

residential mortgage transaction, to abolish the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to move to page 88, line 8, through line 6 on page 89, for the purpose of making a point of order.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some of us have amendments in title I. How does the gentleman's proposal affect those amendments getting heard today?

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, it would in no way affect the other amendments. We are doing this at the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), who would like to deal with the issue of NEA, is my understanding.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is not my request. It was my understanding that the request was, would I agree to it? If the gentleman wants to continue at another stage of the bill, it is all right with me, but to place this in my pocket is the wrong approach. I would just as soon hear it or just as soon postpone it.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, let us move on and dispose of this issue. Most of the speeches thus far have been on that issue, so I think it is important that we deal with it expeditiously. It will not affect in any way the gentleman's ability to offer amendments.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman saying he wanted to go to the NEA and for how long a period?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, 30 minutes has been allowed in the rule.

Mr. SANDERS. Then we will come back to the beginning of the bill?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we will go right back to the start of the bill after we finish this?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$81,250,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$16,760,000, to remain available until expended, to the National Endowment for the Arts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs beginning on page 88, line 10, and all that follows through page 89, line 6, include unauthorized appropriations in violation of clause 2 of House Rule XXI.

The language I have just specified is an appropriation of \$98 million for the necessary expenses for the National Endowment of the Arts. Authorization in law for the National Endowment for the Arts expired in fiscal year 1993. Clause 2 of House Rule XXI states "No appropriation shall be reported in a general appropriations bill for any expenditure not previously authorized by law."

Since the National Endowment of the Arts is clearly not authorized in law and the bill includes an appropriation of funds in this agency, I make a point of order that the language is in obvious violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the language which is proposed to be stricken under the point of order, I would simply ask, is this the point of order that would allow the House to put back by recorded vote exactly what will be stricken 5 minutes earlier so that one party can claim victory over another, or is this a serious legislative approach?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask that the gentleman confine his remarks to the point of order.

Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee of jurisdiction over NEA, I would like to speak on the point of order with respect to funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, and want to make a few comments to put NEA funding in context.

Last year the Interior appropriations bill that came to the House floor provided continued funding for NEA for fiscal year 1998.

□ 1415

The point of order was made that constituted funding for a nonauthorized program. The point of order prevailed and the bill left the House with zero funding for the NEA, and then the master of all arts came into play, Houdini. When we found this bill again, we discovered that there was an appropriation, even though it was not authorized.

This year we find ourselves in much the same position. The appropriations bill has been reported to the House with \$98 million for the NEA, yet the NEA has not been authorized since 1993. For the past few years it has been continuing on a year-by-year basis only by virtue of the appropriations process. A point of order has been made that the \$98 million should be struck on the grounds it constitutes funding of a nonauthorized program. Some of my colleagues may ask, well, what has the authorizing committee been doing? Let me explain.

Back in 1995 the committee reported an NEA authorization bill. It would have permitted the NEA to exist for 3 more years, phasing it out over that same 3-year period, giving plenty of time for the private sector, local States and municipalities to take over the program. In fact, the NEA would have ceased to exist as of October 1 of this year had that bill become law. However, there was no floor action taken on it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing the question of the current legislation and I think his attention should be directed to that fact. I think if he wants to state the history of the appropriations, the point of order should be disposed of and the gentleman permitted to strike the last word or participate in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to confine his remarks to the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is entertaining debate on the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I was merely pointing out that there is a lot of history in relationship to what we are discussing today in relation to the point of order, so that someone does not fault the committee because we have not taken action, because we have taken action.

So I would suggest that it is definitely out of order to move ahead with legislation that has not been authorized by the authorizing committee, and I would hope that we would sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) makes a single point of order that the two paragraphs appropriating funds for the National Endowment for the Arts violate clause 2(a) of rule XXI by providing for an unauthorized appropriation.

As stated by the Chair on July 11, 1997, the authorization for the National Endowment of the Arts lapsed in 1993. The National Endowment of the Arts has not been reauthorized since the ruling of the Chair last year. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained and the two paragraphs are stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

Page 88, after line 9, insert the following:
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$81,240,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$16,760,000, to remain available until expended, to the National Endowment for the Arts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from

Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am proud to offer my amendment to restore \$98 million in level funding for the NEA. I would have been equally proud to have risen to oppose a motion to strike NEA funding as adopted in the committee bill, and I salute my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for his successful committee amendment, yet another sign of the breadth of support there is for the NEA.

I also salute the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) for his long and consistent leadership in support of the arts and for his deep dedication to responsible stewardship of our Nation's resources. In this House we often refer to each other as the gentleman from a certain State or the gentlewoman from a certain State. Indeed, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) has been a gentleman; not only a gentleman, but a wise gentleman and a leader, and I thank the gentleman for his fine service over so many years.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment. The reforms adopted last year directly addressed the causes of past problems, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) will make clear in a few minutes. Perhaps these reforms address the concerns. I asked those 150 Republicans who supported the Republican amendment last year, which supported a Federal role for the arts to support my amendment this year. I have been a lifelong supporter of the arts, because truly man does not live by bread alone. The arts are a medium through which we publicly discuss profound and great matters of life and death, love and duty, freedom and bondage, man's relationship to God and nature. NEA dollars help new plays to be written, new symphonies to be conceived, performing arts groups to develop and thrive, and the performing arts to reach our most rural communities and our most isolated neighborhoods.

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the JOHNSON amendment to the Interior Appropriations.

As my colleagues know, this amendment would restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts, an organization which has wasted U.S. taxpayer dollars on art which has often been objectionable to Americans. By ending funding to the NEA, we are not ending Federal funding for the arts.

Contrary to popular belief, the National Endowment for the Arts is not the sole recipient of Federal funding for the arts. There are an estimated 200 arts and humanities programs or activities funded by and administered through various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, but are not getting one dime of NEA funding. These programs are programs such as the Commission of Fine Arts, the Holocaust Memorial Council, JFK Center for the Performing Arts, the National Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian, and many others.

The Federal Government also provides support for the arts through tax expenditures, such as the deduction for charitable contribution to the arts, humanities, culture, on income, gift and estate taxes. Zeroing out funding for the NEA will not end Federal funding for the arts. It simply ends a program which has misused taxpayer dollars with some of the sickening attempts to subsidize blasphemous, offensive and pornographic depictions.

In addition, I might point out that the NEA administrative overhead and bureaucrats earn about twice as much as the artists they seek to subsidize, and much of their subsidy goes to just a few large cities in our country. I do not know if this is what is called fleecing of America, but it is objectionable, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear the reforms that have been instituted in the past couple of years. They are listed here, and in addition, there are some others. First of all, we now have six Members of our Congress, three House, three Senate, that serve on the Arts Council: The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) from the House; Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. DURBIN from the Senate.

We put a 15 percent cap on funds that any one State may receive in order to ensure a more equitable distribution. We also added a requirement that 40 percent of the funds must go for State grants and set-aside programs. We put in a requirement that there would be a reduction of administrative funds, and we provided authority for the NEA to solicit and invest private funds. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) mentioned earlier one of the agreements. We have implemented that agreement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) mentioned about one city getting too much and we put restrictions on this, to broaden it all across America.

In response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), in this year's bill there is the establishment of a priority for grants for education for underserved populations and community music, and I mentioned earlier

Jessup, Iowa had a group out there. They paid half for this, this small community, the NEA paid half, and they had a string quartet that spent 6 months with students in Jessup.

In 1996 Congress eliminated grants to individuals, seasonal support and sub-granting so that we would not have a repetition of what happened in Minneapolis. These reforms have had a strong impact on the organization and the kind of grants it supports. In addition, Senator HELMS put obscenity restrictions in the NEA legislation in 1990, and just recently the United States Supreme Court upheld these restrictions in the Finley case as being constitutional.

So I just want to be sure that we are recognizing the enormous changes that have been made in the NEA.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to leave that chart, because I think it is very important. I appreciate the chairman of the subcommittee showing us all the good reforms, and they are good reforms. The problem is, even with all of these reforms, we still have a bad NEA in place. That is the problem, and that is why I rise in opposition to this amendment to add funding back for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am not under any illusions about this amendment. We are going to have a tough time defeating it. But I think there are very important principles at stake here, principles that supporters of the NEA simply gloss over. Fiscal responsibility of course is one principle. Is it fiscally responsible to give taxpayers' dollars to some artists who produce art that offends many of the taxpayers? Time and time again, even with all of the reforms, NEA money trickles out to so-called artists who go out of their way to offend the sensibilities of working Americans. Is this a fiscally responsible use of taxpayers dollars? I do not think so.

Another principle is censorship, and I contend that the NEA censors artists by doling out money only to those artists that know how to work the system. The NEA picks winners and losers, just by the very virtue of being a government agency. It thereby censors those who do not meet their particular tests.

Artists need to have the freedom to produce their art and they should do so in a free market setting. By allowing the continued government interference in the arts, we risk compromising the artistic freedom of this country.

The Federal Government has no business in an agency like this. The Federal Government is producing art, culture through the Smithsonian, through the museums, through our art galleries and things like that. Those are legitimate concerns. But this is the National Endowment for the Arts that, in my opinion, does nothing to promote artistic freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Government should get out of the arts business entirely, so I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility and against government censorship.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute if I may do that, and reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not reserve time; the time is controlled by the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thought she just yielded me 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would say to the gentleman I do have a lot of requests for time. I thought the gentleman wanted 5 minutes to speak.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I do, but I just wanted to yield myself 1 minute of the 5 minutes because I had requests for time from other people, and that is why I asked whether I may do that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. From the gentlewoman from Connecticut, the gentleman had been yielded 5 minutes. To yield the gentleman control of that time, so that he may control the dispensation of time, would require a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, she has yielded me 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Will I be able to yield time to other people?

The CHAIRMAN. Not absent a unanimous consent request.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask unanimous consent in order to yield that time to others?

The CHAIRMAN. To be able to control the 5 minutes and its distribution (as by reserving time or being seated), that is correct.

Mr. YATES. I do not understand that.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I certainly would be happy to have him yield time on his side; I also have them on my list.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I will take the 5 minutes now. I thank the gentlewoman very much for that opportunity, and I thank the chair for what I believe was a misapprehension of my rights under the rules.

□ 1430

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who preceded me, the minority whip, in connection the speech he made is just wrong, wrong, wrong. The government does not actually control the giving of the grants. That is in the hands of panels, of civilians who are expert in the field. They are the ones who make the original selections.

It is true that there has to be a censorship because there just is not enough money made available under the appropriations for the National Endowment of the Arts to provide grants for as many applications as they re-

ceive. They, therefore, have to be selective.

The second statement of the gentleman was that the Federal Government should not be in this business. Well, the general welfare is the government's business. I remember statements like the gentleman's being made before 1957 in connection with Federal aid for education. The Republicans were opposed to Federal aid for education and they prevented that program from being enacted by the Congress.

Then in 1957 the Russians launched Sputnik and General Eisenhower, who was President at the time, President Eisenhower, sent a request to the Congress for Federal aid for education in mathematics and in science. The Congress quickly passed that. But no mention was made for education in the civilian sense. That took a later date.

Now, we do not have the Federal Government making grants for the purpose of studying the languages, history, philosophy, ethics, religion, legislature or the arts, as such, other than through the NEA. We do have the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation does an excellent job for mathematics and for the sciences.

But insofar as the political sciences are concerned, the National Science Foundation does not engage in that. In other words, the National Science Foundation does not contribute to the disciplines that will educate our children in the ways of peace. Only the arts and humanities represent the Federal Government in making those kinds of grants and in teaching in that respect.

Does the committee believe that education in science and math is enough? I do not think so. I think that the endowments have done a remarkably fine job over the years and I am constrained to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to restore the funding for the arts.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that this amendment simply restores funding to the NEA that my amendment originally placed in the bill last week, funding that was just stricken by the Republican point of order.

Of course this amendment should be supported, even if the procedure being used is Mickey Mouse. If we have to support a Mickey Mouse procedure in order to provide funding for the arts, then that is what we will have to do.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, first I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma

(Mr. LARGENT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a little repetitious. We have been through this so many times. But I want to take advantage of an opportunity to pay tribute to a very distinguished colleague who was first elected to Congress when I graduated from high school. That is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The gentleman is a dear friend. He has been a devoted and committed Member of this body. We sometimes have our disagreements on all kinds of issues, but I respect him profoundly and I wish him all the best.

Let me add that I am totally opposed to this amendment. At the Constitutional Convention, the whole question came up of funding the arts and it was overwhelmingly rejected on the grounds that that is not an appropriate function of the national government.

In 1965 we got into "guns and butter." We got into funding everything. The national government swelled enormously, penetrating virtually every aspect of our lives. This is not a time to revive it; this is a time for downsizing, getting the national government out of our lives and getting folks back home more involved in participating in funding such things as the arts and humanities.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Johnson amendment restoring full funding to the National Endowment for the Arts in the amount of \$98 million.

I strongly support full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 30 years our quality of life has been improved by the NEA. Support for the arts proves our dedication to freedom of expression, one of the fundamental beliefs that our Nation has been built upon.

Full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts will not detract from the quality of life in our Nation as a whole. The NEA is a dynamic investment in the economic growth of our Nation's communities. Arts are extremely important to the constituents of our districts, and by supporting them I know that I am ensuring that our rich, diverse American culture will continue to be memorialized and celebrated.

In addition, the cultural benefit they provide, arts organizations make a direct economic impact on our communities, providing jobs, often fueling a vital flow of patrons to restaurants and shops.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support the Johnson amendment

restoring full funding to the arts, and I commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for his support of this endeavor.

I am pleased to rise today in support of the Johnson amendment, restoring full funding to the National Endowment for the Arts in the amount of \$98 million.

I strongly support full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. Over the past 30 years our quality of life has been improved by the NEA. Support for the arts proves our dedication to freedom of expression, one of the fundamental beliefs our great country is built on. Full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts will not detract from the quality of life in our Nation as a whole.

The NEA is a dynamic investment in the economic growth of our Nation's communities. Arts are extremely important to the constituents of my district, and by supporting them, I know that I am ensuring that our rich, diverse American culture will continue to be memorialized and celebrated. In addition to the cultural benefit they provide, arts organizations make a direct economic impact on the community, providing jobs and often fueling a vital flow of patrons to restaurants and shops.

The NEA brings the arts to our young people. Each year, the arts endowment opens the door to the arts to millions of school children, including "at-risk" youth. An education through the arts improves overall student learning, and instills self-esteem and discipline. The arts also help prepare America's future work force by helping students develop reasoning and problem-solving skills, and enhancing communication ability—all important career skills for the 21st century.

The NEA has worked diligently for the past 8 years to create a more accountable and efficient system. In 1994 the NEA constricted the grantmaking process by eliminating subgrants to third party artists and organizations. The following year, the NEA eliminated seasonal operating support grants, and in the fiscal year 1996 and 1997 appropriations bills, Congress banned nearly all grants to individual artists.

Furthermore, the recent decision by the Supreme Court to uphold the decency standard passed by Congress in 1990 is a victory for both the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Congress. This decision is a significant step to protecting the caliber of art funded by the NEA.

The arts foster a common appreciation of history and culture that are essential to our humanity. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing by restoring full funding for the arts by supporting the Johnson amendment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I will try and do two quotes here to perhaps change the mind of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and others on this subject.

Let us go back to the year 1787. During the Constitutional Convention, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina offered a motion to authorize the government to spend money on the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences.

The motion was put up before the members and it was defeated overwhelmingly.

From that point on through the years of 1960, Americans enjoyed a vibrant and successful art community. Successful not because of the government, but without the government. Is the gentleman from Illinois repudiating all of that history?

Suddenly, almost 200 years later in 1965, Congress started talking about supporting the arts through Federal funding. But do my colleagues know which President said he was against funding for the arts? President Kennedy, who stated, "I do not believe Federal funds should support symphony orchestras or opera companies."

NEA has gotten very political. Everybody who is going to support the NEA would have to agree it has gotten very political, and the Federal Government has been the primary endorser of very controversial pieces of art. This art has been antithetical to our traditions and to our mores.

One of the great publishers of magazines and newspapers and a candidate for President, H.L. Mencken, said it best in this quotation:

After 20 years, he said,

of active magazine publishing and newspaper publishing, I cannot recall a single writer who really needs government assistance. That is, not one of any talent whatsoever. A great many pretenders, of course, are doing badly. But I cannot see that it would be of any public benefit to encourage them in their bad work.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is the NEA has often not provided art that we can be proud of. It has been in large part social experiment for the elite. Some of the art produced was antithetical to our values. I do not support the Johnson amendment. Let's remember our history for almost 200 years when the government did not provide federal funding for the arts.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I must say I find it most unfortunate that we are still here listening to continuing political attacks on the NEA. I strongly support, and I think it goes without saying, the contributions the NEA has made to cultural standards in this country.

But I want to say now, as one who served as the Republican leader on the subcommittee that wrote the reforms in the early 1990s to deal with those questions of standards of decency and to protect against the controversial sexual and religious themes and, indeed, blasphemous themes, I want to say that as the Republican leader who wrote the reforms we put in protections and reforms in that legislation so that we would not be violating the

community standards of decency. In fact, just last month the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to have those standards of decency.

Now, with respect to this question of whether or not abuses are continuing in the so-called Corpus Christi project, I can tell my colleagues categorically that no NEA funding was used under that, and let us not use this as a stalking horse or as a diversion. Let us support the Johnson amendment.

Mr. Chairman. I rise to urge this House to vote to support the NEA and vote for this amendment. I find it most unfortunate, and can not explain the irrational political attacks on the NEA. These attacks are bred of ignorance or willful, crass, and disingenuous political abuse.

Since its formation over thirty years ago, 2nd National Endowment of the Arts has provided the public side of a very valuable public-private partnership to foster the arts. The people in this room represent the private side of that partnership. For urban, suburban, and rural areas alike.

Nevertheless, there were abuses in recent years that became public in the early 1990's. There were blasphemous and irreverent productions that clearly violated community standards.

"CORPUS CHRISTI"

Now, all of us have been hearing from constituents about a play "Corpus Christi," which many people mistakenly believe was supported by the NEA. I want you to know that NEA funding did not support this play!

Should this event prove to show that the reforms we instituted have to be strengthened, then I can assure all our members that I will lead that effort and close any loopholes in current law.

In 1990, I served as Republican leader of the subcommittee that re-wrote NEA regulations to establish new decency standards and outlawed NEA support for projects with controversial sexual and religious themes, and those which violated community standards of decency.

In the past month, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld these standards, saying the federal government CAN consider general standards of decency and the "values of the American public" in deciding which projects should receive cash grants.

The N.E.A. has provided the critical support which allowed production of such American classics as the original "Driving Miss Daisy," "The Great White Hope," and a "Chorus Line." The N.E.A. has brought us the television programs "Live from the Lincoln Center" and "American Playhouse."

All told * * * over 11,000 artists have received fellowships from the Endowment. They've won dozens upon dozens of Pulitzer Prizes, Macarthur Awards, and National Book Club Awards.

Let's continue to support this worthwhile organization. Vote for this amendment. Support the Arts.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring back a chart that we looked at just a few min-

utes ago and have kind of a little different perspective on what we were doing. The gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) just mentioned some of the reforms.

When we go down this chart of NEA reforms, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Illinois, the CLIFF STEARNS and the PHIL CRANE of the world who have been fighting this fight for dozens of years, and other people in this conference, trying to highlight the abuses of this program, I think here are some dividends that have been paid.

There is a \$400,000 grant in Kansas in March of 1997, a review of that art project. It was called "Santa's Workshop" and it had Santa Claus masturbating. So this fairly recent phenomenon here of 1997, of where we do not quite have it right.

But the people who have the courage to come up here and say that this is not a proper thing to spend taxpayer money on, and have highlighted the abuse and the way the NEA is run, should be proud that we have made progress.

The subcommittee chairman should be proud of what he has been able to do, because that \$400,000 grant to produce art showing Santa masturbating is more money than the entire arts agencies in Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, North Dakota, Wyoming, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and all the U.S. territories received combined.

Whether we consider that program art or not, whether we consider it the proper role of the Federal Government, this has been a poorly run Federal agency where 25 cents of every dollar goes into administration and most congressional districts receive little, if any, support from it.

It is an elitist organization, out of touch with the American people in terms of business management, out of touch with the American public in terms of what art is. We are making small progress, and that is something to be thankful for. But we can set our watches by this debate, because it will happen again next year, and one year we will take this pot of money and give it to the communities to let them come up with programs better than we can do here. That day is coming.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Johnson amendment. As a congressional appointee by the Speaker to the National Council of the Arts, I have been monitoring the NEA and found that significant and positive changes have been made by this agency and Congress to ensure that taxpayers' funds are spent wisely and not on obscene and offensive art.

Like many others, before the NEA undertook these changes, some of

which were internal and some of which were dictated by Congress, before that time I supported efforts to reduce, prioritize, or eliminate funding for the Endowment. I now think we should give the NEA a chance to work under new guidelines and mandates of law that now govern the agency and that we should level-fund it.

□ 1445

In recent weeks I have heard reports that NEA funded a theater called Project Corpus Christi, a play portraying Jesus as having sex with his apostles. I am glad to report the NEA did not fund this project. The Manhattan Theater Club, the theater involved in this controversy, did receive funds from the NEA but for a separate and noncontroversial play.

I think we should support, level fund this endowment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, when we are on a tight budget, we have to make choices. We cannot buy expensive tickets to the theater or even go to the movies if we can barely afford to buy our food and pay our rent.

At a time when we are talking about a debt in this Nation of \$5.5 trillion, when we are talking about balancing the budget, it is difficult to explain to the American people why we need to spend \$98 million for such a program as we are talking about here today.

We all support the arts, but it does not seem fair to make the hardworking people of this country pay for exhibits that are only art by name, because in many cases they are pornographic, they are profane, and would be viewed with disgust by the majority of the people who see it.

When we are trying to balance the budget, as I mentioned, when we are trying to reduce the size and the scope of the Federal Government, can anyone honestly place arts on the same level as, say, providing for our national defense and improving our Nation's infrastructure, improving or saving Medicare and Social Security?

The National Endowment for the Arts has proven time and time again that they cannot be trusted as good stewards of the people's money. This is a travesty and a slap in the face of those people who call themselves Christians and who believe in the Christian faith and the religious values that have made this Nation great. I think we must show the American people that we are serious about changing the way Washington spends their money, and I think we should eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Johnson amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

As cochair of the Congressional Members Organization on the Arts, I represent over 140 Members of this House, bipartisan Members, who are dedicated to the survival of the NEA because we know that one of the greatest benefits is that it touches a broad spectrum of the population, both rural and urban, young and old, rich and poor, and everyone in between.

The arts are an important part of our economy, recognized by the Conference of Mayors of the United States, which has given us its strongest support and said that NEA must survive because of the economic benefits it means to every city in the United States.

When we spend \$98 million on the NEA, we provide the first link in a delicate system that supports 1.3 million full time jobs in all the 50 States, providing \$3.4 million back to the Federal treasury in income taxes. I know of no other investment we make as Members of Congress that brings back to the treasury such an incredible return.

But it is more than that. Test after test has shown that each child exposed to the arts is a better student.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Johnson amendment. There is no question that art serves many purposes. It communicates powerful emotions that are often difficult to express in other ways.

Yet art is best judged in the context of individual creativity and independent thought, not through a Federal bureaucracy. And freedom of artistic thought is very important to our society. We do not need a Federal agency determining which art is worthy of government funding and which is not. Citizens and private groups should decide what they think is quality art and spend their money to fund it accordingly. When the NEA gives grants to art projects, taxpayers are put in the position of supporting art they may find objectionable.

A recent congressional oversight study found private giving to the arts is at an all-time high. In fact, private individuals outspent the NEA 100-to-1. When it comes to supporting the arts, the private sector is where it is at. Local and State governments do likewise. Art thrives not on government handouts but on thousands of individual acts of creativity.

The NEA is no longer needed to fund art. Instead, it serves as a prime example of government overreaching its sphere of influence.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I rise in support of Federal funding for the arts and funding for the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I find it appalling that we are even debating whether to cut the funding of the National Endowment of the Arts today.

We spend more on the Marine Corp Band than we do on the NEA. In fact, we give less to the arts than any other western country. Even during the Middle Ages the arts were something to be protected and preserved and their importance was understood.

They were not mistaken. The arts are good for the public, and study after study shows that children who are exposed to the arts do better in school and have higher self-esteem.

The money from the National Endowment for the Arts touches the lives of millions of Americans.

At the Metropolitan Museum of Art, thousands of people flood in and out of their doors each day.

The American Ballet Company travels around the country bringing the grace of ballet to every area of our country.

Before the NEA was created in 1965, there were only 58 orchestras in the country; today there are more than 1,000.

Before the NEA, there were 37 professional dance companies in America; now there are 300.

Before the NEA, only one million people attended the theater each year; today over 55 million attend annually.

Mr. Chairman, the benefits of the arts and the NEA are evident, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting full funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the Council on the Arts, I rise in strong support of the Johnson amendment and want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the NEA, and I do so not only as a proponent of federal support for the arts, but also as one who has seen first-hand the inner workings of the NEA.

Along with Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. DOOLITTLE, I have the privilege of serving as one of six Congressional members on the National Council on the Arts, which basically serves as the Board of Directors for the NEA. Among the distinguished members of the National Council are Father Leo O'Donovan, the president of Georgetown University; and Wallace McRae, a third generation livestock rancher from Montana and the author of four volumes of poetry. Let me also point out that the new chairman of the NEA, William Ivey, is the former director of the Country Music Foundation.

This is not a radical group, needless to say. In reviewing and voting on NEA grant applications, the members of the National Council take their responsibilities to U.S. taxpayers very seriously. They are united by their commitment to making the arts accessible to all

Americans—which is what this debate is all about.

Now we all know that NEA opponents delight in telling tabloid-like stories about objectionable projects funded by the NEA. But let's be clear on the facts. Out of more than 112,000 NEA-funded grants over the past 32 years, only 45 were controversial. That's less than four one-hundredths of one percent of all grants. Most importantly, reforms instituted by Congress and internally by the NEA have restructured the grant process so that the mistakes of the past will not be repeated.

We didn't abolish the Department of Defense because of \$500 toilet seats and we didn't abolish the Navy because of the Tailhook scandal. We certainly shouldn't abolish the NEA because of a few projects years ago were controversial. It's simply absurd.

One of the standards by which we judge a civilized society is the support it provides for the arts. In comparison to other industrialized nations, the United States falls woefully behind in this area—even with a fully-funded NEA. In a nation of such wealth and cultural diversity, it is a tragic commentary on our priorities that year after year we must engage in a protracted debate about an agency that spends less than 40 cents per American each year—and in return benefits students, artists, teachers, musicians, orchestras, theaters, and dance companies and their audiences across the country.

But let's be honest—this isn't a fight over money. The Republican leadership wants to eliminate the NEA because they are afraid of artistic expression in a free society. This battle isn't about defending the values of mainstream America—this is about the GOP pandering to Pat Robertson and the Religious Right.

Polls overwhelmingly show that the American public supports federal funding for the arts. And if those reasons are not compelling enough for some, let's just talk dollars and cents. For every \$1 the NEA spends, it generates more than 11 times that in private donations and economic activity. That is a huge economic return on the government's investment. And you certainly don't need to be from New York to see the impact of the arts on a region's economy.

The Republican assault on the arts—on cultural expression itself—is an outrage—and it must be defeated.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut, as the proponent of the amendment, has the right to close.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. And how much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the government has an important role in funding the arts. Two years ago some of us thought we could combine two good principles; fund the arts, but do it by replacing the NEA with a block grant directly to the State arts commissions. We thought we had a viable compromise that would end the annual debate; an honorable effort to broaden

the base. That failed. The block grants are not viable.

We need to fund the NEA and we need to increase the funding for the NEA. I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from Connecticut in making sure that will happen.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

I would encourage my colleagues to read the report that we issued last year: A Creative and Generous America, The Healthy State of the Arts in America. Because the arts in America are healthy. What is failing is the continued failure of the National Endowment for the Arts.

It is not a broad-based program. The NEA has failed in its primary mission to make that happen. More than one-third of NEA funds go to six cities, and one-third of all congressional districts fail to get any direct funding. That means one-third of America does not even see the NEA. In short, the NEA makes up a minuscule portion of arts support in America.

There is no credible evidence that the NEA has had anything to do with the recent growth and explosion in the arts. It is a failed small agency. And before my colleagues say how well it works, just a year ago 63 percent of NEA grantees could not reconcile their project costs, 79 percent had inadequate documentation of personnel costs, and 53 percent had failed to engage independent auditors.

This agency needs to be overhauled if not eliminated.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON), to restore funding for the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments in favor of limited funding are hollow and without merit. Government support for the arts is not a program for the elite. Eliminating the endowment will do nothing to reduce the deficit. The private sector cannot and will not provide sufficient funding to make up this loss in the credibility.

Some of the many reasons most Americans believe in government support for the arts is it stimulates economic growth, it invests in our communities, they are basic to a thorough education. We know that student achievement and test scores in academic subjects improve when the arts are used to assist learning in math, social studies, creative writing and communication skills. We know SATs and ACTs are elevated by students who have had the arts training.

I invite anyone who thinks the NEA is not needed to visit the Puppet Com-

pany Playhouse in Glen Echo Park, just a few miles from the Capital.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and to support the Johnson amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment. It is the right thing to do.

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, for those of us who find ourselves supporting a gradual change, this is a difficult vote and a difficult amendment.

I am rising today in opposition to this amendment for a variety of reasons but, in particular, I would have supported the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) several years ago to gradually privatize the National Endowment for the Arts, and I believe as a politician who also loves the arts, that politics and art rarely mix. And if there is one thing that this debate has shown us today, it is that.

I think that the National Endowment of the Arts should move towards being a private national endowment over time. Unfortunately, having talked to the National Endowment of the Arts this morning, I found that while they were given authorization to begin development programs to raise independent funds a year ago, in that year they have only raised \$50,000. That is not a real effort, in my view, towards moving toward a truly independent national endowment, and my vote today should be seen by supporters of the arts and seen by the National Endowment of the Arts as a clear encouragement to them to move towards privatization.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding me this time, and I certainly support her amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I consider myself one of the most conservative Members of this body, and my record as one of the fiscal conservatives is a matter of record. But let me tell my colleagues, regarding the arguments I have heard today, this is a question about whether or not we give any money to the arts. It is that basic; that simple.

This government has always supported the arts. From Washington, from Thomas Jefferson, from Abraham Lincoln, we have always, as a Nation and its founding leaders and through every administration, supported the arts.

Now, I admit that some mistakes have been made, and I have highlighted those mistakes. But it is not our responsibility or duty here to abolish Federal Government participation in the arts. With those mistakes that have been made, it is our responsibility to correct those mistakes. If we need tax credits, if we need to change the project basis, let us do that. But this is about funding our museums, this is about funding our symphonies.

Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a child who has attended or heard a symphony or visited a museum who would not benefit from this effort to fund the arts.

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

As I listened to the debate, one thought kept crossing my mind, and that is how easy it is to be a philanthropist with other people's money. It is really easy to give away other people's money, \$9.5 million.

The impression some Members would give us, and the movie stars, is that the arts and arts programs in this country are hanging by a thread, and if we do not fund the NEA all of the arts are going to go away. Well, the truth is that is not true.

The fact is there are several people that are contributing to the arts community in our country today. One is the Federal Government. Now, not just the \$98.5 million that we are trying to stop being funded to the NEA. There are over 200 programs funded by taxpayers that go to the arts: Holocaust Museum, Commission of Fine Arts, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, JFK Center for the Performing Arts, National Endowment for Children's Educational TV, NEH, National Gallery of Arts, the Smithsonian.

How much money is the Federal Government spending of our tax dollars on the arts? Well, in 1997, it was \$696 million, in 1998 it was \$710 million, and in 1999 it will be \$815 million that is going to go to fund the arts. So we are great philanthropists with other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I will just finish by urging my colleagues to vote "no" on the Johnson amendment.

□ 1500

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the 30 remaining seconds.

I urge support of my amendment in the strongest terms possible. This body votes R&D tax credits to support the creativity necessary to an entrepreneurial society. We support NIH funding to create the knowledge base for medical innovations.

We must support NEA dollars to support the infrastructure for a strong, vital, national, creative culture community of the arts. We must do no less if we are to have the quality-inspired leadership that this Nation needs in our democracy.

If my colleagues have never been in a HOT school, a higher order of thinking school, go. It will demonstrate why NEA dollars count now and in the future.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague NANCY JOHNSON's amendment to restore \$98 million in funding to the National Endowment for the Arts. For a small and carefully safeguarded investment of taxpayer money, NEA funds activities that enrich all aspects of our society.

We will hear a good deal today about the economic benefits NEA offers to our local communities—and that's right. Last year, we invested \$98 million in the NEA. This investment supported 1.3 million full-time jobs in local communities, generated an estimated \$37 billion in economic activity, and returned almost three and one half billion dollars to the federal treasury in income taxes. Clearly, any investment which provides a return of nearly 35 times your initial investment is worth continuing. Since FY96, the NEA has directly contributed over \$3 million in awards to the Connecticut economy, and 19 individual awards were recommended last year.

But more important is the immeasurable contribution that NEA makes to our nation's art and music, creativity and talent. When we invest in NEA, we add to the store of artistic expression in the world. We add to the human spirit. And that is the most important investment of all.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and fund this important program.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts because the NEA broadens public access to the arts for all Americans.

The latest Lou Harris poll found that 79% of Americans support a governmental role in funding the arts. Furthermore, 57% said they favor the federal government funding the arts. Federal funding for the arts is a good investment because the arts contribute to our society both financially and educationally.

From a financial standpoint, the NEA is an investment in the economic growth of our communities because the non-profit arts community generates an estimated \$37 billion in economic activity, returns \$3.4 billion in income taxes to the federal government each year, and supports 1.7 million jobs.

Federal funding for the arts is also a catalyst for leveraging private funding since recipients of NEA grants are required to match federal grants up to 3 to 1. It is also important to recognize that the NEA's budget represents less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the federal budget and costs each American less than 38 cents per year.

Our communities benefit from an investment in the arts when art is a part of a comprehensive educational program and last year, the NEA made arts education a top priority. In 1997, the NEA invested \$8.2 million in support of K-12 arts programs. Through these programs, the NEA opens creative doors to million of school children, including "at-risk" youth. Participation in the arts improves overall student learning, instills self-esteem and discipline and provides creative outlets for self expression. The arts also help prepare America's future high-tech workforce by helping students develop problem-solving and reasoning skills, hone communication ability and expand career skills for the 21st century. In my extensive work with education and technology, I see how important arts education is to developing our future workforce.

Exposing children to the arts is even more important now that we know how crucial the first 3 years of a child's life are to full mental and emotional development. Even at the very beginning of life, children respond to music and visual stimuli. The NEA increases opportunities for parents and teachers to share art with children who may not otherwise have such opportunities.

In Michigan, the NEA supports mentoring programs, in-school performances and apprenticeships in local school districts, colleges and universities. These programs have enriched the cultural fabric of our community. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the continued funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, in ardent support of the National Endowment for the Arts. I commend my colleague, NANCY JOHNSON, for her perseverance on this issue and thank Chairman REGULA for bringing to the floor a fine Interior Appropriations bill.

Every day, arts programs across the United States are helping Americans. CityKids is an educational program in New York City, and let me describe for you what one of the students told me:

Chayka wrote:

My grandfathers, grandmother, father and uncle were all alcoholics. I lived in the projects oldest of 5 girls to a single mother and all I had was my ambition, drive, determination, and talent. The arts . . . has kept me sane. Now I've taken these skills that I've learned and through the arts I educate thousands of youths. It makes communicating to my peers about teen pregnancy, drugs, abuse, and racism heard effectively.

The National Endowment for the Arts is a powerful symbol for improving the quality of our lives and the refining of our communities. The arts clearly enhance community livability; attract industry; create jobs; increase the tax base; and enrich us all. Dance, theater, and music encourage personal achievement in our communities. In a time when we have balanced the budget, lowered taxes, and improved education in our country, we can take the time to appreciate the creative opportunities made possible by local arts organizations and the NEA.

The NEA does touch us in our communities. For instance, this weekend the 21st Annual New York Philharmonic Free Concert will take place at Heckscher State Park in my district on Long Island. Every year, this concert brings together 40,000 people and this free concert is made possible because the NY Philharmonic

receives a grant from the NEA to offer free concerts throughout New York State and the region. 40,000 people take advantage of this opportunity and benefit from the NEA—families who otherwise may not have the occasion or the money to hear classical music.

As a result of Federal arts funding, the American people have gained access to a greater range of nonprofit arts organizations. Since 1965, the number of professional nonprofit theaters has grown from 56 to over 425; large orchestras have increased from 100 to over 230; opera companies from 27 to over 120; and dance companies from 37 to over 400. Additionally, countless small chamber and choral groups, museums, art centers, cultural festivals, cultural organizations and writers guilds have sprouted up in small towns, rural communities, medium-sized cities and suburbs throughout every corner of America. A Congressional initiative that allocated 7.5 percent of all NEA arts funding to help develop arts programming in under-served areas specifically helped us reach this outcome.

Over the past few years, Congress has instituted changes that have allowed for important reforms. I'd like to take a moment to highlight an excellent program that has been instituted in response to Congressional concerns about the fairness of the distribution of NEA grants. The new ArtsREACH program is designed to send grants to states that have historically been under-served. Specifically, ArtsREACH will provide direct planning and technical assistance grants to communities in targeted states to create coalitions of cultural organizations, local government and community arts agencies. They will work together to ensure that the arts are an integral part of achieving community goals. ArtsREACH will target local arts and civic leaders and help them to use the arts to build stronger communities. In fact, the United States Conference of Mayors recently passed a unanimous resolution endorsing ArtsREACH.

The arts make a difference in helping to solve everyday challenges. I have seen firsthand how the arts build communities. Public funding for the arts combined with private sector giving has had a profound impact upon the health, education and economy of our nation. Business leaders are building upon the economic stimuli and social problem-solving abilities created by the arts to nurture further growth at the local level. The arts enrich the lives of all Americans because they speak to our economic, intellectual and spiritual well-being. In my home state of New York, organizations supported by the arts provide 174,000 jobs. Nonprofit arts organizations alone have an economic impact of nearly \$4.1 million.

Not only do the arts contribute to a stronger community, they also help prepare job-seekers and enhance creativity in the workplace. When hiring employees, more and more businesses are looking for those qualities developed through education and exposure to the arts.

The U.S. Department of Labor's report on the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills recently highlighted the important role of arts education in achieving many "core competencies" for the workplace, including creative problem solving, allocating resources, team building, and exercising individual responsibility. Employers recognize that individuals with a strong background in arts have the creative talent to innovatively approach challenges.

The arts inspire me and millions of Americans. On the cusp of a new millennium, when we are actually aware of our legacy and our future, the time is right to reinvest in our identity and to ensure that we remain a world leader culturally as well as economically.

I urge my colleagues to continue funding the National Endowment for the Arts. Help the arts flourish in small towns and inner cities across our great nation.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of the amendment by my colleague from Connecticut. The arts enrich our culture, our humanity, our communities, and our economy, and I am pleased to vote for this amendment to restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts.

The small investment the government makes in the NEA—its budget is only .01 of our national budget—serves as a catalyst for local, state and private investment in the arts, and bolsters an industry that provides millions of jobs across the nation.

We see the results of this investment in Connecticut's thriving arts community. Connecticut's nonprofit arts industry—and it truly is an industry—contributed an estimated \$1.3 billion to the state's economy in 1996, and provided jobs for roughly 30,500 people.

Just last month, New Haven demonstrated again how the arts can both build our economy and bring our community together. Performers from around the world came to New Haven for the annual International Festival of Arts and Ideas. An estimated 80,000 people traveled to New Haven to visit this summer's festival and enjoyed the artists, dancers, musicians and craftsmen. The arts means travel and tourism, money and jobs for the city of New Haven.

The arts build our economy, enrich our culture and feed the minds of adults and children alike. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress who supports the arts, I believe that the Federal government should remain an important contributor in this area.

Critics point to a few controversial grants that the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has made, and I agree that some funding decisions may have been unwise. However, in recent years, the NEA has taken strides to eliminate controversy from the grant process by eliminating "individual grants" and "subgrants."

In fact, most of the funding from the agency is directed toward the cultural life and diversity of our country—to people of all ages, to people in our inner cities, in our suburbs, and in our rural communities.

In Delaware, the NEA provides assistance to the Delaware Division of the Arts and the Delaware Humanities Forum so they may grant funding to the Delaware Symphony Orchestra, the Delaware Theater Company, Opera Delaware and many other community and school activities.

When it comes to partnership between private, state, and Federal funding of the arts the NEA sets an outstanding example. According to the agency, one endowment dollar attracts twelve dollars or more from state and regional arts agencies as well as corporations, businesses and individuals.

In fact, NEA funded programs generate economic activity through tourism, urban renewal and economic development throughout the na-

tion. According to the NEA, non-profit arts programs contribute an estimated \$37 billion to the economy and are responsible for 1.3 million jobs.

It is also important to note that most industrial countries have a national budget for the arts and humanities. The United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands, France, Germany and Sweden not only have national budgets for the arts, but in most cases, provide more funding for the arts than the United States.

Federal support of the NEA opens the door to the arts for all Americans, sets a standard for private and public investment partnerships and generates economic development in our communities. In light of these facts, the Federal government can not neglect its responsibility in continued support of the arts, and I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment to restore NEA funding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Connecticut [Mrs. Johnson] to restore \$98 million in funding for fiscal year 1999 for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Many speakers today will describe the overall value and worth of the NEA. They will note how we all benefit from the NEA, in every single one of our congressional districts and states.

We all know the NEA devotes 40% of its budget to partnerships with state and regional arts agencies, funding that is directed to projects tailored to those communities.

Before the NEA existed, only five states had state-funded arts councils. Today, all fifty states have such councils.

All of our constituencies benefit from NEA funds, programs that only costs taxpayers 36 cents each year.

In return, arts agencies, arts organizations, and arts programs and activities provide substantial social, educational and economic benefits.

I would like to speak, however, about two NEA grants to small local and regional museums in my district, the 3rd Congressional District of Massachusetts.

This year, the NEA awarded the Worcester Art Museum in Worcester, MA, a grant of \$120,000 to support the creation and presentation of an exhibition on the lost Roman city of Antioch.

It is very fitting that the NEA supported this exhibition, which is the culmination of archaeological and artistic effort by the Worcester Art Museum undertaken throughout this century. One of the many breath-taking sights in the museum is to come upon the Antioch mosaics, which were installed around 1937, the result of a partnership between the Worcester Art Museum and various universities and museums in the United States and France to excavate the Antioch site between 1932 and 1939. Building on this work over the following decades, the Worcester Art Museum has become renown for one of the finest collections of Roman mosaics in the United States.

The NEA grant will support the creation of the exhibition, the accompanying catalogue, and the education programs—especially those for children—that will be part of this major exhibition of art and artifacts from Antioch. The exhibition will then travel to Texas and Ohio, where it will also enrich the lives of citizens, scholars and school children in those communities, as well.

Another smaller grant by the NEA was also awarded this year to the Higgins Armory Mu-

seum, a small museum in Worcester, MA that is among the best armory collections in the world. The exhibition schedule of the Higgins Armory Museum includes a series of professional development workshops for teachers, and visits by approximately 25,000 students from some 500 public and private schools throughout the six-state New England region.

The NEA provided a modest \$5,000 grant to support an upcoming exhibition entitled, "Road Warriors: Knight Riders." This unique and creative exhibit will educate the general public about the medieval period of armor worn by mounted knights with a more contemporary icon, namely the various uniforms of motorbike culture. The exhibit will especially reach out to young people with education programs.

I am proud of the strong artistic and cultural heritage of central Massachusetts, and I am equally proud of the vibrant artistic community that is actively engaged in cities and towns throughout my district today.

On behalf of them and on behalf of the communities of Central Massachusetts that benefit economically, culturally and socially from their presence, I urge all my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment to restore funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

WORCESTER ART MUSEUM,
Worcester, MA, June 19, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to encourage your support of the President's proposed increase in funding for the National Endowment of the Arts to \$136 million for FY 1999. As a strong supporter of the arts in our community, you already realize how important federal funding is to the Worcester Art Museum's ability to sustain a high caliber of exhibitions and services.

As you know, the Worcester Art Museum has recently received a grant award from the NEA to support its upcoming exhibition, Antioch: The Lost Roman City, scheduled to begin its national tour in Worcester in the Fall of 2000. This matching award not only signifies a level of project excellence on a national level but provides the leverage for securing additional funding sources needed for the execution of his exhibition. When an exhibition or project receives the NEA's "stamp of approval," other funders are more inclined to follow suit. This federal funding will enable approximately 170,000 viewers the opportunity to understand and learn about the ancient city and culture of Antioch, an opportunity that would not be possible without the initial support of the NEA.

I thank you in advance for your advocacy on behalf of the Worcester Art Museum and cultural institutions nation-wide and encourage your continued efforts to reinforce the importance of federal arts funding and its impact on the economic and cultural health of our communities.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. WELU,
Director.

HIGGINS ARMORY MUSEUM,
Worcester, MA, June 30, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: The Higgins Armory Museum was the recipient recently of a \$5,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts helping to fund the Museum's 1998-1999 winter and spring special exhibition. These annual events are an integral part of the Museum's ongoing educational programming which is designed not

only as a benefit for the Museum's general audiences, but also as a collaborative effort with local and regional educators to tie in with public and private school interdisciplinary curriculum. The exhibition schedule each year includes a series of professional development workshops for teachers, and visits to the Museum by approximately 25,000 students representing some 500 public and private schools throughout Massachusetts and the entire six-state New England region.

I am writing to you on behalf of our Board of Trustees to express appreciation to you and your colleagues in Congress for the important part you play in making this kind of financial support available. It is extremely meaningful to institutions like ours if we are to continue providing the kind of educational and cultural programs to the audiences we serve.

When you are in the Worcester area and your schedule permits, we would welcome the opportunity to show you the Museum and how these federal dollars are being used. We'd also like to express our very sincere thanks in person. We are extremely proud of our institution, and I'm confident that you would be also. So please consider this an official invitation, and let me know whenever you can come to see us.

Sincerely,

KENT DUR RUSSELL,
Executive Director.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Johnson amendment to restore \$98 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. As a member of the Interior Appropriations subcommittee, I have learned a great deal about the NEA in the last few years. I know that the NEA would admit it has made mistakes in the past, but it has instituted a series of management reforms to ensure that those types of problems will not recur. Even given those problems, opponents of the NEA can point to only a handful of questionable grants out of hundreds of thousands that have been awarded during the 32-year history of the NEA. After hearing real people and real artists discuss what the NEA has brought to them and to their communities, I know that the NEA is an incredible catalyst for bringing people together and expressing, in a creative fashion, the full range of the human experience.

The National Endowment for the Arts is successfully working to bring arts to underserved communities, through after school youth programs that are introducing our young people to the power of creative expression as an alternative to violence, and through folk and traditional arts that remind us of our common bond and what it means to be an American.

Moreover, the American public supports public funding for the arts. A Louis Harris poll indicates that, by a decisive 79 percent to 19 percent margin, a better than 3-to-1 majority of the American people is convinced that it is important that there should be federal, state, and local councils for the arts to develop new programs, research and provide financial assistance to worthy arts organizations. By 57 percent to 39 percent, a clear majority of the American people favor the Federal Government funding the arts.

Let's stop playing politics with this agency and follow the direction of the American people on this issue. Support the Johnson amendment and restore funding for the arts.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, today we have the opportunity to continue funding for the National Endowment

for the Arts. The fact is that the NEA is an essential component of cultural programs across the country. Not only in big cities, but in rural communities and small towns. In northern Michigan, where communities are rich with pride in their unique culture and heritage, eliminating the NEA's role as a source of state endowments and grant funding will effectively silence many quality programs. I have received many letters from local arts councils, senior centers, community theaters, youth programs and museums detailing the positive effect their programs have had and how even a small amount of federal funding can impact their program. The arts draw these communities together to celebrate and to educate each other. The past controversy over the NEA has led to reform and restructuring of that organization. The NEA has a new Chairman, Bill Ivey. These reforms and this chairman should be given the opportunity to prove themselves, not be stripped of their funding, support the Johnson Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 173, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—253

Abercrombie	Cummings	Goode
Ackerman	Danner	Gordon
Allen	Davis (FL)	Goss
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Granger
Baesler	Davis (VA)	Green
Baldacci	DeFazio	Greenwood
Ballenger	DeGette	Gutierrez
Barcia	Delahunt	Hall (OH)
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Hamilton
Bartlett	Deutsch	Harman
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Dicks	Hefner
Bentsen	Dingell	Hilliard
Bereuter	Doggett	Hinchey
Berman	Dooley	Hinojosa
Berry	Doyle	Holden
Bilbray	Edwards	Hooley
Bishop	Ehlers	Horn
Blagojevich	Engel	Houghton
Blumenauer	English	Hoyer
Boehlert	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Bonior	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Borski	Evans	(TX)
Boswell	Farr	Jefferson
Boucher	Fattah	Johnson (CT)
Boyd	Fawell	Johnson (WI)
Brady (PA)	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (CA)	Filner	Kanjorski
Brown (FL)	Foley	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Kelly
Capps	Fowler	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Fox	Kennedy (RI)
Carson	Frank (MA)	Kennelly
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Kildee
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Kilpatrick
Clayton	Frost	Kind (WI)
Clement	Furse	Kleccka
Clyburn	Ganske	Klink
Conyers	Gejdenson	Klug
Cook	Gephardt	Kolbe
Costello	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Coyne	Gillmor	LaFalce
Cramer	Gilman	LaHood

Lampson	Mollohan	Schumer
Lantos	Moran (VA)	Scott
LaTourette	Morella	Serrano
Lazio	Murtha	Shaw
Leach	Nadler	Shays
Lee	Neal	Sherman
Levin	Oberstar	Sisisky
Lewis (CA)	Obey	Skaggs
Lewis (GA)	Olver	Skeen
Lipinski	Ortiz	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Owens	Smith (MI)
Lofgren	Pallone	Smith, Adam
Lowe	Pascrell	Snyder
Luther	Pastor	Spratt
Maloney (CT)	Payne	Stabenow
Maloney (NY)	Pelosi	Stark
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
Markey	Pickett	Strickland
Martinez	Pomeroy	Stupak
Mascara	Porter	Sununu
Matsui	Poshard	Tauscher
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Thompson
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Thurman
McCollum	Rahall	Tierney
McDermott	Ramstad	Torres
McGovern	Rangel	Towns
McHale	Regula	Trafficant
McHugh	Reyes	Upton
McInnis	Rivers	Velazquez
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Vento
McKinney	Roemer	Visclosky
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
Meek (FL)	Rothman	Waters
Meeks (NY)	Roukema	Watt (NC)
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Mica	Rush	Weldon (PA)
Millender-McDonald	Sabo	Wexler
Miller (CA)	Sanchez	Weygand
Minge	Sanders	Wise
Mink	Sandlin	Woolsey
Moakley	Sawyer	Wynn
	Saxton	Yates

NOES—173

Aderholt	Gallegly	Parker
Archer	Gekas	Paul
Armey	Gibbons	Paxon
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pease
Baker	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Graham	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Gutknecht	Pickering
Barton	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bateman	Hansen	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hastert	Portman
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hayworth	Radanovich
Boehner	Hefley	Redmond
Bonilla	Herger	Riggs
Bono	Hill	Riley
Brady (TX)	Hilleary	Rogan
Bryant	Hobson	Rogers
Bunning	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hostettler	Royce
Burton	Hulshof	Ryun
Buyer	Hunter	Salmon
Callahan	Hutchinson	Sanford
Calvert	Hyde	Scarborough
Camp	Inglis	Schaefer, Dan
Campbell	Istook	Schaffer, Bob
Canady	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Chabot	Jones	Shadegg
Chambliss	Kasich	Shimkus
Chenoweth	Kim	Shuster
Christensen	King (NY)	Skelton
Coble	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Collins	Largent	Smith (TX)
Combest	Latham	Smith, Linda
Condit	Lewis (KY)	Snowbarger
Cooksey	Linder	Solomon
Cox	Livingston	Souder
Crane	Lucas	Spence
Crapo	Manzullo	Stearns
Cubin	McCrery	Stenholm
Cunningham	McIntosh	Stump
Deal	McKeon	Talent
DeLay	Metcalf	Tanner
Dickey	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Doolittle	Moran (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Nethercutt	Thomas
Dunn	Neumann	Thornberry
Ehrlich	Ney	Thune
Emerson	Northup	Tiahrt
Ensign	Nussle	Turner
Everett	Oxley	Wamp
Ewing	Packard	Watkins
Fossella	Pappas	Watts (OK)

Weldon (FL)	Whitfield	Wolf
Weller	Wicker	Young (AK)
White	Wilson	

NOT VOTING—8

Dixon	John	Norwood
Ford	McDade	Young (FL)
Gonzalez	McNulty	

□ 1521

Mrs. BONO changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, today during the fiscal year 1999 Interior appropriations bill vote on the amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) to continue funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, I intended to vote "no" for her amendment. I thought I voted "no" for her amendment. The voting machine indicated a "yes" vote. I would like the RECORD to show that I intended to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for the Members that are asking, it is our plan to roll votes until 5:30. At that time we will catch up whatever amendments would be pending and we may have to rise for a suspension that has to be done today. When we reconvene, we will then roll votes again until 8, or let us say 8:30. Hopefully if everybody works at it, I think we can finish this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for a colloquy at this point.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to discuss the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse which is owned and operated by the National Park Service. The lighthouse, the tallest in the world, is located along the Outer Banks of North Carolina, which is a beautiful part of my district.

The lighthouse is being threatened by the ocean and beach erosion. Two proposals are currently being debated on how best to save this historical structure. Either relocate the lighthouse inland or to stabilize the lighthouse where it is by building an additional groin to complement the three that are already in place.

As we have both mentioned in previous conversations, the moving of the lighthouse would change the character and the historical importance of this structure. At this time, I am curious if the subcommittee has taken a stance on how best to save the lighthouse.

Mr. REGULA. The subcommittee has not taken an official stance. However, the subcommittee believes the historical structure can be saved in a more cost-effective way than relocating it inland.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Ohio knows, the Senate Interior appropriations bill provides \$9.8 million for the relocation of the lighthouse. However, the House bill

does not address the issue. When the Interior conference convenes, does the gentleman intend to accept the Senate position or choose an alternative?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am committed to supporting a proposal to save the taxpayer money while protecting the lighthouse. I am currently working with other Appropriations Committee members to provide the appropriate money necessary for the construction of the fourth groin during the conference committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment and look forward to working with him during this process.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) for a colloquy.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the manager of the bill for a moment of his time to discuss a program of particular importance to me and many of my colleagues, the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center.

Mr. REGULA. I would be pleased to join in a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center is of critical importance to these highly endangered species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has decided to relocate this facility to an area near Fort Collins, Colorado, to take advantage of the area's habitat, infrastructure and proximity to educational and research institutions. I am grateful for the chairman's support of \$1 million for the construction of the facility. However, I respectfully request full funding of the President's request in order to construct this important facility. An additional \$800,000 was appropriated in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the many challenges the gentleman faces with balancing competing needs and projects, but I would like to emphasize the importance of this facility and the role that it plays in the survival of the species. I respectfully ask the gentleman to work in conference to secure full funding for this important project.

Mr. REGULA. As the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, there are many competing demands on the limited funds provided in this bill. I feel we have done as well as we could. However, I recognize the importance of the National Black Footed Ferret Conservation Center in recovering endangered species as well as its importance to public education. While we cannot meet every request, I assure the gentleman that I will keep his concerns in mind as we reconcile the differences between the House and Senate bills in conference.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has asked me to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, 1998 marks the centennial of Guam's relationship with the United States. As the gentleman knows, during World War II, Guam was the only American territory occupied by the Japanese. The people of Guam were steadfast in their desire for Americans to return to the island. The Japanese were aware of this loyalty. As a result, many islanders were persecuted and tortured for their loyalty to the United States. The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has stated his concern that, unlike other Americans, the people of Guam have never received full reparations for the atrocities they experienced during World War II. He has fought for recognition and eventual reparations to the people of Guam.

Mr. REGULA. I am aware of the gentleman from Guam's concerns and efforts in this area.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Guam has also noted that \$400,000 has been added to the technical assistance program in the Insular Affairs account without specific designation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Guam has expressed his interest in having \$300,000 of those funds allocated to establish a War Reparation Study Commission to verify claims from the people of Guam for the purpose of determining amounts of individual compensation for those who suffered atrocities. Is the gentleman aware of the gentleman from Guam's request?

Mr. REGULA. I am aware of the gentleman from Guam's request that funds be made available for this purpose, and I believe that once such a commission is authorized, consideration should be given to providing funds to meet this need, along with consideration of other territorial needs.

□ 1530

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with him. I thank him for entering into this colloquy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by

law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$596,425,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,062,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which \$3,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)); and of which \$1,500,000 shall be available in fiscal year 1999 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; in addition, \$32,650,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$596,425,000, and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities: *Provided*, That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burrows in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKAGGS:

Page 2, line 13, insert "(decreased by \$1,000,000)" after "\$596,425,000".

Page 3, line 6, insert "(decreased by \$1,000,000)" after "\$596,425,000".

Page 69, line 15, insert "(decreased by \$500,000)" after "\$320,558,000".

Page 70, line 17, insert "(decreased by \$3,000,000)" after "\$630,250,000".

Page 70, line 22, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)" after "\$150,000,000".

Page 71, line 4, insert "(increased by \$16,000,000)" after "\$120,000,000".

Page 71, line 5, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)" after "\$30,000,000".

Mr. SKAGGS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is sponsored by me and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX). It will remedy, I believe, one of the major imbalances in this otherwise pretty good bill, producing savings in energy and money and, in the process, providing some real benefits to the environment.

The amendment that we are offering would shift funds from elsewhere in the bill to add \$40 million to the energy conservation and efficiency accounts. That includes a \$16 million increase for weatherization, \$4 million for State energy grants, another \$10 million for building technology programs, and increases of \$5 million each for the industry and transportation energy conservation programs in the bill.

These are investments we need to make as a country, because the track record that has already been established shows that they pay off many, many times over. The President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, for instance, has estimated that past investments in these areas have produced improvements in efficiency that are already saving American consumers \$170 billion a year. Even if they have exaggerated this by 50 percent, which I do not believe they have, this is clearly a great return on investment.

It is also not just about money. The companies that, for instance, make home appliances, report that new appliances benefited by the kind of R&D that these programs support use significantly less energy than older ones, 50 percent less for refrigerators, for example. A 1995 study by the Department of Energy shows that well over three quads, that is, I believe, three quadrillion Btu's of energy, can be saved if the department and industry can continue to work in this area to replace old appliances with efficient new ones.

Similarly, experts at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory estimate we can save another 10 quads of energy by the year 2020 if we will accelerate, as these programs will do, if we can accelerate the use of advanced energy efficient building, heating, lighting, and related technologies in new housing and other construction in this country, all of which can be done without increasing building costs.

Transportation is another area where increased efficiency pays off, even when, as now, oil prices remain low. Transportation accounts for fully two-thirds of this country's oil consumption. The Department of Energy and industry are working to reduce this by a million barrels a day which will, in turn, greatly aid in our efforts to bring down air pollution.

There are also immediate payoffs for the weatherization and State grants programs. The Oak Ridge National Labs reports that in 1996 weatherization meant a savings of 33 percent in the gas used to heat weatherized homes while, overall, that program and State energy programs have a favorable cost benefit ratio of about two to one.

We really need to maintain momentum in these areas. That is why, while I regret that I need to suggest to the Members that we have offsets in some other accounts, this will really move the country ahead in dealing with these pressing needs for energy conservation.

The offsets that are included in this amendment include a million dollars from BLM's Wild Horse and Bureau Program and from two of DOE's programs, Oil Technology and Advanced Turbine Research, both of which, I think, do not produce the kind of returns on investment that we have enjoyed in the efficiency and conservation areas. They are not bad programs, but I think it will serve us well to give

them somewhat less emphasis while we beef up in these other conservation areas.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just point out to my colleagues, that, while the bill now nominally funds these programs at about \$630 million, a big piece of that really is an accounting change from last year's approach. An apples to apples comparison would be \$586 million, down significantly from this fiscal year.

By comparison, if we were really just keeping on the course that we were on as recently as 1995, adjusted for inflation, we would be spending about \$860 million this coming fiscal year on these programs. I think that would have been a wise investment. But at least let us keep making the progress that this amendment will enable us to make. I urge my colleagues' support for it.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) in offering the Skaggs-Fox energy conservation amendment. I have been a strenuous supporter of funding, as many of my colleagues have, for the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Conservation Program funded through the Department of Energy accounts in the Interior Appropriations bill. These programs go to the heart, Mr. Chairman, of the Federal Government's cooperation and community based solution to the needs of the people.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for working with me on this amendment in supporting increased funding for these important programs. I also want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his excellent staff for their work on this very difficult appropriations bill.

I am concerned that, under the bill, energy efficiency programs at the Department of Energy will be reduced by \$25 million below fiscal year 1998 levels and approximately \$200 million under the budget request.

We urge the support of the House for a reallocation of funding within the bill in order to better serve our Nation's energy, economic, environmental, and security needs. This is the most important vote in favor of energy efficiency during the past 5 years, and we need Members' help.

The bipartisan amendment will add about \$16 million for the Low-Income Weatherization Program, which helps over 60,000 low-income, elderly and disabled citizens weatherize their homes each year, in both cold and hot climates.

We propose to add back \$4 million to the State Energy Program, which produces enormous energy savings for schools, hospitals, and other partners with State government and the private sector. We propose to add another \$20

million to energy conservation programs in transportation, buildings, and industry. Major innovations in lighting, windows, building design, industrial energy efficiency, and automotive technology can be traced to these programs. A recent study estimated that these types of programs save our economy over \$170 billion per year.

The proposed cuts will actually hurt real people and will hurt our Nation's important environmental, economic, and energy security goals. Weatherization helps low-income Americans through the installation of insulation and otherwise improving the energy efficiency of homes. On average, these improvements can save poor households over \$200 a year in energy costs. That can make a huge difference in each family.

The State Energy Program provides leveraging of funds to conduct energy improvements in schools and hospitals so that more money can go into education and health care. This program reaches into small business and homes to reduce energy costs and apply innovative technologies to solve our energy challenges.

Our amendment is supported by a broad coalition, Mr. Chairman, of low-income advocates, business groups, and energy and environmental groups, including the National Association of State Energy Officials, the National Community Action Foundation, the National Association of State Community Services Programs, the National Association of State and Utility Consumer Advocates, the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, the Alliance to Save Energy, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Substantial Energy Coalition, the Sierra club, and the list goes on.

I urge my colleagues to support the Skaggs-Fox amendment and place a higher priority on people, our environment, and our national energy strategy.

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

Mr. Chairman, once again, this Congress has failed to adequately support energy efficiency programs that work for the American people. This is a failure born of shortsightedness and is particularly troublesome given the challenges our Nation confronts in the next century. With regions around the world competing to develop the most efficient economies possible, we are holding ourselves back in this race by declining to support energy conservation.

The Department of Energy's renewable energy and efficiency programs have been extremely successful. These programs have saved American consumers billions, and I underscore the word billions, of dollars in utility bills. They have made housing more affordable for low and moderate income families, and these vital programs have helped communities nationwide reduce air pollution levels that burden local industry and threaten public health.

The evidence is clear, energy efficiency is a wise investment, an invest-

ment with substantial return for consumers, business and the environment. Every dollar cut from energy efficiency programs represents a lost opportunity to make our buildings and motor vehicles more efficient and less costly for manufacturers and owners. These cuts in energy funding take dollars directly out of the pockets of our constituents.

I believe that the American people want government that works. They want a government that saves money and improves our quality of life. The amendment before us will restore adequate funding for programs that achieve these important goals.

Mr. Chairman, a wise man once said that those who fail to see the forest through the trees are doomed to get lost in the woods. We are lost indeed. I ask all my colleagues to support the Skaggs-Fox amendment so that we may find a way to a cleaner environment and a stronger economy.

I ask simply that we look at the heat waves that are affecting our cities across this Nation, how it is we are handing out simple fans to people and how many senior citizens are suffering because of lack of energy efficiency to the point where they will not put on their air conditioning system because the energy costs are so hard for them to burden. That is but one example across our Nation. From Massachusetts to Illinois to California to Texas and Florida, energy efficiency is important if we are going to deal with global change.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this committee over the last number of years has already reduced the fossil energy funding by 30 percent over the last 3 years. Over the same period, we have increased conservation funding by 14 percent.

I represent an area which has extreme coal reserves. We had 10 years ago 12,000 coal miners. We have today 2,500 coal miners. They do not work in eastern Pennsylvania. They work in western Pennsylvania.

We have done everything we could to increase the efficiency of burning coal. We have 600 years of coal deposits so we are trying to find ways to use this energy resource. We right now are more dependent on foreign oil than we were in 1974 when I came to Congress.

We actually had long lines. We had to line up at a gas station to get gas in part of the time when I first came to Congress because of the shortage. Gasoline prices were over \$2.00, and at the time the Saudis told us, you had better increase your fossil fuel research, do it more efficiently or you are not going to have the reserves, you are not going to burn coal efficiently and consequently you are going to depend on us more and more.

We started a program. Because we could not work fast enough, we were not as efficient as quickly as we would like, we have not been able to accomplish our goal. On the other hand, we have come up with what we feel is rea-

sonable funding over a long period of time so that when this oil from overseas dries up, we will have the reserves and the efficient energy from coal that we need.

If we have further cuts in fossil energy, it will result in increased emissions and increased energy consumption due to continued reliance on outdated technology.

We have done a marvelous job over the years in reducing emissions. In the area I represent, in all of western Pennsylvania, as a matter of fact, you had big globs of coal dust and steel deposits, iron ore deposits on the automobiles at one time. We have cleaned all that up. Ninety-eight percent of what goes in the air has been cleaned up substantially, and this has come about because of the research that we have done.

This would be a drastic blow to the areas that are doing research on fossil energy if we were to cut the money from this area to increase conservation.

So I would ask the Members to consider very carefully that we have these massive deposits of coal which we need to increase the efficiency and effectiveness, and the only way we can do it is by fossil fuel research. We want to continue that program. I would hope we would defeat this amendment.

□ 1545.

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

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make clear that the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fox) and I are proposing does not touch the \$113 that is in the bill for coal. It deals with oil recovery research and the gas turbine program, a big piece of which was once managed by Westinghouse, which I think now has been sold off to a foreign company, Seimans. So we are trying to look for the most bang for the buck and are not going after the coal account.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Even though that company was sold off with less than 50 percent to Seimans, it will still be run by an American company. Of course, that research ties in. We are continually trying to work with fossil fuel, oil research and so forth to increase the efficiency of these resources in the United States. So that is the reason I am so concerned about cutting fossil research.

Mr. SKAGGS. If the gentleman would yield further, I do not think we are in disagreement at all about the goal. I believe it can be demonstrated that the kind of payback we get, already demonstrated by technology in use in the economy, has really made a much greater contribution toward oil independence, for instance, than is likely

to come from the other programs that we are cutting.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know the gentleman may think that, but we are over 50 percent dependent today. Then we were 34 percent dependent. So it is all relative, in how dependent we are.

In the short term the gentleman may be right. But, long-term, we could have a breakthrough with one of these research projects and reduce the emissions and increase the efficiency substantially. So we think this is a counterproductive amendment, and we would hope Members would vote against it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Fox-Skaggs amendment. The committee's recommendation for energy conservation is over \$630 million. This is an increase of 14 percent above the 1996 level. By comparison, the other Department of Energy programs in the bill, fossil energy research, Strategic Petroleum Reserve operations and the Naval Petroleum Reserve operations have been decreased by 34 percent since 1996.

The General Accounting Office has been monitoring the use of funds in the Energy Conservation Program and reports that there is more than \$265 million in funding appropriated in prior years for energy conservation programs that is yet to be spent by DOE. That is on top of the \$630 million recommended by the committee for fiscal year 1999.

I know there are those who say that fossil energy research is bad, but energy conservation and energy efficiency research is good. Let me remind my colleagues that traditional fossil fuels will continue to account for the vast majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future. Improved technology for extracting and using fossil fuels will do more to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions than most of the programs funded under the energy conservation account.

The advanced turbine system program has great potential for improving efficiency and lowering emissions. The portion of this program that has traditionally been funded in the energy conservation account receives great support; however, the portion traditionally funded in the fossil energy account does not. That just does not make sense.

Again, we have that old false argument: fossil is bad, conservation is good. The fossil energy research program, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve operation and the Naval Petroleum Reserve operation have all tightened their belts. They are focused; they have streamlined their operations and substantially reduced their appropriations requirements over the past 3 years.

On the other hand, the energy conservationists have displayed an attitude that "we want to continue to do everything we have done in the past, and any new programs that require

more funding." That attitude is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has done the responsible job of providing funding for energy conservation programs. The proposed offsets to increase energy conservation funding are totally unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I was a kid, my mother always told me to work smarter, not harder. For the largest part of the 20th Century, the United States has worked harder, not smarter. We have fought making automobiles more efficient, we have fought making homes more efficient, we have fought making industry more efficient because we felt we lived in a world of inexhaustible energy.

We also believed simultaneously that this fossil fuel or nuclear fuel which we were consuming would have no impact upon the environment. Well, it turns out that there is a negative impact on both the economy and upon the environment if we use fuels that are not as efficient, not as smart, as those that are the best available.

But what has happened over the years is that the energy conservation strategy, one which over the last 20 years since the first oil shock has proven to be very effective as a mechanism for having us rethink our relationship with energy, still is battled by the forces of old energy, shall we call it, and that old energy is so powerful that notwithstanding their dominant role in the provision of energy in our country and around the world, they still believe that they should be beneficiaries of handouts inside of the Federal budget.

Now, what the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is offering this afternoon is a very modest amendment, one which will adjust the Federal budget in terms of our priorities so that the energy conservation, the "working smarter, not harder" strategy which does not get the rest of the subsidies, the rest of the benefits that the other more powerful energy industries in America receive, move just a little bit of this money, just a very small amount of the money over into this agenda. This is ultimately the way in which, it seems to me, we should be wanting to deal with Kyoto, that we should be wanting to deal with this global warming issue.

Mr. Chairman, the CO₂ that is emitted up into the atmosphere is a relatively small percentage, yes, of the overall atmospheric gasses, but because it creates a cover over our sky, it creates a greenhouse effect, as the earth's warming sends up these rays which then are reflected back down.

Now, how long do we want to go? How many weather forecasts are we going to have to see before we begin actually investing in an alternative strategy; not displacing the old strat-

egy, but having a better and more sensible mix for the 21st Century?

That is what the Skaggs amendment is all about. It is moving our energy agenda to the 21st Century, so that we have the proper strategy to deal with these environmental issues, and, ultimately, economic issues which will face our country.

So I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) for his amendment, and I hope that it is adopted by all the Members here today. There could be no more important amendment. In fact, if the President was ever going to veto a bill, I would hope it would be over an issue like this, because it is so directly related to the future of our relationship between energy and the environment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support for the amendment. I know the gentleman is extending his remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fox) as well.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure Members understood, I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts does, that these accounts in this bill this year have been cut by about \$24 million under fiscal year 1998, and that is a very important fact to keep in mind.

There was some reference to the fact that we had increased funding here. We have not. The bill proposes to cut it by \$24 million. The amendment we are offering would make that up plus a little bit more, but it is not as if it is anything more, as the gentleman pointed out, than a modest change.

Finally, I am sure the gentleman's mother instructed him as well that the cheapest energy is the energy you save, which is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. When we pass legislation out here mandating better appliance standards, after all, what is a utility? What is a coal or oil or nuclear power plant? All it is is the combined demand of refrigerators and stoves and toasters. If we make them more efficient, we reduce the need for us to have to pollute the atmosphere for the children of the next generation. Support the Skaggs amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we get the facts out. The committee has heard all of this and we made a balanced judgment. We already have \$265 million in that account for efficiency from prior years that is unspent. You add that to the fact that in our bill efficiency gets twice as much as fossil research. With the \$265 million that is unspent, energy efficiency would have three times as much as fossil.

We need balance. Obviously the committee does not quarrel with efficiency, or we would not have given double the amount of money to efficiency that we gave to fossil. But, on the other hand, we want to have some security.

We are spending \$200 million a year on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the oil that is there. Why? To be secure from oil shortfalls from the Middle East. We fought a war called Desert Storm. Do you think we would have been there had there not been oil under the desert? No way.

So there are a lot of factors that have to be considered. Obviously efficiency is important, but security is also important.

I am struck by the fact that for every barrel of oil we take out, we leave two in the ground. Now, with research on fossil energy, we will improve that record. If we could just get two barrels out for every barrel we leave in the ground, we would have a lot more oil, and we would be a lot less dependent on foreign sources for petroleum.

It is a matter of balance. Efficiency is great, but I likewise say fossil research is great. Some of the money that would be in the Skaggs amendment and the Fox amendment would go to the big three auto makers. Do you think they need to have additional money to do research so they can make their vehicles more efficient? We found out that simply by mandating the miles per gallon, that we are getting the efficiency and competition from around the world that has brought that about. They do not need to have additional subsidies.

Where does this money come from? For those of you that are concerned about the environment, it comes out of the Bureau of Land Management's Wild Horse and Burro Program. That program has enough problems without reducing their funding. Instead of taking money out of that, we ought to see how we can better manage the BLM wild horse program. It takes money out of the turbine program. Why are we spending money on turbine research? So we can use our fossil energy sources more efficiently.

Anyone will tell you we are going to be dependent on coal, we are going to be dependent on petroleum, we are going to be dependent on the fossil sources. So let us concentrate on not only efficiency, but how to make fossil energy more efficient, in getting it out of the ground and making it available.

The turbine program is very effective, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) has pointed out. The other programs in fossil I think are giving us a better handle on resources.

When you look down the road with a growing economy and a growing population, the need for fossil resources will be much larger, and if we do not put money in fossil research, we are going to become more and more dependent on other nations, other sources, for our se-

curity, because petroleum is essential to every facet of life.

Therefore, I think it would be very unwise as national policy to not just double efficiency, but because of the \$265 million in unspent funds, we would triple it.

□ 1600

I think it ought to be 50-50, frankly. Fifty percent on efficiency, 50 percent on fossil, and perhaps we should have an amendment that takes some out of energy efficiency and puts it in fossil.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to strike a reasonable balance in the committee, and the Members endorsed this policy as we have it today. I urge the Members to vote "no" on this amendment. Vote for security in terms of our access to petroleum domestically, our access to the more efficient way to use our coal resources, and at the same time recognize that we have a balance in terms of efficiency.

I think the bill is a common sense, responsible approach, and I urge Members to vote "no" on the Skaggs-Fox amendment.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I had not originally intended to speak on this amendment because it involves dear friends on both sides of the issue. But I had intended to speak on the importance of the fossil energy R&D programs which, in the Committee on Science, which I have the privilege of serving on, we have consistently tried to support over the years. We have recognized the value of increased efficiency brought about by research on fossil energy.

I am also one of the greatest exponents of energy conservation R&D because I understand the importance of saving energy.

So what we have here is a situation which requires balance. Now, on balance, I am inclined to support the position taken by the chairman of the committee. I would point out that what he has had to do in the House is to take a substantially smaller allocation than in the Senate and make that allocation cover in some reasonable way a number of accounts which have to be covered. Now, obviously, his decision is somewhat short of absolute perfection, but I am not sure that we have the wisdom in this body to achieve absolute perfection.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) said, that the allocation for fossil energy R&D only represents half as much as the allocation for energy conservation, and it may not be wise to take even more from fossil energy R&D in order to increase some of these very valuable energy conservation R&D programs.

I would suggest that we focus on an end-game strategy whereby in con-

ference with the Senate we may be able to reach agreement on some slight increases in both of these accounts. It will not be a great deal, I am sure, but we are about \$75 million under what the Senate has appropriated in these 2 areas. I think that the Chairman might be able to figure some way to squeeze an extra few million into these accounts as the bill comes out of the conference so we can come a little bit closer to the Senate figures. This is what I am going to urge and I think it is a reasonable approach.

I would be very concerned if I had to make a judgment between how to divide scarce dollars between these two accounts, because both of them are very important to me. We have had to face a situation where the committee has recommended considerably less than the President has recommended for both of these accounts. If I had my way, I would accept what the President recommends on both of these accounts. However, I am unlikely to have my way.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for the gentleman's analytic insights in all of this and was privileged to serve on his committee for a few years, so I hesitate to challenge him in this respect.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman hesitates, but he will go ahead.

Mr. SKAGGS. But I will go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

I assume the gentleman does recognize that we are already getting huge payoffs, real money, real energy saved presently from the conservation and efficiency efforts, whereas the prospects for eventual savings down the road for some of these other programs in the fossil area are just that. We believe they will produce these results, but they really do not have anything like the track record on energy saved presently that we are able to get from these dollars going into conservation.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point of view on this, and I would not quarrel with it, but I would point out that there are other factors here. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), in his usual eloquent way, pointed out that we have a situation here where energy conservation is being battled by the forces of old energy, old energy being of course fossil energy. Well, being sort of old myself, I think I tend to come down on the side of the forces of old energy. There are some old people working in these old energy fields that need jobs.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, there is a matter of the social dislocation caused by the impact of what

we are spending here, and I recognize that, as I think all of us should recognize, that in the long run, fossil energy is what we may have to depend upon when all of the more esoteric forms of energy have contributed as much as they can to our economy.

Coal, as a practical matter of fact, is still the largest source of energy that we have in this country or in the world, and we might as well learn to get the absolute, most effective use of that coal in the long run without neglecting of course the importance of saving energy, which I cannot quarrel with.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, our amendment does not touch coal.

Mr. BROWN of California. I accept that. Now let us get together and fight to get a little bit more money for these accounts when we go to conference with the Senate, and I trust the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be a conferee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do so to express in the strongest possible terms support for the Fox-Skaggs amendment which will restore needed funds for energy conservation programs, including low-income weatherization. That is very important, if one comes from the northeast part of the United States. Even with these added funds, the programs will still be funded at significantly lower levels than they were 4 years ago.

Now, I know it is not easy to be in the position of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), as the chairman, to deal with all of the competing requests. I think he has done a magnificent job overall, but I think the bill needs a little tweaking and I would think that he would not mind a little tweaking.

These programs are needed now more than ever before. We are actually more dependent today in 1998 on foreign oil than we were at the time of the Arab oil embargo, and we know even more how burning fossil fuels can harm the environment. That is a serious consideration, and we are in a more competitive economic environment, which makes efficiency of the essence.

These conservation programs take a sensible approach to addressing those needs. They do not mandate any actions; they underwrite efforts that create new methods to save energy, help get those methods put into practice, and particularly important, help poor Americans take advantage of these methods.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do what they have done in the past and restore funding for these important programs. Let me commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), particularly. He has been a real leader in this effort since he first came to the Congress, and I think emphasize

ing programs that try to demonstrate that government is compassionate and can appreciate the problems of those who are in special circumstances is very important, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), has done that. I think it is also very important to encourage the type of research into energy conservation that we are calling for here.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman agree, though, that if we spend 3 dollars on conservation efficiency, for every 1 dollar we spend on fossil research, that that is a pretty hefty balance in favor of efficiency. They have to go together, because the boilers, for example, will allow us to burn coal, get more Btus out of a lump of coal, and it gives us more security rather than depending on imports. We are faced with 60 percent of our petroleum coming from offshore here in the very near future, and we do not want that to happen.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, that is a cause for real concern, and as my dear friend and colleague knows, I have been a supporter of the clean coal technology program that some of my friends who probably were labeled green are somewhat offended by that, and I never could quite understand the logic.

But let me say in terms of this amendment, this bill here today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), have done an outstanding job. They deserve our support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. However well-intentioned, the gentlemen's turbine research offset is unfortunate.

In 1992, the Federal Government entered into a commitment with the Nation's gas turbine developers to develop a new generation of turbine. It would break through the temperature barriers that limit today's turbines; it would be more efficient, it would be more economical, and it would be much cleaner, so clean that it could be placed in the most environmentally constrained regions of the country.

Together, government and industry took the risk, and it is about to yield terrific results. The United States is on the verge of having turbine technology that no competitor can touch. In the coming year, the first prototypes will be assembled. In the year 2000 they will be tested, fulfilling the government's 1992 commitment. By 2001, the United States will be building and using a turbine that will be superior to any other in the world. Once that is done, our Nation will have a large share of what is expected to be a huge and growing market for advanced turbine technologies.

As the program has progressed, the developers who moved forward have been expected to pick up larger and larger shares of the costs. As the concepts have matured, industry's cost-sharing has exceeded 60 percent. Although industry now provides the major funding, our government's commitment must be honored.

If Congress withdraws its support, U.S. leadership in this field will be jeopardized. It is possible the program can be completed without government backing, but no one knows how long that would take, and we would run the risk of having this program caught up, passed up by foreign competition.

But if we honor our commitment, when the program is completed, we will have the best turbine in the market. Government support is still a critical part of this program. It is still a part of our commitment of 1992, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Skaggs amendment on energy efficiency and conservation programs.

I appreciate the difficulty in balancing the critical needs of our country in preparing the Interior Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. However, today I rise in strong support of the Skaggs amendment to restore much needed funding for our country's energy conservation programs. Of particular interest to my home state of Florida is the recommended \$10 million increase in funding for building technologies.

The windows and glazing programs, which is funded through the Building Technology Category, provides funding for a promising new technology with enormous energy saving potential for the commercial windows market. I am hopeful that the Skaggs amendment will lead to a funding increase in the windows and glazing programs, which would allow the further development of plasma enhanced chemical vapor deposition (PECVD) techniques for electrochromic technologies. This technology provides a flexible means of controlling the amount of heat and light that pass through a glass surface providing significant energy conservation opportunities. The Department of Energy estimates that placing this technology on all commercial building windows in the United States would produce yearly energy savings equivalent of the amount of oil that passes through the Alaskan pipeline each year.

In recognition of the importance of this technology, the State of Florida has provided over \$1.2 million toward the advancement of PECVD techniques for electrochromic applications. The program is being undertaken in conjunction with the University of South Florida and utilizes the expertise and patented technology of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado. The State of Florida's program has made significant progress toward making electrochromic windows a reality. This program is an excellent example of successful technology transfer from a national laboratory as well as an example of a successful public/private partnership.

The Florida program is consistent with industry priorities and goals of the Department of Energy's windows program. Earlier this year, twelve other members of the Florida

Congressional Delegation joined me in sending a letter to Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member YATES in support of PECVD funding to help further the development of this important technology. A significant portion of our country is experiencing the hottest summer on record, I believe this only helps illustrate the importance of our conservation programs.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SKAGGS for his commitment to energy conservation in his years in this House, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Skaggs amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) will be postponed.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, today I intended to offer an amendment to provide funding to prevent the spread of a serious threat to our Nation's urban ecology. Action to stem the incursion of these pests is required immediately if we are to control and isolate this ecological hazard.

Humans are not directly threatened by this insect; nevertheless, the flora that makes our communities livable and aesthetically pleasing places to inhabit is imperiled.

The Asian Longhorn is a tree killer. The beetle prefers to gestate in the leafy, deciduous trees that line roads and avenues in urban and suburban neighborhoods. In killing our trees, the beetles implant their larvae in the bark of healthy trees. The larvae feeds off the tree's wood to grow, eventually felling their hosts, and then moving on to repeat this devastating cycle elsewhere.

The ability of this insect to multiply and spread rapidly throughout our entire region is what makes the prompt action of our government, in conjunction with local authorities, so necessary. Currently, a 12-block area on Chicago's north side has been infected with the Asian Longhorn. Local ecologists fear that the zone of infestation may be larger than this area and are currently conducting expansive searches throughout the city to identify other infestations.

Dealing with this threat is no easy task. The remediation of this intruder requires a painful solution. The felling of inspected trees is the only proven means of preventing the spread of Asian Longhorn throughout America.

□ 1615

To date, there is no known usable pesticide to eradicate the beetles.

Sadly, infected trees will have to come down. In parts of New York City, the site of an early infestation last year, more than 1,000 trees were felled to prevent the beetle's spread. The Federal Government provided technical support and \$500,000 in assistance to New York with replanting efforts in affected communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge us to do the same in Illinois. The amendment I intended to offer would have appropriated \$1 million for beetle eradication and the replacing of trees in infected areas. I feel strongly that our potential spread of this foreign intruder and the danger it poses to our urban ecology warrant Federal assistance to avert ecological disaster.

Our memory of past ecological disasters should serve us well in rising to the challenges presented by the Asian Longhorn. As all baby boomers remember, our Nation's trees were visited by another alien pestilence in the 1960s. During that decade, Dutch Elm Disease killed hundreds of thousands of graceful elm trees in cities and towns throughout America. The quality of life was diminished. Property values declined.

Since that period, many urban areas have never recovered their forestry resources. We can ill afford another blight of this nature.

In Chicago, an aggressive tree planting program works to make the city green once again. The Asian Longhorn beetle threatens to derail our community's effort to make a beautiful, ecologically safe landscape.

Stopping this pest before it spreads and replacing the trees lost to accomplish this goal are enterprises worth funding by Congress. Future generations will thank us for our foresight.

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

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

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it was in the early 1960s, I think 1963 or 1964, that the United States was invaded by Beetles from abroad. It was a different kind of "beetle" back then. Now, we have beetles in the congressional district that I represent. Asian Longhorn beetles.

Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the comments that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) just made. Last week, the Asian Longhorn beetles were found infecting a dozen blocks in the Ravenswood neighborhood in Chicago's North Side in my congressional district. City officials and scientists from the United States Department of Agriculture are still trying to determine the extent of the infestation.

This threat is very real. This beetle came to the United States in wooden packing crates from Asia. A few years ago the Asian Longhorn beetle turned up in New York. It killed thousands of trees and cost more than \$4.3 million to kill them.

Experts tell us this invader could wreak the same kind of destruction in Chicago and, if allowed to spread, pose a threat to hardwood forests around the country.

Because this problem was just discovered, we did not have time to work with the subcommittee to find a way to address this issue. But we would appreciate any effort that the chairman could make as this bill goes to conference with the other body to find funding or a way to help the City of Chicago address this problem.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will not offer my amendment today, but instead will ask that the honorable gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, encourage the Forest Service to consider the situation in Chicago concerning the Asian Longhorn beetle infestation, and urge the Forest Service to devote necessary resources to eradicate the beetle and help the City of Chicago quickly replace the trees lost during this undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, I am very sympathetic because Ohio's elms have been devastated by the Dutch Elm disease, which is an infestation carried by beetles. The gentleman understands that limited resources are available to the Forest Service for this purpose. However, I recognize the threat posed by the Asian Longhorn beetle, and we will encourage the Forest Service to examine this situation, along with other similar problems, because one of the things that makes our cities beautiful are the trees.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation; and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, \$286,895,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$6,950,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided*, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the "Fire Protection" and "Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting

Fund" may be transferred and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a Bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., Protection of United States Property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, \$6,975,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907), \$120,000,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than \$100.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 Offered by Mr. SANDERS: In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is also supported by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and does two important things that I believe most Members of this body agree with.

First, it deals with a very serious problem of underfunded mandates, of forcing citizens in close to 1,800 coun-

ties in 49 States to pay more in local property taxes than they should be paying because the Federal Government has fallen very far behind in its payment in lieu of taxes on federally owned land.

In my own State of Vermont, over 50 towns in our southern counties are affected, including Bennington, Rutland, Addison, Windham, and Windsor Counties. This amendment addresses the overall problem of underfunded payments in lieu of taxes by increasing funding for this program by \$20 million, from \$120 to \$140 million.

Mr. Chairman, in real dollars, PILT payments to counties and towns all across this Nation have been decreasing for a very long time. In real dollars since 1980, appropriations for payment in lieu of taxes have decreased by nearly \$60 million, a one-third decline. And while this amendment will not rectify by any means the entire problem, it will at least allow communities around this country to know that we understand their problem and that we are making some real attempts to address it by appropriating an additional \$20 million.

Mr. Chairman, I should add that the authorization level for PILT today is approximately \$257 million, over twice the appropriation level. In other words, the authorizers understand the problems facing the communities, but unfortunately in recent years the appropriation process has not followed suit.

Mr. Chairman, the PILT program was established to address the fact that the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the land that it owns. These Federal lands can include National Forests, National Parks, Fish and Wildlife Refuges, and land owned by the Bureau of Land Management.

Like local property taxes, PILT payments are used to pay for school budgets, law enforcement, search and rescue, fire fighting, parks and recreation, and other municipal expenses.

Mr. Chairman, this is the important point that I think has to be made. There has been a lot of talk in this body in recent years about fiscal responsibility and about devolution, respect for counties, towns, and cities; saying we are the Federal Government, we have all the power, but you have got to respect the other agencies of government throughout America.

If we are serious about these concepts, then it is time for Congress to pay its bills. That is what this issue is about. The U.S. Government owns property and we should begin making the payments in lieu of taxes that we are supposed to.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would begin to address the unfunded mandate by increasing the payments in lieu of taxes program to approximately where it was 10 years ago. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, the \$50 million that we are using for these purposes, the purposes include \$20 million for payment in lieu of taxes, \$30 million for

deficit reduction. Over a \$5 trillion national debt; this amendment begins to address that issue. The funds would be transferred and offset from the Fossil Energy Research and Development Program.

In this regard, let me quote from the report of the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, the Republican resolution. And this is what that resolution says, and I quote:

The Department of Energy has spent billions of dollars on research and development since the oil crisis in 1973 triggered this activity. Returns on this investment have not been cost-effective, particularly for applied research and development which industry has ample incentive to undertake. Some of this activity is simply corporate welfare for the oil, gas, and utility industries. Much of it duplicates what industry is already doing. Some has gone to fund technology in which the market has no interest. End of quote.

That is the Republican budget resolution, not BERNIE SANDERS.

I should mention, Mr. Chairman, that over the years we have put \$15 billion into fossil energy programs. That is a lot of money.

Let me conclude by saying this. This amendment is endorsed by the National Association of Counties, by the Taxpayers for Common Sense, by Friends of the Earth, by Rural Public Lands Council, by the Sierra Club, by USPERG and Public Citizens.

This amendment is good environmental policy and it is good public policy in the sense that it tells communities all over America that we are going to pay our bills.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to help accomplish what I believe is long overdue, to begin addressing an inequity to the taxpayers in over 1,700 counties whose homes are located near lands owned by the Federal Government.

In fiscal year 1998 my home State of Kentucky is anticipating an estimated decrease of \$62,000 in PILT funding to eligible county governments. While I do not doubt the benefits of continued investments in fossil fuel developments, I remind my colleagues that we are looking at an authorized program that is only funded at an estimated level of 46 percent.

In my own district, it is difficult to justify to the good citizen of Edmonson County, the home of Mammoth Cave National Park, that it must accept a decrease in PILT funds while the Congress continues to fund \$320 million to research activities and programs that ought to be borne mostly by the private sector.

The fact is PILT funding is critically important to county governments that must rely on these annual payments to provide many basic services to their citizens, from education to solid waste management.

These services, by the way, often benefit the Federal lands and facilities.

In fact, Edmonson County today is providing a costly 24-hour ambulance service for the National Park Service, as well as its own residents.

Unfortunately, Edmonson County was one of 56 counties in my State of Kentucky that experienced a decrease in PILT payments in 1997. With an annual budget of \$629,000, a cut of \$3,000 translates into either reduced public services or higher local taxes. In a county with a per capita income of less than \$7,200, the importance of PILT funds cannot be overestimated.

These dollars are stretched to help pay county employees' salaries, administrative expenses, and the modest salaries paid to the local magistrates. At a time when Congress is encouraging State and local governments to accept more responsibility, an increase of PILT payments becomes more essential to help provide public services and much-needed relief to local taxpayers in Edmonson County and the thousands of other counties in which Federal lands are located.

However, let me assure my colleagues that the case of Edmonson County is not a unique situation. Without the increased funding proposed in the Sanders amendment, hundreds of county governments will again be shortchanged by the Federal Government. In the current fiscal year, an estimated 190 counties will have to absorb cuts in PILT funding greater than \$100. Even worse, 11 States will see reductions of \$1,000 or more.

I want to remind my colleagues that the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act calls on the Federal Government to compensate local governments to offset losses in property taxes due to Federal ownership of lands within their boundaries. The 105th Congress now has the opportunity to finally honor that commitment and to help reduce our deficit. A vote for the Sanders amendment is a vote for taxpayer fairness.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because of the merits of the proposal put forth by the sponsors but because of the offsets that they are proposing.

They are proposing \$50 million in reductions in the Fossil Fuel Research and Development Program. I say, Mr. Chairman, we in this country are dependent upon research and development in our fossil fuel program. We have a tremendous problem in this country in that we are dependent upon foreign oil. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), highlighted that a few moments ago.

In the United States we purchase 6.8 billion barrels of oil per year. Half of that is imported. That situation is probably only going to get worse with the recent discovery of oil in the Caspian Sea. We should not be reducing research and development into our fossil fuel program; we should be increasing it.

We now have the technology to convert coal and waste coal into liquid fuels; however, that needs to be perfected. As was mentioned many times during the debate on the last amendment, we have between 300 and 500 million years of coal reserves right here in the United States. That is more in coal reserves than the rest world has in oil reserves. I ask my colleagues to think about that.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be dependent upon our coal reserves, we need to invest in research and development so we can perfect technologies that we already know and so we can be looking into the next century to find alternative uses for the huge coal deposits that we have in this country.

□ 1630

I am very proud to represent northeastern Pennsylvania, where we have the largest anthracite coal deposit in North America, arguably the largest deposit in the world. It is a high Btu, low sulfur fuel that we cannot continue to turn our backs on by reducing the investment in research and development in fossil fuels. Because, quite frankly, that is what we have been doing over the last several appropriation cycles.

So I encourage all my colleagues to reject this amendment, to continue to invest in our own natural resources so we can be prepared for the next century.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Minnesota, (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) for their hard work and diligence on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor I rise in strong support of this amendment, which would restore desperately needed funding for the PILT program. Each year thousands of counties across the Nation lose out on millions of dollars in property tax revenue simply because the Federal Government owns the property. In my district, the Federal Government owns large portions of the land. For example, approximately 70 percent of Gogebic County is in the Ottawa National Forest.

Since the Federal Government does not pay property taxes on its own land, the PILT program was established to compensate our counties for the land the Federal Government owns. Since its adoption in 1976, the PILT program has neither kept pace with its authorized funding level nor with the true cost of providing services in support of Federal lands. In fact, the PILT program is currently funded at less than half of its authorized level.

Rural counties rely on PILT payments to provide essential services, such as education, law enforcement, emergency fire and medical research,

search and rescue, solid waste management, road maintenance, and other health and human services that need to be provided on Federal property. Without adequate funding for this program, rural counties will struggle to provide these vital services.

Mr. Chairman, if the Federal Government was required to pay taxes on the property it owns like any other individual or corporation, it would have been delinquent a long time ago for failure to pay taxes. The Federal Government has decided that it is in the best interest of this Nation to own and protect and to keep certain land. This does not mean that we must penalize our local communities because they have the fortune that the Federal Government has jurisdiction over these lands. It is irresponsible for the Federal Government to take these lands off the tax roles and then not justly compensate these local communities.

Mr. Chairman, this is only a small increase in the PILT program, but its impact and importance to rural counties is tremendous. In fact, Mr. Chairman, 49 of the 50 States receive PILT payments. I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for equity by voting in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once again I wish to thank the gentleman from Vermont for his authorship of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to add one point.

The subsidies for fossil fuels are targeted in the Green Scissors 1998 report, which is supported by organizations representing more than 8.5 million environmentalists, taxpayers and deficit hawks. So this is a popular concept that we are addressing, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his strong support.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to speak in support of the Sanders amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases payments in lieu of taxes funding for counties and schools by \$20 million for fiscal year 1999. More than 20 years ago this Congress recognized a serious inequity that existed in areas containing a high percentage of Federal property. Because the Federal Government does not pay taxes on its own property, these areas were left without any source of funding to provide for local schools and county services.

In 1976, we attempted to correct this inequity and provided funding in the form of payments in lieu of taxes, or PILT payments. However, since providing these payments, this Congress has failed to fully fund the PILT program. Each year 1,789 communities in 49 States lose needed Federal payments due to the failure of the Federal Government to appropriately compensate

these communities for lost property tax revenue on federally owned lands. The Sanders amendment corrects this shortcoming and provides an increase of necessary funding for communities in my own State of California.

To put this into perspective, many of the areas that will receive this funding were under water in January of 1997, when midwinter storms caused severe flooding. At that time the State of California suffered approximately \$1.8 billion in damage. Each of the 10 counties in my district was declared a natural disaster area. The additional dollars in PILT payments are sorely needed to rebuild after the serious disaster.

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

If these same cuts had been made in an urban and inner city area, lawsuits would have been filed and services leveled would have necessarily been restored.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot of discussion over the need for Medicare and the need to provide medical services for many of our elderly residents. Before any of our citizens can receive Medicare or Medicaid assistance, they first must have roads to travel on to get to the hospitals, ambulances to carry them in, when needed, and hospitals to go to. By underfunding our rural counties, we have forced these counties to cut back on these kinds of county services.

Other county services that have been cut include search and rescue, law enforcement, snow plowing, bridge maintenance and all local ground support for maintenance of Federal lands. If these county services were to go away, the Federal Government would not have an infrastructure in place to service its public lands. When visitors get lost on public lands, it is the county search and rescue that comes to their aid, and when visitors on public lands need police protection, that need is filled by county services.

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

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his support and for his eloquent

remarks. I would just mention, Mr. Chairman, that in terms of the offset that we are talking about, fossil energy programs have received over \$15 billion in 1995 dollars in Federal funding since 1974.

Maybe it is about time we pay attention to the counties and the small towns in California and Vermont.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The gentleman from Vermont is attempting to increase funding for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program to reimburse localities for their lost tax revenue because of national parks, military installations and other Federal lands within their borders. This is an important issue, and the gentleman from Vermont and his colleagues raise some important arguments. I know that in my State of Pennsylvania there are some worthy local governments that are hoping to see a needed increase in their Payment in Lieu of Taxes. But I cannot support this amendment because of what is being cut in order to pay for this.

The fossil energy program at the Department of Energy is very important for the work it does to support cost-shared research and development to make the energy resources we use the cleanest and cheapest they can be. This program is not very well known, except maybe here in the House around July of every year when it seems to be the most convenient and popular offset for a number of other important programs that deserve funding. But the fossil energy research at the Department of Energy is fulfilling the vital function of protecting our energy security, increasing efficiency, and making our energy use cleaner.

Domestically, the simple fact is that U.S. resources, like oil, coal and natural gas, are the main sources we rely on. The Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration reports that 85 percent of our energy currently comes from fossil fuels. This figure will go up, not down, in the coming years. By 2015, 88 percent of the energy we consume will come from fossil fuels. Our national appetite for energy continues to grow and it is expected that by the year 2015 our energy needs will grow by almost 20 percent.

Internationally, in the new post-Cold War world, I think we all know what a wide range of uncertainties that the U.S. faces that have the potential to disrupt our energy imports. Fossil energy research helps make us make the most of our domestic energy resources as well as stretch to the maximum the fuels we do import. Here at home, fossil energy is the biggest thing we have going, so we ought to make the most of it.

Renewable fuel research, solar, wind, geothermal, nuclear, and a lot of other options make a lot of sense too, and I think we should do more work in those areas. But oil, natural gas and coal are what our domestic energy distribution is currently based on, and that fact is not going to change overnight no matter what advancements we make in using other energy sources.

The emerging renewables, solar, wind and geothermal, currently supply less than 1 percent of the energy needs in the United States. I have nothing against these alternative energy sources, and I think they can help diversify our Nation's energy mix, but under any realistic scenario they will only supply a small fraction of our energy needs for the next decades. On the other hand, our Nation is going to rely more and more on natural gas in the future. It is a clean burning fuel, and it can solve many of our energy and environmental problems.

But where are we going to get this gas and how much are we going to pay for it? We still need technological advancements to economically produce the trillions of cubic feet of natural gas located in difficult-to-access geological settings within our borders, and that is the work that fossil fuel research is doing.

There is also coal, our most abundant energy resource. I am sure most Americans do not realize that coal supplies 55 percent of our electricity. Increasingly stringent environmental regulations are making coal power generation and pollution control more expensive. Innovative, low-cost approaches to environmental controls are needed. The efficiency of power generation also needs to be improved to make sure we get every bit of available energy out of the coal we burn.

There is simply no way we can give up the use of our vast domestic coal deposits and yet still keep energy prices affordable and keep our economy competitive. That is also something that the fossil fuel research program is working on.

Finally, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont cuts \$50 million from the fossil energy research to pay for only a \$20 million increase in the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program. The remaining \$30 million would go to deficit reduction. I would like to say that I think we all know there has been a lot of good work on this issue of cutting the deficit, and there is definitely a lot more work to do, but the way this amendment is structured, I am concerned that this may simply be a gratuitous swipe at this year's easy target, fossil energy research, depositing the \$30 million in change for deficit reduction.

Fossil energy research offers tangible benefits to the American economy and does not deserve to be viewed in this light. Fossil energy research does not deserve this \$50 million cut. Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

The splendid argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania misses the mark. We are not talking about fossil fuel research, we are talking about adequate funding and fair funding of payment in lieu of taxes, and our amendment on this matter in no way is a reflection adversely on the splendid work of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The gentleman from Ohio has done a splendid job balancing all these interests. We understand the extremely difficult job he has had to do, and we appreciate the consideration for payment in lieu. We are just trying to rearrange the chairs on the deck of Good Ship Regula here.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I think it is money instead of chairs.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Well, Mr. Chairman, the money in the bank of Good Ship Regula, then.

But I was not only an author, original coauthor of payment in lieu of taxes. When I was administrative assistant, my predecessor, John Botnick, actually wrote the language that became in 1976 the payment in lieu of taxes legislation based on a very simple, elemental principle.

□ 1645

These lands: national forests, national wilderness areas, national parks, scenic waterways, are held in trust for all Americans to use and enjoy. But what about the neighbors to those wonderful national treasures, the neighbors, the communities, the people that live next to them who have to support the services provided for all those national treasures?

Take a look in my own district. Cook County is 82 percent in public ownership. Lake County is 92 percent in public ownership. St. Louis County, which is about the size of the State of Massachusetts, is 62 percent public ownership. That remaining small amount of land held in private hands has to provide the property taxes to support the services for all those 6-million-plus people who come from all over America to see these great national treasures.

We have debated on this floor many times the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in the Superior National Forest, land with water so pure that you can paddle along and drink the water right fresh from the rivers and the lakes, and they want it preserved for all Americans. That is terrific. But in order to do that, there are expensive landfills, there are expensive sanitation programs that St. Louis County and Lake County and Cook County all have to support that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

St. Louis County's budget has gone up \$77 million since we enacted the Payment in Lieu of Taxes. That is a 30-percent increase, even with being very frugal. But Payment in Lieu of Taxes has not gone up at all for them.

And yet, when the fisherman with the fish hook caught in the eye from Iowa or Illinois who has gone up there to go fishing needs rescue, it is the St. Louis County, the Lake County and the Cook County sheriff's department and rescue department that are going to have to send the people out to haul those people out of the woods and save their lives. They have to be paid. Those services have to be paid for, and we are not keeping up with the cost.

St. Louis County has 3,000 miles of county road to support the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the Voyageurs National Park. They are not getting any increase in funds for those counties to provide the support services that are necessary. That is what this amendment is all about. It is not us against them. It is not Minnesota or Vermont against Pennsylvania. It is all of us together.

It is unfortunate we have had to deal with this account for coal research. But there has been, as has been said previously, billions of dollars in coal research, plenty of money for that and still plenty of money available for it.

What we are saying is, keep faith and trust with the people who live in these national treasures to whom we said, "We are going to help you keep pace."

The value of lands in St. Louis County in those areas that are held in national trust is 27 cents an acre, authorized funding under Payment in Lieu of Taxes. If those same lands were in timber production, as they well should be and could be, they would be valued at \$2.59 an acre.

Counties certainly take care of all the road and rescue and fire and safety and other needs of the county to provide for all the services that would be necessary to support that activity. We are not saying return those lands to private commercial development. We are saying keep them in national trust, but also keep our trust with the people who are neighbors to those national lands and let them keep pace. Why should they have to continue to dig ever deeper in the property tax that stretches them too far?

This amendment restores a measure of fairness and equity to all those neighbors of these great national treasures.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Sanders amendment. The offset is not my first choice, but the issue of PILT is so important, I think, to rural America that I am supporting this amendment.

The only thing sure in life is death and taxes. That is for my colleagues and I. But for the Federal Government,

for 2 decades I feel they have straight-armed, they have stiffed rural America, because they took lands into public ownership with a promise to pay and have never delivered in 20 years what is a fair Payment in Lieu of Tax payment. The Federal Government today continues to purchase private land and remove it from the tax rolls and continues not to pay its fair share of taxes or PILT.

What happens to my colleagues or I if we do not pay our taxes? Our property is sold, our taxes get paid. Maybe it is time for a Federal land tax sale to pay the debt that I think is owed to rural America. The Federal Government is the largest owner of land in America, where we are approaching 40 percent. We are the most delinquent taxpayer in the history of America.

The Sanders amendment is a small step in the right direction. It does not solve the problem. And the question is asked, what is the impact when land is taken out of the tax base? It is the following: It has been devastating to rural America. Zero economic growth. Zero job creation. No aid for roads, water, sewer, and public schools and local services. A devastating impact.

There are 1,789 counties involved, 49 states affected by this lack of Payment in Lieu of Taxes. Now, in Pennsylvania, where I come from, we pay \$1.20 an acre. It was 60 cents in one of the last bills I helped get through. I had sponsored it for 6 or 8 years. I gave up sponsorship to get a House bill through the Senate, doubling it to \$1.20.

Now, we own 840 million acres approximately. If we were paying \$1.20, the bill would be in excess of a billion dollars.

Now, someone mentioned a few moments ago that this included military bases. That is not true, if my understanding is correct. There is impact aid which got a \$40-million increase, a different budget or different part of the budget, different appropriations bill. But it is urban and suburban and it has been increased with some regularity and they get \$640 million.

Now, as I am look at it, when we remove property from the tax base of rural America, with no chance of economic growth, military bases bring jobs to the community, they bring stimulus to the community and the spin-off is tremendous, yet we are giving them \$640 million. And that is a fairness issue.

For two decades we have underfunded PILT. In 1994, when PILT was reauthorized, Congress developed a 5-year phase-in to make up for the forgone revenues caused by 17 years of inflation and they raised the authorization to \$255.5 million for this year. Despite those good intentions, we are still stuck at \$120 million, which is inadequate for the communities that have been shortchanged. \$135 million is needed just to bring us to level funding.

The Sanders amendment gives us a shot in the arm. I am from the East

and I know this is a Western issue, but it affects Pennsylvania and it affects this country. Public land owners need to contribute to local services, and for those of us who continue to support more and more ownership of land by the Federal Government, it is time to pay up.

Too often issues affecting rural America are overlooked and subsequently underfunded. I am here to say today, as a new Member of this Congress, it is no different than when I went to the State senate. Rural America has been getting the short end of the stick in a lot of ways, and this is just one of them, because they do not have the united voice of urban-suburban America.

It is time for the Government to pay up or turn back to the States or local governments this public land. And if we continue to not pay our share, maybe it is time for a tax sale, where we sell some of the Federal land to pay the tax base back to the local governments where it should be in the first place.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his perceptive remarks. He is right on the money, and I would again reiterate that since 1974 the Federal Government has put in over \$15 billion in fossil energy research while we are shortchanging rural America.

According to the CBO, the beneficiaries of the Petroleum Research and Development program are some of the largest multinational corporations in the world, including Exxon, Chevron, Conoco, Texaco, Amoco, Phillips Petroleum, etc., shortchanging rural America, providing corporate welfare for large corporations that do not need it.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, does Allegheny National Forest get many visitors?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, yes, it gets visitors.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman would yield further, do the visitors spend a lot of money in the communities?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this would not affect the Allegheny National Forest. The PILT payments do not affect the Allegheny National Forest. They affect some other land in my district.

To the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), who I consider a good friend and an outstanding chairman, I think

the PILT issue does not really affect the NF because they get timber payments. But it is so unfair, when we have taken all of this land out of the local tax base across this country. I am arguing for it for fairness for rural America.

I come from the most rural district east of the Mississippi, and I will be tough on rural issues. I just think somehow this Congress has to pay up at some point in time and pay what should go back to local communities.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, would he favor putting this public land on the market and getting it back in the private sector?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think there is public land owned in America, yes, that should go back. It would be better served in local communities' ownership, local, State government, yes.

I think the Federal Government should not own 40 percent of America. I think we own too much land, and we have been accumulating it for decades, and that is a policy that should change.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was not planning on coming here to speak on this, but I have to. Simply sitting back in my office and listening to this discussion, my feelings, and the time that I worked with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), my feelings for him are of great affection and normally I am on the same side. And in fact, as it comes to the Payment in Lieu of Taxes issue, my heart is with him.

However, when they come after the fossil research, we are in a situation right now, I happened to be in Kyoto last December, and everybody is jumping up and down and screaming to us that the sky is falling, that we have to come up with alternative methods and cleaner methods of providing energy.

I thought that the Skaggs amendment was interesting, because we were talking just previous to this about the comparison of conservation to doing clean fossil fuel technology. And the fact of the matter is, in conservation we can only do so much. It takes energy to run the world. It takes energy to run industry, to run our everyday lives. With conservation, we can do a lot but we can only do so much.

The question then is going to be where will this energy come from? Will it be from domestic production? We have got so much coal, and if we have the ability, the fact of the matter is, yes, we have spent a lot of money on fossil technology and we have not hit the home run yet, but we are getting closer and closer every day.

Just yesterday on the way down here I traveled through the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I was down at Peach Bottom Nuclear Power Plant. And the fact

of the matter is that even those who are proponents of nuclear energy say that they realize we are not going to build in our lifetime any more nuclear power plants. And right now we happen to have cheap oil. So at a time when 85 percent of the energy of this Nation is coming from fossil fuels, the question is where are we going to go?

And by the year 2015, as my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and others have said, we predict it is going to be up to 80 percent of our fuel usage from fossil fuel. We are going to see more and more nuclear power plants come off line.

So if in fact global warming is a reality, how are we going to deal with this? How are we going to develop the kind of technology that is going to let this Nation be self-sufficient?

Everyone wants to go after the fossil fuel technology. That is what is running this country. And, yes, I come from the coal fields of southern Ohio. I come from the coal fields of southwestern Pennsylvania. I lived in those two States almost all of my life. My family were miners of coal. And it was their labors beneath the soil of this country that gave this energy, this cheap energy to this country that allowed the industrial revolution to move forward. It allowed us to have the kind of lifestyle that we enjoy and have the power that this great country has today, because they went under the earth to dig that coal. And now we want to say to them, forget about it. We have got a problem with Payment in Lieu of Taxes. Let us forget about the coal miners.

I am going to tell my colleagues what. When those capitalists in other parts of the world, like the Middle East, finally figure out how to get control of us, when they finally figure out how indeed they can hold us hostage like they did in the 1973 oil embargo, in the 1979 oil embargo, I sat in those lines, as many Members here did, waiting for fuel. We could get fuel on odd days if we happened to have an odd number, in even days if we happened to have an even number. We forgot about that because the price of oil has gone down.

□ 1700

But now we are going to attack the fossil fuels in order to solve a problem that has nothing at all to do with the fossil fuels.

If in fact we are worried about global warming, if we are worried about having a certain style of life for our children and their children's children, we have to continue to invest in this technology. For the foreseeable future, we are dependent upon these fossil fuels. There is no way around it.

I wish that my friends, who have a very valid point on payment in lieu of taxes, would have come up with a different offset. I would like to be able to support them. But what they are doing, I think, in my estimation is wrong-headed, and I would urge the Members

of this House to soundly reject my friends' amendment.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we get the facts out. I understand the concern of my colleagues who would like to have more payment in lieu of taxes, but let me point out that their public lands generate an enormous flow of visitors, all of whom spend money and pay taxes on the purchases they make which flow to the respective governments. Two hundred seventy-eight million visitor days in the Park Service, 850 million visitor days in the Forest Service, 30 million visitor days in the Fish and Wildlife, 65 million visitor days in BLM.

Let me point out something else. This committee has cut fossil energy research by over 30 percent over the past 3 years in spite of the fact that we have become less secure as far as our energy needs. At the same time while we were cutting fossil research by 30 percent, we were adding 18 percent to PILT.

It would be nice to have more PILT money obviously, but we have to strike a balance. We have to be less dependent on other resources around the world. We have to make our country's energy secure. None of this will mean anything if we do not have security as far as the access to energy.

Electric utilities have made dramatic reductions thanks to fossil research. Let me point out that the fossil research is all matched. It is not all Federal money. That is the reason that the gentleman's amendment puts \$20 million into PILT but takes \$50 million out of fossil, because PILT spends out every dollar. Fossil will be spent out over a period of years as the research develops being matched by the private sector. This is not an unfunded mandate that we are addressing. That is an erroneous use of a term. This is giving counties money to compensate.

These Federal lands do not send children off of the lands into the school system. They do generate an enormous flow of money from the visitors that come into the communities. Therefore, I think it is important that we keep the fossil programs going.

EPA is proposing to reduce the small particulate requirement from 10 to 2.5 PM. That is .04, the diameter of a human hair. How are we going to get to these mandates, imposed by EPA unless we continue a program of fossil research? Keep in mind we have reduced it already 30 percent over the 3-year period while we were increasing PILT by 18 percent. In 22 eastern and mid-western States, the regulations will require a reduction in ozone and smog. How are we going to keep these plants operating unless we continue the research?

Certainly, the private sector is committed to this. They match the money that we put into energy research dollar for dollar. I think it is vitally important to this Nation's future that we maintain this research in fossil. The new regulations are going to cost utilities \$7 billion. You talk about cost to your taxpayers if we do not give them more PILT. They are going to pay it in the electric bills if we do not do the fossil energy research.

One of the great values of fossil energy research is the fact that we are holding down the cost of gasoline at the pump. We are holding down the cost of electricity, items that contribute substantially to the cost of living. That is a benefit to everybody in the United States. We have the world's strongest economy today on a per capita basis. Why? Because we have cheap energy, because our industries have modernized, because the people in this country work hard and they work smart, as one Member said earlier. But to do this we need to support the fossil energy research programs. I do not think it makes good sense in terms of national policy to reduce energy research further. We already are cutting it by 30 percent over the past 3 years.

I understand why the Members who have public lands would like to have more money for their programs. But nevertheless we have to strike a balance. That is what we have tried to do in this subcommittee.

I would urge Members to vote against this amendment. I do not think it is responsible public policy in terms of the 265 million Americans that would be affected adversely by failure to continue a strong program of fossil energy research.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing con-

necting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; \$98,407,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102-381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq., and Public Law 103-66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94-579, as amended, and Public Law 93-153, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: *Provided further*, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to \$100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

Section 28f(a) of title 30, U.S.C., is amended by striking beginning with the words "The holder" and continuing through "\$100 per claim," and inserting in lieu thereof: "The holder of each unpatented mining claim, mill or tunnel site, located pursuant to the mining laws of the United States before October 1, 1998 shall pay the Secretary of the Interior, on or before September 1, 1999 a claim maintenance fee of \$100 per claim site."

Section 28g to title 30, U.S.C., is amended by striking "1998" and inserting in lieu thereof "1999".

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, \$607,106,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000, except as otherwise provided herein, of which \$11,648,000 shall remain available until expended for operation and maintenance of fishery mitigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan, authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, to compensate for loss of fishery resources from water development projects on the Lower Snake River, and of which not less than \$2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$1,000,000 for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,256,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e)

of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsections (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)): *Provided further*, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to \$400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further*, That hereafter, all fees collected for Federal migratory bird permits shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for the expenses of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in administering such Federal migratory bird permits, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That hereafter, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary shall charge reasonable fees for the full costs of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in operating and maintaining the M/V Tiglax and other vessels, to be credited to this account and to be available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to \$1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; \$66,100,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, \$30,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES
CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543), as amended, \$15,000,000, for grants to States, to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), \$10,779,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION
FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101-233, as amended, \$12,700,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION
FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, \$800,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201-4203, 4211-4213, 4221-4225, 4241-4245, and

1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-96), and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301-5306), \$2,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of amounts previously appropriated to the African Elephant Conservation Fund, Rewards and Operations account, and Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Fund may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, donations to provide assistance under section 5304 of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, subchapter I of the African Elephant Conservation Act, and section 6 of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 shall be deposited to this Fund: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, all penalties received by the United States under 16 U.S.C. 4224 which are not used to pay rewards under 16 U.S.C. 4225 shall be deposited to this Fund, to be available to provide assistance under 16 U.S.C. 4211: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, not more than three percent of amounts appropriated to this Fund may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to administer the Fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 104 passenger motor vehicles, of which 89 are for replacement only (including 38 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the report accompanying this bill: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Secretary may sell land and interests in land, other than surface water rights, acquired in conformance with subsections 206(a) and 207(c) of Public Law 101-618, the receipts of which shall be deposited to the Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake Fish and Wildlife Fund and used exclusively for the purposes of such subsections, without regard to the limitation on the distribution of benefits in subsection 206(f)(2) of such law: *Provided further*, That section 104(c)(50)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361-1407) is amended by adding the words "until expended" after the word "Secretary" in the second sentence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Page 16, after line 17, insert the following, and renumber all lines accordingly:

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

(a) UNIT SC-03.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in paragraph (2) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on that map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map entitled "Amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated May 15, 1997, and on file with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) The map described in this paragraph is the map that—

(A) is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System" and dated October 24, 1990; and

(B) relates to unit SC-03 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(b) UNIT FL-35P.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, make such corrections to the map described in paragraph (2) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on the map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map entitled "Amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated October 22, 1997, and on file with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) The map described in this paragraph is the map that—

(A) is included in a set of maps entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System", dated October 24, 1990; and

(B) relates to unit FL-35P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(c) UNIT FL-35.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, revise the map depicting unit FL-35 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System to exclude Pumpkin Key from the System.

Mr. SANFORD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical correction that has been brought to our attention by the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is one offered by myself and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH). It is one that has been discussed with the majority and the minority without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general admin-

istration of the National Park Service, including not less than \$1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706, \$1,333,328,000, of which not to exceed \$12,500,000 may be used for salaries and expenses of the Denver Service Center, and of which not less than \$600,000 is for salaries and expenses associated with new hires of mineral examiners at the Mojave National Preserve, and of which \$12,800,000 for research, planning and interagency coordination in support of land acquisition for Everglades restoration shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201 of Public Law 100-203.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, \$41,939,000, of which \$4,500,000 is for grants to Heritage areas in accordance with section 606 of title VI, division I and titles I-VI and VIII-IX, division II of Public Law 104-333.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California:

Page 17, line 22, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)"

Page 37, line 10, after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this important amendment to the Interior appropriations bill which will provide urgently needed recreation and after-school opportunities for our Nation's youth. This amendment will rejuvenate the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, or UPARR program which has languished for the last couple of years.

The UPARR program, the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, provides competitive matching grants of up to \$200,000 to local communities to help them design programs to meet youth recreation needs. Research shows that many of our most serious youth-related problems, including juvenile crime, drug use, gang activity and teenage sexual activity occur most frequently during the hours immediately after the end of school when 5 to 7 million children go home alone every afternoon. The Urban Parks Program helps local communities to fund programs to reduce juvenile crime, to provide safe havens for our youth and to offer constructive academic or recreational opportunities after school. That is why the Urban Park Program is supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues, Major League Baseball, the National Recreation and Park Association and the National Council of Youth Sports.

Many other organizations support this effort.

This program enables and makes small grants to communities to try to recover, to revitalize, to rehabilitate the recreational facilities in their communities so that they will then be able to offer young people an alternative to doing nothing or to getting into trouble in after-school hours and on the weekends. This is an effort to try to reclaim a baseball field, to try to reclaim maybe a tennis court, to reclaim a recreational area for young people, swimming pools, bathhouses. Very often some of our older facilities have fallen into disuse. They have not been kept up. Now, what we see is in partnership with organizations like the Professional Golf Association, in partnership with the National Basketball Association, with the Sporting Goods Manufacturers, with Major League Baseball, we are coming together, attracting private money with these grants to revitalize these recreational facilities.

This money is offset because I take it from an account where we are giving \$11 million to the Northern Mariana Islands, and I am reducing that by \$2 million for the purposes of the Urban Parks and Recreation Program. I am doing that because the money that goes to the Northern Marianas to date, they have been unwilling to match that money and that is a requirement of that money. Yet what we see is communities all over the country seeking to match the money from the Urban Parks Program. They have put up their money, they have gotten local sponsors, they have gotten the private sector to buy into these, and they want to use the money. But we see an account with respect to the Northern Marianas where there is over \$80 million that is sitting there, sitting in their account, and they are unwilling to match it and now we are going to add another \$11 million.

What I am suggesting is we would be better to give that money to the city of Phoenix or to Pueblo or to Bridgeport or to Savannah or to Peoria or to Kokomo or Kalamazoo, where these communities are hungry to do something for their young people, they are hungry to try to combat crime problems, to combat drug problems, to create sporting activities, to create sporting teams, to create academic programs combined with sports programs so that young people will have these kinds of alternatives.

□ 1715

Rather than have this money languish in an account where the recipient of the money refuses to match it, we ought to give it to those communities that they are seeking to match it.

There is a huge backlog of communities that are desiring this effort that have gone out and made the push, made the push within their private sector to gather resources to get in-kind contributions or to get monetary programs that have worked with citizen

programs where people volunteer to rebuild, to paint facilities, to recapture much of what many of us have experienced when we grew up when we knew the importance that recreation played in our childhood, and teaching us the rules of sportsmanship, and teaching us the discipline of practice, and teaching us how to engage with other individuals, and giving us productive time to use when we were not in school or not engaged in other activities.

That is why it is important that we adopt this amendment. It will not harm. It will not harm the account with respect to the Marianas because, as I pointed out, they have a huge backlog of money that they have been unwilling to match for the purposes for which Congress has appropriated that money.

So I would urge my colleagues, many of you have heard from your mayors, many of you have heard from the sporting good manufacturers, many of you have heard from volunteer organizations in your communities that are struggling, struggling to try to rebuild and recapture and revitalize these facilities.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to our children. We now understand, there are studies, there, you stack them up, they are taller than I am, that tell us the most important time to capture the time of young people is that time from after school until the time that their parents or guardians come home. That is when most of the crime is committed by young people. That is when young people get into trouble most of the time.

But in many, many communities, and if you look at the list of the communities that are making applications for this program, in many communities they simply do not have a constructive alternative to offer to these young people.

We have done this with the UPARR program. We can continue to do it with the UPARR program, and we can do it in the constructive fashion so that we can take advantage of the energies of these young people and the willingness of the local communities to come up with the matching money, to come up with the local energy to create these facilities. I would hope that the House would approve this amendment, and I ask for an aye vote on this amendment.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has said we have heard from the manufacturers of tennis rackets, from the manufacturers of basketballs, tennis balls, guns, you name it, all these sporting goods outfits. Now we are going to hear from the people that work in the parks, that work in the forests, that work in the fish and wild-

life, that work in BLM, and I am going to speak for them.

The gentleman is asking them to fix the roof in their spare time. He is asking them to go out and repair bridges in their spare time. We saw that when we were out in Yosemite. The employees told us "we did a lot of the work here to offset the damage from the big flood ourselves in our free time."

We had oversight hearings this year. We have \$10 billion, not million, \$10 billion of backlog maintenance. That is not my number. That is a number from the Director of the parks, from the Director of the Forest Service, from the Directors of the Fish and Wildlife Services, and from BLM, \$10 billion of maintenance left undone.

One of the people testified that, for every dollar of maintenance that is neglected, it costs \$5 down the road. Let us not take money out of these programs. If we have extra money, let us address the backlog maintenance. Let us not worry about manufacturers of tennis rackets or baseball bats.

That is what UPARR is. Build tennis courts. Build baseball fields. It is nice. But 47 States have surpluses. It is about time for them to come into this program. Let the States work with the local communities to provide these recreational facilities. I have not had any State offer money to deal with backlog maintenance on Federal lands. If you want to take care of those precious crown jewels that we keep talking about, we need any extra money that we have to be spent on backlog maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Nobody has been more diligent in trying to warn this Congress and the country about the backlog in the national parks and in the public lands with respect to maintenance and even, to some extent, and clearly, in acquisition.

But let me say that is not the competition that this amendment is. This is money that is put into an account for the Northern Marianas. They have been unwilling over the last several years to match that money; and there is now, according to the budget, about \$80 million sitting in that account.

All I am suggesting is that we take that \$2 million and help these cities. People are volunteering their time here. I work every weekend with organizations and try to help organizations that are paying for the ball fields and trying to recover these facilities so that they can use them for their children. So we are not matching volunteers here. We are matching an account that has more money in it than they can possibly use as opposed to this program where people can use it for recreational opportunities for the young people.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's point. Frankly, since the gentleman men-

tioned it, I am going to take a quick look at that and see if we cannot get that \$80 million to put into backlog maintenance. I think that is a wonderful idea.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would support the gentleman. We can do it right now.

Mr. DICKS. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, why does the gentleman not, for the gentleman's diligence and good work, at least give him the \$2 million?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest to the National Governors' Association that they adopt the Miller amendment. I think, with their surpluses and all but maybe a handful of States, 47 to be exact, they ought to take care of this. I do appreciate the gentleman calling to my attention this money that is available.

Mr. MILLER of California. Now the gentleman is going to steal the money from me. No good deeds go unrewarded.

Mr. REGULA. It could end up with about \$9 billion of backlog instead of \$10 billion if we can get that \$80 million the gentleman has been telling us about.

I realize it is not exactly apples and oranges. But all I am saying is that, when we are faced with \$10 billion in backlog, when we are faced with our employees who are spending their free time, many of them, doing this work in our public lands facilities, I do not think we should start building tennis courts and golf courses and baseball fields in our communities. That is a local responsibility.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we can make that argument about a lot of efforts. But when we address the crime bill and we are looking at the priorities, this was one of them. The point is, this provides, you know, a small match that brings together a lot of private resources and some public resources at the local level. The governors of the State, unfortunately, this is not on their agenda. These are a lot of cities that are trying to provide some local recreation opportunities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REGULA was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this ought to be in the crime bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. It was.

Mr. REGULA. I think that is a logical place to put it rather than to take money from our parks and our forests.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not taking them.

Mr. REGULA. I understand, but the gentleman from California is not off-setting. But if that money is available, we would like to get it and use it for public lands.

Mr. MILLER of California. But that is not my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Miller amendment. Not to get into a fight with the chairman or anyone else, but I think that, in other parts of this budget, we are taking out all the money for summer jobs in this country.

We are looking at cities filled with kids where, on the one hand, we are not going to help them get a summer job, and, on the other hand, we are not willing to put some money to invest in recreational facilities so that they can be involved in organized activities that will keep them out of difficulty.

We all know from our own childhood, if not from someplace else, that idle hands are the devil's workshop. I remember in the crime bill discussion, we had an awful lot of people out here jumping up and down saying that midnight basketball was not a good idea. But if we go by the places even in this city at night where there is a light and a hoop, we will see kids playing basketball. I think we would rather have them doing that than some of the other things they can think of doing.

For us to take \$2 million out of \$80 million that is sitting somewhere being unused because we have a law that says we have to put the money in there, we made some kind of deal, but they never match it. I am up here because Seattle put in a grant for \$250,000, and we know how to use it. We have got the matched money ready to go, but we would like access to this money.

I think there are cities all over this country where, whether you like it or not, as we have devolved programs from the Federal level down to the State level, there are lots of States dealing with lots of things they did not use to deal with, so they are unwilling to take care of the needs of cities.

If somebody does not take care of the needs of cities, we are going to be in serious trouble in this country. So I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a brief moment?

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentions Seattle, Washington, I wanted to point out that in the past, funding has also contributed to the development of programs and projects such as the innovation project established in Tacoma, Washington. The goals of this innovative project were to provide at-risk youth alternatives to gangs and drugs through participation in outdoor recreation activities and to develop life skills such as self-esteem, leadership, decision-making and cooperation.

The program was designed to operate as an extensive partnership involving professionals from the disciplines of parks and recreation, education, city

government, social services and criminal justice.

It was designed to operate year round with expanded activity during the summer months and over extended holiday periods. Youth participants were involved through various avenues such as schools, home school associations, youth service agencies, and neighborhood community centers.

The program has provided various activities such as backpacking in Olympic National Park; whitewater rafting on the Thompson River in British Columbia; cross-country skiing in Mount Ranier National Park; winter camping, inner-tubing and snow shoeing in various winter sports areas; water safety instruction; fishing, canoeing, boating and swimming, mountain packing on designated State and Federal lands; weekly environmental education outdoor skills workshops, leadership training for advanced youth participants and youth hosteling and meeting travelers from around the world.

I have listened carefully to my chairman, and it seems to me for this small investment if we can do and provide more opportunities for kids after school to be in programs like this, and if the Park Service can play a role in this, I certainly support the gentleman from California.

I will work as hard as anyone on the backlog, but if we have got \$80 million sitting in a trust fund and the chairman can get \$78 million of it for the backlog and we can get \$2 million for this urban recreation thing, I think that is the kind of program the American people support. It is prevention of crime that we should be focusing on, and having some opportunities out there through this bill seems to me to be a good idea.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, on the point both he and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) have made, if we go back into our childhoods, we all know the value of a coach, the value of the mentor, the value of the after-school recreation director that helped us get over some trouble spots when we were young children, when we were adolescents. That opportunity and that relationship is being denied to too many children today in America.

This is a small effort. This is not going to solve a problem, but this has been an effective effort when we put the money into it. Unfortunately, the last couple of years it has languished, and I just think it is an important one that should be embraced by the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). People should under-

stand what is going on here, and again I will have to say that my understanding is limited as well, but my understanding of what we are talking about is an agreement that was reached with the Northern Mariana Islands as part of a change of their status that they used to be like all the other people who were appendages of the United States but they were not independent, nor were they States.

In order to change their status and become not dependent on American welfare programs and not dependent on other social benefit programs, they decided to become somewhat independent and have more of a free enterprise approach to their economy.

Part of the agreement that we made with them was to provide them certain infrastructure projects that cost a certain amount of money, and what we are talking about here is breaking an agreement or not setting aside the funds that are necessary or taking advantage of funds that may or may not be available that are in contradiction, and this is in contradiction to an agreement we have reached with these people in the Northern Mariana Islands.

This stems from and, again, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and I have an honest disagreement on this, as do Republicans and Democrats have honest disagreements, as to what labor policy should take place in the United States but also in the Northern Mariana Islands.

□ 1730

I happen to believe in a less regulated society and less regulations dealing with labor law, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) believes in more regulations for labor law to protect the interests of labor and protect the interests of various working people. I disagree with that philosophy. That is not the philosophy of the Republican Party, but I respect the concern of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) about that.

Unfortunately, the amendment we are talking about now, however, based on this opposition to this labor policy in the Northern Mariana Islands, is negating an agreement that we have reached with those islanders in order to have a change in their legal status.

I would suggest that this is not the fair approach, not a judicious approach. Even though it can be argued that the funds may be better spent someplace else, an agreement has been reached. We would not want to break any other agreement with any other peoples around in order to fulfill these same obligations and opportunities for spending money that have been talked about today.

So I reluctantly rise in disagreement, but I understand the honest philosophical motivations that the gentleman has in making his approach.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, two points. One, I have been working on UPARR for many years, both on the resources side and on the crime bill side, and the only reason we are tapping this account is that this account is now building up an amount that is supposed to be matched on an annual basis. It has not been matched for the last several years, so we are just putting money into an account, when money is now hard to come by. It has \$80 million in it unmatched, and to take \$2 million for this fiscal year, if they spend the money, there is no harm to them. But there is no indication they can spend anywhere close to the \$80 million because of the matching requirement that other communities have. It is an effort to try to address the crime problem here and use the money without harm.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think it is clear that the gentleman is accomplishing two things with one move, and that the gentleman honestly disagrees with some of the labor practices on the Northern Mariana Islands and is able to express that through this amendment, which also transfers funds to a program that the gentleman appreciates.

However, I would say that I oppose this amendment still, but understand my colleague's desire in this attempt. But I would oppose it, because, number one, I do disagree with his theory on labor practices, as is happening in the Northern Marianas; and, number two, I would think we should make sure if we have reached an agreement with the Northern Mariana Islands and it takes a certain amount of money to fulfill that agreement, that we keep that in the budget so we can fulfill our pledge, rather than trying to do other things.

There are many other things we can do with this money that we can argue are very beneficial to the people of the United States, but we made an agreement with these people and we should keep it. So I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in support of the amendment which would place \$2 million in the Urban Recreation and Recovery Program. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has done something very good here, and I think the House recognizes there is no one among us who is more expert about this particular program, the value of it, the efficacy of the work that is done through this program and the need to put money into it.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has identified a source of funding which is not going to hurt anyone. The \$2 million out of this \$80 million from the Northern Mariana fund is money which is not being used. There is no likelihood this money is going to be matched by the Northern Marianas

at any time in the near future. This is a very good program, and we really need to be funding it.

There is a great deal of willingness on the part of many Members of the House, it seems, to spend money on prisons, but not as much willingness to spend money on parks; not as much willingness to spend money on prevention, rather than waiting until after the problem has arisen before we deal with it. That, I think, is a very serious mistake.

There has been a recent study that was done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that said that if young people, high school age, are going to get into trouble, they are going to do so in those hours right after school lets out, the hours between 3 and 7 o'clock or so in the evening.

One of the reasons people in those situations get into trouble is because there is nothing for them to do when school lets out. There are millions of young people in urban areas and in rural areas alike across this country that have no access to recreational facilities after school is out. By spending a few dollars on recreational programs, we can avoid the need to spend a great deal of money later on the construction of prisons and for other purposes in the criminal justice system.

We know very clearly that if young people have access to recreational programs, if young people can hook up with a mentor, some older person that can establish a relationship with them, that their life is much less likely to take a bad turn and they are much more likely to develop into good, sound, solid citizens.

Money spent on these recreational programs, money spent for these parks, is money well spent, and we are well advised to adopt this amendment. It is a good, sound, solid amendment, a good use for this funding.

I urge all Members to get behind this amendment and support this expenditure of \$2 million for our Urban Recovery and Parks Program. It is a very good purpose, a very good idea.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Miller amendment. This is an amendment that would provide a very tiny amount of money for an authorized program, the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program. \$2 million is what would be proposed here, what is proposed here in the amendment. It has an offset, which is as benign as any offset that anybody could come up with in trying to fund something that is entirely legitimate.

We are trying to find \$2 million out of a \$10-plus billion bill. That is \$2 million. That is not two percent, it is 2/100ths of one percent of the \$10-plus billion bill that we are talking about.

Every Member in this body, from whatever district they hail from, whatever State, whatever kind of district, they have communities which could benefit from this kind of legislation.

In my area, there are two communities that have asked for just \$50,000 and \$100,000 respectively under the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program, which has not been possible because there are no funds in that authorized program. They would, of course, have to match it. It is one of those cases where you build a partnership on the part of the Federal Government and the State or local government, particularly in this instance the local government, to do something which is of great benefit to people.

So I would urge Members to listen to their mayors in those communities, or whoever is their chief operating officer, in those communities that are struggling to find recreational opportunities for their youth.

It is summertime. There are so many opportunities for kids to find trouble. It is in the ballparks and the playgrounds, those active places for recreation, that kids go and stay out of trouble. Our public parks are where the McGwires and the Griffey's hit their first home runs, where the Grant Hills played their first competitive basketball.

But beyond that, urban parks offer families brief refuge from urban decay, from bus exhaust and traffic congestion. The urban park, with its water fountains and little league baseball fields, is the place where the vast majority of Americans are going to be spending their leisure time this summer and around the clock, not just in the summertime, but around the clock. It is a place where many children first learn team sports. It is the place where families get together to fly a kite or bike or walk or rollerblade along a river greenway.

One of my particular interests, Mr. Chairman, has been that many of our urban centers, particularly in the earlier settled parts of the country, many of our urban centers run along riverways that not so long ago functioned as industrial sewers. Because we have put billions of dollars, billions upon billions of dollars into the Clean Water Act over a period of years, and because of the more recent industrial restructuring that has gone on, these riverways now are a place that could be restored as green space to provide for recreation, a true wealth of recreation for use by our urban families.

In those cases, communities that I could name one right after the another, and, again, every Member could name in their own districts, these communities need some help with the restoration to make these areas available for their families for recreation. That help could come clearly from the Urban Park Recreation and Recovery Program that we are proposing here, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is proposing, just \$2 million, with a benign offset to be used.

Some communities have recreational facilities that are in such poor shape they endanger kids' safety and health. These dollars could help repair, reconstruct and rehabilitate such facilities.

In the past, these grants have been provided recreation for the disabled, repaired swimming pools, resurfaced tennis and basketball courts, purchased picnic tables, created arts and craft areas, fitness trails and bocci courts for senior citizens.

The public knows that this is money that is well spent. They expect money well spent to be appropriated by their government. So I urge support for the Miller amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today also in support of the Miller amendment to fully fund the administration's request of \$2 million for the Urban Parks Recreation and Recovery, or UPARR. This invaluable program provides competitive matching grants for the revitalization of local recreation areas and the improvement of recreation programs and services in low income inner-city neighborhoods. These opportunities are targeted at urban youth and the expansion of pre and after school activities.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district in the City of New Brunswick, which is located in the central part of New Jersey, UPARR grants have been used to renovate jogging paths and playing fields and to construct new playing fields at Buccleuch Park. The park is used as a recreational facility by local high school sports teams, as well as sports teams from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

In addition, a UPARR grant made additional renovations possible so that senior citizens and disabled persons from the senior citizen resource center next door could make use of the park's facilities. Other UPARR grants have facilitated similar activities at Feaster Park, Joyce Kilmer Park and Recreation Park, also located in New Brunswick.

The National Park Service anticipates applications from 100 to 150 urban localities across the country for UPARR grants in fiscal year 1999, requests which will total approximately \$20 million. The \$2 million that we are trying to add to the bill today with this amendment will enable the Park Service to award 10 to 15 grants, only 10 percent of those requested. This, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, is a modestly funded program, but one that has a large impact on those communities that are fortunate enough to receive these grants, as I know from my own City of New Brunswick.

I urge my colleagues to support urban neighborhoods and urban youth by voting for the Miller UPARR amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amend-

ed (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), \$40,812,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2000, of which \$7,700,000 pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 104-333 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service may hereafter recover all costs of providing necessary services associated with historic preservation tax certification, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, \$149,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Denver Service Center may not levy any assessments against specific construction projects.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 1999 by 16 U.S.C. 4601-10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, \$69,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which \$500,000 is to administer the State assistance program: *Provided*, That any funds made available for the purpose of acquisition of the Elwha and Glines dams shall be used solely for acquisition, and shall not be expended until the full purchase amount has been appropriated by the Congress: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available for land acquisition at Everglades National Park and Big Cypress National Preserve, the Secretary may provide for Federal assistance to the State of Florida for the acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, within the Everglades watershed (consisting of lands and waters within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys) under terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary, to improve and restore the hydrological function of the Everglades watershed: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading to the State of Florida shall be subject to an agreement that such lands will be managed in perpetuity for the restoration of the Everglades.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGOVERN:
Page 19, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

Page 70, line 17, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Before recognizing the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO- PRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1745

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today along with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), in support of an initiative that is vital to our children, our families and our Nation: Reestablishing the Stateside program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his graciousness as we take up debate on this important issue. He and his staff have always extended every courtesy to me and my office, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and their staff for all of the help that they have provided me.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has a proven track record and strong bipartisan support. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a simple idea. It uses money from nonrenewable public resources like offshore oil and gas drilling and reinvests the money into a renewable resource: Public open space.

A trust fund was established over 30 years ago to meet the need for more open space and in that time, over 37,000, over 37,000 park and recreation projects, from neighborhood parks and ballfields to scenic trails, nature reserves and historical sites, have all been developed. This is a real American success story.

Unfortunately, the spirit of this program has been misdirected in recent years. Though Congress has funded the Federal program which has protected Federal lands, the Stateside program has been zeroed out. For those who believe that the Stateside program is better provided by the States, I would respectfully disagree and say that the States cannot do it alone. The Stateside program is already a partnership, as States and towns match every Federal dollar. We can leverage good money on good projects.

The Stateside program acknowledges State leadership on parks and open space projects and works in lock step with what I would say is a Republican philosophy to devolve power back to the States. It is a nonregulatory program that lets States take the lead, a successful program with a successful track record administered at the State level. That is why governors from all over the country support the Stateside fund.