and Oregon. Once begun, it took on a life of its own. This occurred back in 1994. Money was inserted into the Interior bill without authorization.

And 4 years later, now, we have spent at least \$40 million on the planning process of ecosystem management, whatever that really means to whoever wants to define it, and there is no end in sight.

The implementation, according to the agencies involved, would cost upwards of \$125 million a year for 10 years. That is not possible in this bill. It will not be possible over the next 10 years.

The language in the bill brings this unauthorized regional planning process, and that is really what it is, back down to the local level where managers better understand the capabilities and the challenges facing the land in a particular area. The administration has objected to this concept. If they would come forward in a constructive manner, I, speaking for myself only, would be willing to work with the administration on appropriate language. But I cannot support the imposition of a one-size-fits-all standards on our forests and BLM districts from northern Nevada to western Montana.

So I hope that the Members in this body will take particular care to look into the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project itself, understand what those of us in the West face regarding ecosystem management, and support the committee's version of this particular provision.

I also encourage my colleagues to support this bill and approve of all of the provisions within it, because it is a finely balanced and finely tuned bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment that will be offered in a few minutes to provide full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts at the level of \$98.5 million and urge my colleagues to join me in casting an important vote in support of the Nation's arts programs.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations for 22 years, I have been privileged to work closely with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and other supporters over the years to ensure the survival of the National Endowment for the Arts.

The National Endowment for the Arts is a critical institution for our Nation. This important organization has served as a catalyst for the expan-

sion of arts institutions throughout our Nation. The NEA is responsible for building the cultural infrastructure of our country. Over the last 30 years, the NEA has nurtured a healthy infrastructure of cultural institutions in order to better serve the unique needs of each community.

In 30 years, the number of State arts councils increased from 5 to 56, the number of local arts councils grew from 600 to 3,800, the number of orchestras increased from 110 to 230, the number of nonprofit theater companies increased from 56 to 425, the number of dance companies grew from 37 to 450, and the number of operas grew from 27 to 120.

Since its creation in 1965, the NEA has awarded over 100,000 grants, and less than 40 have been considered to be controversial. It is estimated that the endowment cost each American just 64 cents a year. However, with this modest investment, the agency helps enhance the quality of life for all of our citizens.

I really think, when you analyze this, you see that the Endowment has been a catalyst. It has helped spread the arts all over this country. Instead of attacking it, we should be applauding it for a job well done.

I want to compliment both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), our chairman, for the work that they have done to try to fashion a way for the House to be able to work its will on this issue.

I just feel so strongly. In my own State of Washington, to see all of the various arts institutions grow and develop with small seed money from the NEA has really been something that I am proud of and I think everyone from our State is proud of. So I would like to see the money left in under the Obey amendment, but if that does not occur then we certainly want to support the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) when she offers an amendment to restore the money.

It is certainly, in my judgment, one of the high priorities for this bill.

I rise in support of the amendment to provide full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) at the level of \$98.5 million, and urge my colleagues to join me in casting an important vote in support of our nation's arts programs.

As a Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been privileged to work closely with my distinguished colleague SIDNEY YATES, and other supporters over the years to ensure the survival of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is a critical institution for our nation. This important organization has served as a catalyst for the expansion of arts institutions throughout our nation. The NEA is responsible for building the cultural infrastructure of our country. Over the last 30 years, the NEA has nurtured a healthy infrastructure of cultural institutions in order to better serve the unique needs of each community. In 30 years, the number of state arts councils increased from 5 to 56;

the number of local arts councils grew from 600 to 3,800; the number of orchestras increased from 110 to 230; the number of non-profit theatre companies increased from 56 to 425; the number of dance companies grew from 37 to 450; and the number of opera companies grew from 27 to 120.

Since its creation in 1965, the NEA has awarded over 100,000 grants and less than 40 have been considered to be very controversial. It is estimated that the Endowment costs each American just 64 cents a year. However, with this modest investment, the agency helps enhance the quality of life for our citizens, by supporting theaters, touring dance companies, folk festivals, arts education, orchestras, museums, and a wide variety of other programs.

Many widely acclaimed programs began with the talent of individuals who had received seed money from the NEA, and many rural areas of our nation would not be able to enjoy arts programs without outreach by the Endowment.

We must recognize that the small investment made by the federal government in funding the NEA creates tremendous leverage in obtaining private investment. For every dollar spent by the Endowment, it attracts \$11 in investment from the private sector. In fact, many private sector contributors rely heavily on the NEA's grant selection process as a guide to the kinds of programs that should be supported.

Endowment support has helped to increase audience support for all art forms. For example, the annual audience for professional dance has grown from one million to more than 16 million over the past 28 years. Audiences for the work of professional opera companies have grown to over 7.6 million, compared to only 5 million a decade ago.

Non-profit theaters serve an audience that has grown to over 20 million. Symphony performance attendance has risen to over 27 million annually. All of this has occurred with seed support from the NEA.

Also, support for the arts is support for the economy. The NEA's modest budget has annually generated matching funds estimated at over \$1.2 billion. These monies permeate the economy. At least 1.3 million full time jobs are supported by the arts; \$25.2 billion is earned through salaries, wages, and entrepreneurial income; local governments receive \$790 million in taxes and fees; state governments receive \$1.2 billion; and the Federal government receives \$3.4 billion in income tax revenue.

It is clear that the outreach and support granted by the NEA to the arts has an incredible ripple effect throughout our economy, and restricting or eliminating the NEA's ability to perform that outreach would be both economically and culturally devastating.

In my home state of Washington, many arts and cultural institutions have benefitted from NEA grants, including: Tacoma's Broadway Theater, the Pacific Northwest Ballet, the Seattle Art Museum, the Spokane Symphony, and the Seattle Childrens Theater.

Throughout the nation, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is serving the interests of the American people. It is important for our future, and it should continue to receive the support of Congress. Let's do what's right for the nation, and vote for the amendment to restore funding to the NEA.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I want to particularly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman, for the excellent balancing act he has accomplished, although a few more changes will need to be made and we are going to address the National Endowment for the Arts very shortly.

I am especially pleased that the bill eliminates the Purchaser Road Credit program. That is a major environmental victory. We were able to accomplish that with the help of our Western colleagues. We worked together. We reasoned together. This shows that when people sit down and reason together and try to work things out, we can actually make some serious progress.

The Purchaser Road Credit is being eliminated as part of an agreement under which Easterners and Westerners agreed to forego other changes to amend the bill. That is a fair deal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

There are some timber amendments that fall outside the agreement, those concerning the Chugach and the K-V Fund, and I urge my colleagues to support those amendments.

I also want to clarify language we agreed to have in the bill that enables the Forest Service to use the Roads and Timber Trails Fund for some new purposes. This could be a great plus for the environment if the Forest Service uses this money for true forest health projects as section 334 requires.

We will be watching very closely to see that this section is not violated by using the funds for salvage logging or road building.

Turning to the National Endowment for the Arts, this is something we go over time and time again. I think it is a sad commentary that we have to engage in this debate yet once again. We have already made NEA selection criteria more stringent. We have already limited grants to individual artists. We have already reduced NEA funding to about half of its peak level, and I think that is cutting too much but the will of the House has to be worked.

Yet even though we have addressed every legitimate concern raised by NEA opponents, and some that were not as legitimate, they are still hell bent on destroying an agency whose programs educate and enrich the lives of Americans in all regions and in all walks of life.

I simply do not understand it. I look at what NEA has done in my district in upstate New York, a rural area. We have the world class Glimmerglass Opera. It gets support. We have small county organizations like the Chenango County Council for the Arts doing magnificent work to introduce youngsters in their formative years to the arts.

It helps schools bring in a wide variety of arts programs. It enables our small cities to support symphonies and museums, all designed to enrich their lives. I do not see anything wrong with

that. As a matter of fact, I think that is exactly what we should be supporting. These are institutions that would have a difficult time surviving without the small contributions that they receive from the NEA.

I think the Federal Government ought to undertake these sorts of legitimate activities through which the American public working collectively can enrich our culture in a way that is difficult for individuals working alone.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment. It is well thought out. It is well reasoned and it is good for this bill and it is good for America.

Finally, just let me say that this Member, along with so many of my colleagues, will miss the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) when he is not here in the next Congress. I hope I am. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a tower of strength. He has been a person that you can talk to who will listen to you. He has just done so much for so many for so long and he will be sorely missed.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for serving America so well.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his kindness.

I rise for two particular reasons, and that is to support the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. It is a sad story that the amendment offered by the Democrats could not have been left in, that provided the \$98.5 million, and that we will be subjected to a point of order of which then the Johnson amendment will hopefully be offered and supported to provide for the Endowment for the Arts.

But I would say that the American people stand alongside of those of us who enthusiastically continue to support the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. In fact, for every dollar the NEA invests in communities, there is a 20-fold return in jobs, services and contracts, and corporate America believes it is important to have a public-private partnership.

In Houston, Texas, the symphony, the opera, the ballet, all of my indigenous and community-based arts groups stand alongside of support. I hope we do not have to go through these she-nanigans again, and I hope we vote enthusiastically for supporting the arts again for \$98.5 million.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to join those who have already stood in support of the National Endowment for the Arts. It has been spoken to in many

instances already, but let me say, for our State of Rhode Island, this is an issue of particular importance, because we are very proud in Rhode Island that our former Senator, Claiborne Pell, was amongst the champions of NEA when he first got here to the Congress in 1960 and, with the help of my uncle, President Kennedy, was able to fashion the National Endowment of the Arts early on. And what a success it has been.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have a program called Arts Talk that focuses on dropouts in our schools. We have found students in the Vo-Tech schools, who have no exposure to the arts, are able to get exposure through the programs like Arts Talk, which expand the arts to people that do not ordinarily have access to the arts.

What this has done is, it has helped awaken their imaginations, helped them have a better self-image, because in many instances they learn about their own cultural heritage expressions within the arts. In addition to that, they may find some inherent talent in their own being that will allow them to express themselves through the arts, either by playing an instrument, acting in a play or painting a picture.

These things may sound esoteric to us, but I can tell you in Rhode Island they have had a marked impact on helping reduce juvenile delinquency in the schools. We have actually seen students that we have paired up with this program have a greater attendance in the schools, because they feel good about what they are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a program that really does not just meet the eye with respect to the arts. The implications of this program go well beyond just the immediacy of having our young people exposed to the arts.

I would ask my colleagues to keep this in mind when we have the point of order on the Obey language which will strike it and, therefore, strike the \$98 million for NEA; and I would hope we support the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to restore that funding, because I think it is so critical for our future generations to build their self-esteem and sense of self, which is so powerfully done through the arts.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for the work that he has done on this bill and on two other issues related in this bill, the Blackstone Valley Heritage Quarter and the support he gave Indian health services, which I must say was drastically underfunded, but thanks to the work that the chairman and the committee members provided, we are going to see an increase in Indian health services, which is something that I think we should all applaud.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also associate my words with the words about the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and this bill being a good

bill, and also with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES). Though we have opposed each other on many issues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) reminds me of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Natcher.

One time when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was on the floor and I was mad as a hornet, Mr. Natcher, being from Kentucky, who was in the majority at the time and in control of the bill and, with me, fuming right there at that microphone, said "Mr. CUNNINGHAM," he said, "I am from Kentucky and we have race horses. Quite often they come out of the block so fast that they break their legs, and we then have to shoot them. If you will settle down, I will help you pass your amendment." So I got the word of the then-chairman, Mr. Natcher.

But I would say that I am proud of what the Republican majority has done with the balanced budget, welfare reform, and tax relief for working families, and I am proud of this bill.

I have a potential sadness with this bill, in the fact that in 1995, on the Interior appropriations bill and the rule, the Republican Party was at an impasse. There was a group that wanted to increase the funding for the NEA and there was a group that wanted to strike the funding for the NEA. The result would have been that we would have lost that rule and the other side of the aisle would have taken over that rule and written it as they saw fit.

So then the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), got the Republicans of both groups in a room for 4 hours and we came to an agreement. That agreement was that we would continue to fund the National Endowment for the Arts for a certain period of time.

Then the problem was that they could not use the funding within the year and they would lose that amount of funding, so we agreed to let them keep it so they could establish a true endowment that would fund the NEA, and we also promised to work for a tax break where you could give to the arts and get an additional tax break.

That was a word and that was a bond. My view of a principles of your word is that if I give, say, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) my word, I would fall on my sword before I would break that word, unless I came to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and looked him in the eye and said, I cannot follow that because of these reasons, and let him respond.

But once an agreement had been executed, like the National Endowment for the Arts agreement, you cannot come back on your word.

I would ask the committee, many Members feel very strongly on both sides of this issue. That is fine, and they have fought for that. But the agreement was not just to reduce the NEA, it was not just to compel it to follow certain rules; it was, after the agreement, to eliminate it from the

taxpayers, and Joe Six-pack would not have to pay for the NEA, but it could become its own endowment.

I would ask this House and those Members that signed and agreed, I was in the room, you can spin it any way that you want. I am not talking about the Democrats, they were not part of this agreement, I am talking about my own party.

You can spin it any way you want. I was in the room, I know the agreement, I know the acknowledgment, and I know how it was carried out. My potential sadness is that that word would be broken in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to live up to their word and vote against the Johnson amendment.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman, but I would point out, we came to the floor of the House from the committee with zero funding 3 years in a row; 1997 and 1998 and this year would have been zero had there not been an amendment in the full committee supported by some Republicans.

We got to the Senate for a conference on the bill, and the Senate made it very clear that they were not bound by any agreement made by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has expired.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In my humble opinion, it should be struck, the point of order, the Johnson amendment should not be offered, or if it is offered, those members should stick to their word. The chairman of the committee in conference should not yield and accede to the Senate provision, and then the word would be kept.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is rather difficult. The Senate has dug in, the other body, and also the President made it very clear that a \$14 billion bill, which affects a lot of things in your State as well as others, would be vetoed over this issue. So it is pretty complicated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand.

Mr. REGULA. We kept our part of the bargain. We came with the zero.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER) assumed the chair.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 318. To require automatic cancellation and notice of cancellation rights with respect to private mortgage insurance which is required as a condition for entering into a