

Rogers Smith (TX) Tiaht
 Rohrabacher Smith (WA) Traficant
 Rose Solomon Volkmer
 Roth Souder Vucanovich
 Roukema Spence Walsh
 Royce Stearns Watts (OK)
 Salmon Stenholm Weldon (PA)
 Scarborough Stockman White
 Schaefer Stump Wicker
 Schiff Stupak Williams
 Seastrand Talent Wise
 Shadegg Tate Wolf
 Shaw Taylor (NC) Young (AK)
 Shuster Thomas Young (FL)
 Sisisky Thornberry Zeliff
 Skeen Thornton
 Smith (MI) Thurman

NOT VOTING—12

Brownback Gallegly Peterson (FL)
 Clinger Lantos Ramstad
 Emerson Lincoln Tauzin
 Fields (TX) McDade Torricelli

□ 2103

Mr. MCKEON and Mr. WAMP changed their vote from "no" to "aye."
 So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 218, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—203

Ackerman Coyne Gonzalez
 Allard Cummings Gordon
 Andrews DeLauro Gutierrez
 Baesler Dellums Harman
 Baldacci Deutsches Hastings (FL)
 Barrett (WI) Dingell Hefley
 Bartlett Dixon Hinchey
 Becerra Doggett Horn
 Beilenson Duncan Hoyer
 Bereuter Ehlers Inglis
 Berman Ehrlich Jackson (IL)
 Bilbray Engel Jackson-Lee
 Bilirakis English (TX)
 Bishop Ensign Jacobs
 Blumenauer Eshoo Jefferson
 Blute Evans Johnson (SD)
 Boehlert Ewing Johnson, E. B.
 Bonior Farr Johnston
 Borski Fattah Kaptur
 Boucher Fawell Kasich
 Brown (CA) Fields (LA) Kelly
 Brown (FL) Filner Kennedy (MA)
 Brown (OH) Flake Kennedy (RI)
 Bryant (TX) Flanagan Kennelly
 Campbell Foglietta Kildee
 Cardin Foley Kleczka
 Castle Forbes Klug
 Chabot Ford LaFalce
 Chapman Fox LaHood
 Chrysler Frank (MA) Lazio
 Clay Franks (NJ) Leach
 Clayton Frost Levin
 Clyburn Furse Lewis (GA)
 Coleman Gejdenson LoBiondo
 Collins (IL) Gephardt Lofgren
 Collins (MI) Gibbons Longley
 Condit Gilchrest Lowey
 Conyers Gilman Luther

Maloney Petri
 Manton Pomeroy
 Markey Porter
 Martini Portman
 Matsui Quinn
 McCarthy Rahall
 McDermott Rangel
 McHale Reed
 McInnis Richardson
 McKinney Rivers
 McNulty Rohrabacher
 Meehan Ros-Lehtinen
 Meek Rose
 Menendez Roybal-Allard
 Meyers Rush
 Millender Sabo
 McDonald Sanders
 Miller (CA) Sanford
 Minge Sawyer
 Mink Saxton
 Moakley Schaefer
 Moran Schiff
 Morella Schroeder
 Nadler Schumer
 Neal Scott
 Olver Sensenbrenner
 Owens Serrano
 Pallone Shays
 Pastor Skaggs
 Payne (NJ) Slaughter
 Pelosi Souder

NOES—218

Abercrombie Fazio
 Archer Fowler Mascara
 Arney Franks (CT) McCollum
 Bachus Frelinghuysen McCreery
 Baker (CA) Frisa McHugh
 Baker (LA) Funderburk McIntosh
 Ballenger Ganske McKeon
 Barcia Gekas Metcalf
 Barr Geren Miller (FL)
 Barrett (NE) Gillmor Molinari
 Barton Goodlatte Mollohan
 Bass Goodling Montgomery
 Bateman Goss Moorhead
 Bentsen Graham Murtha
 Bevill Green (TX) Myers
 Bliley Greene (UT) Myrick
 Boehner Greenwood Nethercutt
 Bonilla Gunderson Neumann
 Bono Gutknecht Ney
 Brewster Hall (OH) Norwood
 Browder Hall (TX) Nussle
 Bryant (TN) Hamilton Oberstar
 Bunn Hancock Obey
 Bunning Hansen Ortiz
 Burr Hastert Orton
 Burton Hastings (WA) Oxley
 Buyer Hayes Packard
 Callahan Hayworth Parker
 Calvert Hefner Paxon
 Camp Heineman Payne (VA)
 Canady Heger Peterson (MN)
 Chambliss Hilliary Pickett
 Chenoweth Hilliard Pombo
 Christensen Hobson Poshard
 Clement Hoeckstra Pryce
 Coble Hoke Quillen
 Coburn Holden Radanovich
 Collins (GA) Hostettler Regula
 Combest Houghton Riggs
 Cooley Hunter Roberts
 Costello Hutchinson Roemer
 Cox Hyde Rogers
 Cramer Istook Roth
 Crane Johnson (CT) Roukema
 Crapo Johnson, Sam Royce
 Cremeans Jones Salmon
 Cubin Kanjorski Scarborough
 Cunningham Kim Seastrand
 Danner King Shadegg
 Davis Kingston Shaw
 de la Garza Klink Shuster
 Deal Knollenberg Sisisky
 DeFazio Kolbe Skeen
 DeLay Largent Skelton
 Diaz-Balart Latham Smith (MI)
 Dickey LaTourette Smith (NJ)
 Dicks Laughlin Smith (TX)
 Dooley Lewis (CA) Smith (WA)
 Doolittle Lewis (KY) Solomon
 Dornan Lightfoot Spence
 Doyle Linder Stearns
 Dreier Lipinski Stenholm
 Dunn Livingston Stockman
 Durbin Lucas Stump
 Edwards Manzilla Stupak
 Everett Martinez Tanner

Spratt Tate
 Stark Taylor (MS)
 Stokes Taylor (NC)
 Studds Thomas
 Talent Thornberry
 Tejeda Thornton
 Thompson Tiaht
 Thurman
 Turkildsen
 Towns
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Volkmer
 Walsh
 Ward
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson
 Woolsey
 Wynn
 Yates
 Zimmer

Tate
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Thornton
 Tiaht

Traficant
 Vucanovich
 Walker
 Wamp
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 White

Wicker
 Wise
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Zeliff

NOT VOTING—13

Brownback Lantos Tauzin
 Clinger Lincoln Torres
 Emerson McDade Torricelli
 Fields (TX) Peterson (FL)
 Gallegly Ramstad

□ 2111

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3662) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3666, VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. QUILLEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-630) on the resolution (H. Res. 456) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3666) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2115

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 455 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3662.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3662) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes,

with Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 48, line 19.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILDLIFE FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire suppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned over National Forest System lands, \$411,485,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of amounts previously appropriated under any other headings for Forest Service fire activities are transferred to and merged with this appropriation and subject to the same terms and conditions: *Provided further*, That such funds are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes.

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, \$164,100,000, to remain available until expended for construction, reconstruction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for construction, reconstruction and repair of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be obligated for the construction of forest roads by timber purchasers: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this head for the construction of the Wayne National Forest Supervisor's Office may be granted to the Ohio State Highway Patrol, Ohio State Department of Transportation, as the Federal share of the cost of construction of a new facility to be jointly occupied by the Forest Service and the Ohio State Highway Patrol: *Provided further*, That an agreed upon lease of space in the new facility shall be provided to the Forest Service without charge for the life of the building.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, \$30,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funding for specific land acquisitions are subject to the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, \$1,069,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or

other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 per centum of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the sixteen Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 per centum shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), \$92,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed 159 passenger motor vehicles of which 14 will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 149 shall be for replacement; acquisition of 10 passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft, the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only, and acquisition of 20 aircraft from excess sources; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (b) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed \$100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (c) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (d) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (e) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, 558a note); and (f) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to change the boundaries of any region, to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office, or to implement any reorganization, "reinvention" or other type of organizational restructuring of the Forest Service without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation and may be used for forest firefighting and the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Commit-

tees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 103-551.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report 103-551.

No funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be used to disseminate program information to private and public individuals and organizations through the use of nonmonetary items of nominal value and to provide nonmonetary awards of nominal value and to incur necessary expenses for the nonmonetary recognition of private individuals and organizations that make contributions to Forest Service programs.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money collected, in advance or otherwise, by the Forest Service under authority of section 101 of Public Law 93-153 (30 U.S.C. 185(l)) as reimbursement of administrative and other costs incurred in processing pipeline right-of-way or permit applications and for costs incurred in monitoring the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of any pipeline and related facilities, may be used to reimburse the applicable appropriation to which such costs were originally charged.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of 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 the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93-408.

None of the funds available in this Act shall be used for timber sale preparation using clearcutting in hardwood stands in excess of 25 percent of the fiscal year 1989 harvested volume in the Wayne National Forest, Ohio: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to hardwood stands damaged by natural disaster: *Provided further*, That landscape architects shall be used to maintain a visually pleasing forest.

Any money collected from the States for fire suppression assistance rendered by the Forest Service on non-Federal lands not in the vicinity of National Forest System lands shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriation and shall remain available until expended as the Secretary may direct in conducting activities authorized by 16 U.S.C. 2101 (note), 2101-2110, 1606, and 2111.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, \$1,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Forest Service is authorized to employ or otherwise contract with persons at regular rates of pay, as determined by the Service, to perform work occasioned by emergencies such as fires, storms, floods, earthquakes or any other unavoidable cause without regard to Sundays, Federal holidays, and the regular workweek.

To the greatest extent possible, and in accordance with the Final Amendment to the Shawnee National Forest Plan, none of the funds available in this Act shall be used for preparation of timber sales using clearcutting or other forms of even aged management in hardwood stands in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101-593, funds up to \$1,000,000 for

matching funds shall be available for the National Forest Foundation.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service in the National Forest System and Construction accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the "Jobs in the Woods" program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects. Twenty percent of said funds shall be retained by the Forest Service for planning and administering projects. Project selection and prioritization shall be accomplished by the Forest Service with such consultation with the State of Washington as the Forest Service deems appropriate.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to sections 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99-663.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), performed under the minerals and materials science programs at the Albany Research Center in Oregon, \$358,754,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Monies received as investment income on the principal amount in the Great Plains Project Trust at the Norwest Bank of North Dakota, in such sums as are earned as of October 1, 1996, shall be deposited in this account and immediately transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury. Monies received as revenue sharing from the operation of the Great Plains Gasification Plant shall be immediately transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury. Funds are hereby rescinded in the amount of \$2,500,000 from unobligated balances under this head.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For necessary expenses in carrying out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, \$143,786,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 7430(b)(2)(B) shall not apply to fiscal year 1997.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities, \$499,680,000, to remain available until expended, including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the excess amount for fiscal year 1997 determined under the provisions of section 3003(d) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4502): *Provided*, That \$125,000,000 shall be for use in energy conservation programs as defined in

section 3008(3) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4507) and shall not be available until excess amounts are determined under the provisions of section 3003(d) of Public Law 99-509 (15 U.S.C. 4502): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99-509 such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: \$100,000,000 for weatherization assistance grants and \$25,000,000 for State energy conservation grants.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Office of Hearing and Appeals, \$2,725,000, to remain available until expended.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$220,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$220,000,000 shall be repaid from the "SPR Operating Fund" from amounts made available from the sale of oil from the Reserve: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, the Secretary shall draw down and sell in fiscal year 1997 \$220,000,000 worth of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: *Provided further*, That the proceeds from the sale shall be deposited into a special account in the Treasury, to be established and known as the "SPR Operating Fund", and shall, upon receipt, be transferred to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account for operations of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT

Notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 6240(d) the United States share of crude oil in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills) may be sold or otherwise disposed of to other than the Strategic Petroleum Reserve: *Provided*, That outlays in fiscal year 1997 resulting from the use of funds in this account shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$66,120,000 to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private or foreign: *Provided*, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until ex-

pendent, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: *Provided further*, That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

No funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Department of Energy to prepare, issue, or process procurement documents for programs or projects for which appropriations have not been made.

In addition to other authorities set forth in this Act, the Secretary may accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State or private agencies or concerns.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, \$1,779,561,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That \$12,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund: *Provided further*, That \$353,125,000 for contract medical care shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, not less than \$11,306,000 shall be used to carry out the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, or construction of new facilities): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$7,500,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Self-Determination Fund, which shall be available for the transitional costs of initial or

expanded tribal contracts, grants or cooperative agreements with the Indian Health Service under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act: *Provided further*, That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, \$227,701,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction or renovation of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and for uniforms or allowances therefore as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: *Provided*, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-53) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86-121 (the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act) and Public Law 93-638, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: *Provided further*, That the Indian

Health Service shall neither bill nor charge those Indians who may have the economic means to pay unless and until such time as Congress has agreed upon a specific policy to do so and has directed the Indian Health Service to implement such a policy: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title III of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: *Provided further*, That funds made available in this Act are to be apportioned to the Indian Health Service as appropriated in this Act, and accounted for in the appropriation structure set forth in this Act: *Provided further*, That funds received from any source, including tribal contractors and compactors for previously transferred functions which tribal contractors and compactors no longer wish to retain, for services, goods, or training and technical assistance, shall be retained by the Indian Health Service and shall remain available until expended by the Indian Health Service: *Provided further*, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INDIAN EDUCATION

For necessary expenses to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title IX, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, and section 215 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$52,500,000.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-531, \$20,345,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands parti-

tioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99-498, as amended (20 U.S.C. 56, part A), \$5,500,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease (for terms not to exceed thirty years), and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; up to 5 replacement passenger vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees; \$317,188,000, of which not to exceed \$31,664,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, Museum Support Center equipment and move, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of the American Indian, the repatriation of skeletal remains program, research equipment, information management, and Latino programming shall remain available until expended, and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers and a total of \$125,000 for the Council of American Overseas Research Centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, by contract or otherwise, \$3,250,000, to remain available until expended.

REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair and restoration of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$39,954,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or restoration of buildings of the Smithsonian Institution may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for construction, \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and

care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$53,899,000, of which not to exceed \$3,026,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, as authorized, \$5,942,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$10,875,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of capital repair and rehabilitation of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$5,840,000.

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, \$82,734,000, 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.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$92,994,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(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, \$11,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$7,500,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(h): *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 subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out title II of the Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of 1976, as amended, \$21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), \$867,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99-190 (20 U.S.C. 956(a)), as amended, \$6,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89-665, as amended), \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the compensation of Executive Level V or higher position.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), including services as author-

ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$5,390,000: *Provided*, That all appointed members will be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate for Executive Schedule Level IV.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), as amended by Public Law 92-332 (86 Stat. 401), \$125,000.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Council, as authorized by Public Law 96-388 (36 U.S.C. 1401), as amended, \$29,707,000, of which \$1,575,000 for the Museum's repair and rehabilitation program and \$1,264,000 for the Museum's exhibitions program shall remain available until expended.

Mr. KOLBE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II of the bill may be considered read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any points of order at this time?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order on title II.

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the provisions beginning at page 61, line 2, and ending at page 61, line 11, based on the ground that such provisions would constitute legislation in an appropriations bill in violation of rule XXI, clause 2, of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the majority, the chairman and vice chairman concede this point of order.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been conceded, it is sustained.

Are there any amendments to title II at this time?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: In the item relating to "Forest Service—Reconstruction and Construction"—

(1) after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$12,000,000)"; and

(2) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this bipartisan amendment to the Interior appropriations bill with my colleagues the gentleman from Illinois, JOHN PORTER, the gentleman from Florida, DAN MILLER, the gentleman from Minnesota, DAVID MINGE, the gentleman from California, ED ROYCE, the gentleman from Wisconsin, SCOTT KLUG, and the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN HOSTETTLER.

This is a very bipartisan amendment. I want to pay particular thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for their efforts. Mr. KLUG worked very hard on this amendment in years past, as well as Mr. PORTER, and I appreciate their efforts.

One would be surprised to know that there is money in this bill that will go to the Forest Service, but will travel right from the pocket of the taxpayer directly into the pockets of the most profitable timber companies, such as Weyerhaeuser, Georgia Pacific, and International Paper, in the form of federally subsidized timber roads in our National Forest System.

One would think if we are going to allow private timber companies to come in and remove the Federal assets from our forests for their own profit, at the very least these companies would have to pay for their roads that are needed to be made to get to that timber.

The American taxpayer has already paid for 379,000 miles of roads that crisscross our national forests, which is more than eight times the size of our U.S. Interstate Highway System. Enough is enough. We do not need any new taxpayer-subsidized logging roads. If the new roads for logging purposes are warranted, practical, and profitable, why should not the corporate giants build their own roads?

Our amendment would eliminate Federal funds for the Forest Service for the construction of only new timber logging roads in fiscal year 1997. There have been other amendments that have been offered. This is a very specific amendment that only goes for the building of new roads, and the money will be, in fact, rescinded.

Thirty million dollars from this would be cut by the amendment for the purchaser credit program, \$12 million from the reconstruction and construction budget of the Forest Service that is used for building new roads and for the administrative costs associated with those new roads.

The amendment only cuts funds from the budget that would be used to build 550 miles of new roads, and we do not touch the funds that would be used for the repair of roads or the existing infrastructure. Nothing in this amendment would keep private companies from building their own roads.

Some may say that this amendment will cause the price of lumber to in-

crease, leading to higher home prices. The fact is that the interest rates alone affect home prices much more than the price of lumber. Only less than 5 percent of the cost of building a home actually goes to the cost of lumber. So anyone who argues that this is going to push up the price of lumber is not following how homes are built.

Our approach is very simple: Let the market dictate. If the roads must be built and should be built, let the companies that want to build the roads go ahead and build them. Why should the American taxpayer have to reach into their back pocket and subsidize roads that are going to be utilized by private companies for the purposes of going and cutting our finest trees, and in many cases cutting them up, mulching them into fiber board, and selling them to somebody else, where we have to buy them back at inflated prices?

The truth of the matter is if we are to stand up, and I appreciate so many of the Members from the Republican side who have joined with me in the offering of this amendment, because I know that just as you are opposed to so much welfare, that you are opposed to welfare on both sides of the equation, and in fact do not believe in so many of your cases that we ought to be providing subsidies to corporations as well. Many Members of the Republican side have been suggesting that in recent months, and we very much appreciate the help and support that they could give us on this amendment.

Finally, I would just like to add how much I appreciate the fact that, again, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KLUG, and so many other fine Republicans like DAN MILLER and ED ROYCE and JOHN HOSTETTLER have joined with us in this amendment. This will be the first time that we really have a chance to defeat the lumber lobby in the Congress of the United States and stand up for the ordinary people who are paying the taxes. This will not cut roads, it will simply make sure that the roads that are going to be cut by the Forest Service are going to be paid for by the corporations that use them for their own purposes.

Let us be honest with the American people and say where we need to build roads to rebuild the old road system, we will pay for it. Where we need to build roads for recreational purposes, we will pay for it. But if the purpose of the road is to be built so that lumber companies can go in and identify trees that they themselves want to chop down, let those lumber companies themselves pick up the tab.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I had a chance to ask the gentleman a question, I am not sure if he is familiar with President Clinton's Option 9. Option 9 is for the Pacific Northwest. It is going to be very difficult for the President to carry out his Option 9 without the funds for roads, especially new roads, to meet

the commitment to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Second, Mr. Chairman, this I think is probably the fourth time this evening that we have tried to debunk this myth that is being predicated that there is a subsidy for road building. The timber that is sold in the national forest is sold on a bid. It is not on a negotiated basis; it is sold to the highest bidder in a bid process. The Forest Service usually puts a floor in; that is, a figure below which they will not go.

The bid includes the fact that the Forest Service will give credit for roads to be built for timber harvest, because they want those roads built for specific purposes beyond timber harvest. They want them built for recreational purposes, they want them built for fire protection, they want them built for a variety of reasons.

If a company on a private tract of land wanted to build roads for private timber, they could probably build those roads at a fraction of the cost that the Government wants their roads built, because the Government wants a multiple use in their forest. So they dictate how the roads will be built for the broader use. It adds value to the forest land for recreational purposes and other purposes.

If the credit is not given, then the company bidding will simply lower its bid, all companies bidding will lower their bid to take into consideration the cost of that road, because it is a special road that the Government wants built.

So there is no subsidy, there is no savings. You pay in the front or you pay in the back. You pay the same thing. It is a myth to say that anyone is being subsidized because implicit in the bid itself, when a person bids for that timber, he will bid that price, knowing that he is going to get credit for the road construction. If he were not getting credit for the road construction, he would give a lower price for the timber so that he would be able to cover the Government's road construction, because it is a specifically built road to Government standards for use far beyond timber.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can put that myth to bed, and then maybe we can get on with real debate on this subject.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend yielding. Is it not a fact that a lot of the timber that we are attempting to harvest on Federal forest lands declines in merchantable value, or loses its monetary value altogether because of our inability to get these sales out, because of our inability to harvest these dead, dying and diseased trees in particular?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, certainly in the area of salvage that is true, because the appeal process is getting so long now many companies will not give a high bid for government timber because the process is so lengthy.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it not a fact that some of our friends concerned about so-called below costs sales and concerned about taxpayer subsidies are the same people who are opposed to allowing any kind of expedited logging on our forest lands, including the salvage harvesting of dead, dying and diseased trees?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Exactly. The Sierra Club came out recently with a vote two to one against any cutting on government forest lands altogether.

Mr. RIGGS. Did I understand correctly the Sierra Club, the most moderate mainstream environmental organization, the one that enjoys the most moderate mainstream image of all environmental organizations, voted recently two to one to completely ban all logging on Federal forest lands?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Exactly. The implications of that is going to be severe, not only economically, because of the thousands of jobs and tens of thousands of jobs to be lost, but environmentally. Because as we pointed out again and again, we use wood products for many things. That table in front of you is an example. If we do not make it out of wood, we make it out of a finite product, usually plastic or metal. Both are finite and harsher on the environment. We also need the plastics for other uses.

We need the renewable resource of wood. Throughout eastern America, the Appalachian hardwood in the Forest Service, I would say 50 percent of the timber, the Appalachian hardwoods that are going to be collected in the future, is going to come from Forest Service lands, supports the furniture industry that not only supplies homes across this Nation, but is a substantial export market for us, value added.

The other factor I would like to point out in the total object we are talking about is all the folks who want to stop harvest in the forest do not tell us what is going to happen to replace all those forest products that the people need and a growing population needs, much less the jobs that will be abolished.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kennedy-Porter amendment and would suggest that the arguments being made by the other side apparently, after only a brief display, are obviously trying to create a strawman. They do not want to talk about the issue in terms of what is in this amendment. This amendment does not ban harvesting on the national forests. That is not what this amendment does. This amendment takes out some \$50 million in terms of subsidy for new road construction for those sales.

□ 2130

What we are saying is that this ought to make economic sense. I might say it would be a good idea if it made envi-

ronmental sense as well. It would be a good idea if it made scientific sense, I would suggest, too. And first and foremost, perhaps it would be a good idea if it made ethical sense, that it was the right thing to do in terms of what we do in terms of policy.

So I think the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY], is coming from an economic basis here, but I think in the end it makes a lot of scientific and environmental sense. We have rejected amendments to take and transfer this money out, and this is the consequence that my friend, Mr. KENNEDY, is trying to show, what happens to these forests and what is happening with these roads. Because when they are constructed and we end up with nearly 400,000 miles of roads, they are just left in a bad condition.

This slumping, this taking of the soil that is washing into the streams is destroying the fisheries, destroying the watersheds, leaving behind literally tens of billions of dollars of damage in this country, in our landscape, that we have a responsibility for as stewards, that is left in disrepair.

What is the suggestion of this committee? What is the suggestion on this floor? To construct more new roads. Are we closing down some? Yes, but not nearly enough. Are we containing them at the level that is necessary? Not nearly well enough. And that has been bad policy that has been handed to us today to make a decision.

The decision ought to be to take the money and save this money for the taxpayer and to save this legacy for future generations.

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

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and his comments. I want to clear up a couple of the inaccuracies that were suggested by the two earlier speakers.

First and foremost, there is \$2 million that was requested by the Forest Service to go into our forests to clean up the areas that need to be cleaned up. We have not touched that money. The money that was requested specifically by the Forest Service to meet the concerns of the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS], is left in the budget.

This deals with the fact that in 1995 a GAO report showed that the timber sale program lost an estimated \$330 million a year for 3 years for a total of over a billion dollars to the American taxpayer between 1992 and 1994. This is what we are talking about, is whether or not the roads, when they go in, that we can say that we are going to sell as many board feet of timber if we cut the subsidy.

Well, obviously, that is probably true. I will grant my colleagues that. But the truth of the matter is, we are going to save the American taxpayer millions and millions of dollars at the

same time. If what we are really about is simply to subsidize timber sales, then why not just write the timber companies a check and to heck cutting down the trees. Keep the trees.

But that is not what we are really wanting to do. What we want to do is hide the fact that underneath this program is a tremendous subsidy that goes to these companies and ends up with the kinds of damage done that that picture demonstrates.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman is right. If there were not a subsidy, we would not have the \$164 million in the bill that we have before us. It is just economic sense. If these forests cannot pay for themselves, if these forests do not pay to cut these trees down, and I tell my colleagues, our forestry practices are a disaster because of incidents like this.

Go out and fly over the 400,000 miles of roads that they have constructed that are in disrepair and will never be taken care of. At the rate we are going, we are just destroying the environment, is what we are doing, and it does not make economic sense. We would not have to have this money in the bill.

Our forestry practices have resulted in just the prime cuts going. So the areas that remain, yes, they are below cost, because the prime areas have been cut out. It takes money, obviously, to restore these areas today. That is what is going on, is the type of cuts, and what is left simply does not make sense in terms of the economics. That is why we will have to have more and more money each year to deal with this particular problem.

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

I must, unfortunately, oppose the Kennedy amendment. In my judgment, there is a correlation between how much money we spend in roads and how much timber harvesting we are able to do. If we cut the timber road purchaser credit program by 60 percent, we are going to drastically reduce timber harvesting in the States that use the timber purchaser credit program. We are also going to cut back the other construction program.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota, but if we cut the money for roads, then we are also cutting road maintenance and we are cutting recreational roads. These things all are affected.

These roads are used for multiple purposes. The Forest Service provides more recreational opportunities than our entire National Park System, and we have to have roads to get into these recreational areas.

So we cannot walk away from the truth here. The truth is, if we are going to cut the road program by 25 percent, total, then we are going to dramatically reduce the level of timber harvesting.

Mr. Chairman, I must tell my friend from Massachusetts that there is no

subsidy here that I know about, because what happens is, we have two different programs. In some areas, the Forest Service builds the roads, and when they do that, people bid on this timber and they will bid a certain level. In some cases, the timber operator builds the roads, and in that case, he bids less for the timber. That is called purchaser credit.

There are two different systems, but both of them are based on the economics of how much this timber is worth.

Now, I must remind everyone that we have cut timber harvesting in this country by over 50 percent, and in the Pacific Northwest, we have reduced it by 85 percent. This has had a dramatic negative effect on the economies of many areas. To come in now and again cut these timber roads, many of which are used for maintenance and recreation and other purposes, simply is going to cause additional problems.

In fact, most of the money in the President's program for watershed restoration is to take out roads. A lot of this money is used to take out existing roads.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let us point out the fact that there have been a couple of statements that are simply not true. This amendment does not cut recreational roads, number one.

When the gentleman talks about the fact that timber sales might go down, the truth is that less than 10 or 12 percent of the total amount of timber that is cut in this country comes from the national forest.

No. 2, the private sales in this country have skyrocketed, so we are not talking about damage done to the lumber industry. What we are talking about is the subsidy program which the GAO—

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Well, if the gentleman would just allow me to finish, then he can take back, so I will learn something here, because I am sure I will from the gentleman.

The GAO says that we are going to lose \$330 million on this program this year. That is how much they claim is going to be lost.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the people from the Forest Service do not agree with the GAO calculations. And, again, one of the reasons that we are not getting as much return out of our timber harvest is because we have put on all kinds of additional environmental restraints and restrictions in order to protect and do ESA's and do EIS's and all the other things that we have to do to protect the environment. The gentleman agrees that those are important priorities that we ought to do.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to say it one more time. If we cut the roads pro-

gram, we are going to then reduce timber harvesting from what the committee approved, 4.9, down about 1.7 less. It would be down to about 3.2. And we have carpenters and all kinds of people out there who depend on the timber coming off the Federal forest lands.

As I told the gentleman and my good friend, we have already cut the timber harvesting program in this country by approximately 50 percent. I think going any further than that is a very serious mistake, and I would urge the House to reject the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the only point again I would like to make is that, yes, there are going to be reductions in the number of board feet. Where we go about 4 percent of the total board feet last year out of the timber program that comes out of the national forest program, some of that 4 percent that we get out of the total sales from the national forest program will go down a small percentage. It is a tiny, tiny percentage from the overall number of board feet cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has expired.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, let me say one other thing here. At the request of our former chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the General Accounting Office recently completed a report detailing the allocation of Forest Service timber sale receipts to various funds and accounts and comparing total receipts to outlays for timber sale preparation and administration.

The report covers fiscal years 1992 through 1994. That is 3 years during which timber sales are at a postwar low. Nevertheless, the report shows nearly \$3 billion in timber sale receipts against \$1.3 billion in preparation and administration outlays. Therefore, we are covering the cost by approximately \$1.7 billion.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would once again yield, I would just like to point out that that report goes on to say, if the gentleman would read the next page, that those numbers do not take into account the cost of building the roadbed into the forest, which is 70 percent of the cost; it does not take into account something else, too, and it is a phony baloney report.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that I have been on the committee that handles these things for 16 years. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Forest Service, Public Lands and National Parks. If anyone would care to come to our meetings, we hold hearings on these things on a very regular basis. In fact, there is one tomorrow at 10 o'clock. We have gone over this issue ad nauseam. How much it costs, below-cost timber. It goes on and on and on.

Here is the myth that seems to float around here right now, and it goes this way: Cutting all funds for construction of new forest roads will save the Federal Government \$95 million per year or \$495 million over 5 years. They tie this argument to the claim that the Forest Service timber sale loses money.

I can tell my colleagues after 16 years on that committee that is completely and unequivocally false.

Withholding these road funds for fiscal year 1997 will preclude needed environmental improvements to the existing road system and will cause the termination of most timber sales on the national forest.

And today, just today, we went over these facts. Listen to these figures, please, resulting in a net loss of approximately \$600 million in annual timber sales.

Now, a lot of folks have been wondering, why do we have so many fires around the area? We have fires all over the West and other areas. One of the reasons we are hearing this is because they cannot get to them. It is very romantic to see them jumping out of Cessna 210s and things such as that, but, in reality, how they fight these fires is these guys take these trucks and go up these roads. These roads we are not taking care of. These roads we are not going to build. So this is one of the reasons we find ourselves in that situation.

Eliminating the funding for the Forest Service would virtually half the Forest Service's timber sales program, which is needed to, one, accomplish forest management activities; two, provide an important share of the Nation's wood products. And my friends may have noticed how timber is going up over the years. When I built a home 20, 30 years ago, a 2-by-4 was 87 cents. It is now \$4. One of the reasons directly tied to that is because of that.

And being in the construction business myself for many years, I can tell my colleagues that, contrary to what my good friend said, timber is a big part of building homes.

Many accounting firms are looking at this at this particular time, and we have had them before the committee. And what have they testified to? They say one of the reasons the cost of housing is going up is because we are not doing this.

My good friend from Massachusetts made an interesting statement not too long ago. He said, we are going to take care of this timber lobby. That is not the person we are going to hurt. I will tell him who we are going to hurt. If we go back to our districts and look in the faces and eyes of these people with modest incomes who like to hunt and fish and camp and be out in the outdoors and enjoy it, those are the people we are going to hurt.

We are not hurting the lumber industry at all. They are moving out of these areas, and wisely so, because they can do it cheaper. If Members

want a great experience, they should go down with the gentleman from California, WALLY HERGER, and look at some of this that is owned by private industry, where they are flourishing and doing very well, and then look what the Federal Government is doing. Old growth forest and fires.

And now we are even kicking the cattle off the ranch because we do not want those to take care of the grass. Funny enough, in Canada they send them up there, paying them \$5 a head to eat that grass so it does not burn.

□ 2145

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

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to have a good handle on this issue. Let me ask him this. I am concerned about small communities like I have in my area, I have a lot of national forests in my community, like Phillips, WI that is totally in a national forest. They do not have any power of taxation. What happens when they need some new streets like they do?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the gentleman a classic example. Anybody in here ever heard of Escalante, UT? Escalante, UT has Escalante sawmills in it; 268 people have jobs there. Guess what? The extreme groups came in and they challenged every one of the contracts. No, they will not let them do it. Two hundred sixty-eight people do not have jobs anymore. You want to buy a town? You can buy one. It is called Escalante, UT, because they all went out because people were challenging the road building.

Also Kaibab Industries in Arizona has a place in Utah. They are pretty well out. That is what happens in these little communities when we follow amendments like the one from our good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am interested in what is going to happen if this amendment would pass. What is going to happen to this small community that is within this national forest? They are not going to get a new street. They do not have any power of taxation.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues, of my 16 years in that committee, do you know who uses these roads, it is not these guys. A lot of this was pointed out by the gentleman from Washington. This build them themselves in many instances. Who uses the road is the person who likes to recreate, the person of modest means. That is the person who is going to be hurt.

In answer to your question, those little communities are the ones that suffer. The little communities that are all through the 48 lower States and the other 2, they are the people that will suffer. I think this is a misguided

amendment. I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

the CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has expired.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out the fact that you had cited this as though all 379,000 miles worth of roads, all the new roads that the repairs that are going to go into 1,850 miles worth of roads, the new roads that are going to be built for recreational purposes, all seem to account for nothing. All of the cuts that you and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] are predicting come out of these 550 miles worth of new roads. You have a lot of roads to go out and cut a lot of timber, which is only harvested 4 percent of the total take in this country. So how you can blame this tiny little cut of \$50 million for all these terrible things that are going to happen, I think is irresponsible.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks this is a defense bill. Fifty million in the interior bill is a big deal. It is about one-third of the timber program, timber road program. So this is a big amendment, worse than any of the ones we have seen today.

Mr. HANSEN. Well stated. Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and there are several points I want to make. The first on purchaser road credits, they are not necessary for timber harvesting. Logging occurs on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management under their lump sales program, which does not involve purchaser road credits.

States also manage their timber sale programs much more effectively. According to the General Accounting Office, States fund their programs with a percentage of timber sales receipts which provides a built-in incentive to promote cost efficiency.

The General Accounting Office also states that while the States' planning processes are fairly straightforward, the Federal agencies' processes are much more lengthy and expensive.

I would lastly also like to note that the House budget resolution that we recently passed calls for market-based decisionmaking in public land management in the area of multiple activities, including the timber road programs. In my view, those of us who supported our budget resolution should also support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague, Mr. ROYCE, has put this in perspective. There has been a lot of emotion on both sides of this issue tonight. I think in the end it really boils down to hard, cold numbers.

Let me go back to the point the gentleman from Massachusetts made earlier in terms of the General Accounting Office study. The General Accounting Office, which essentially is charged by Congress with doing fiscal analysis, came back and said we have lost nearly \$1 billion over 3 years in below-cost timber sales. Of that, \$245 million was the cost of new road construction.

Again, this amendment does not say you cannot harvest and that timber companies cannot cut down trees. It simply says if they want to do it, they can pay for it.

Let us put in perspective exactly how much mileage we are talking about. There are already 379,000 miles of roads in the National Forest Service which is eight times bigger than the national highway system. We have already built roads from one corner to the next.

It seems to me it should be a fundamental Republican principle that at the very least you break even. What an extraordinarily novel idea, if you actually make money when you sell a Federal resource.

Let me again congratulate my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentlemen from California, [Mr. ROYCE], and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY], for trying to bring some common sense and, more than anything else, economic sense to this issue which says, if you are going to do harvesting, go ahead and do it. Let the private companies pay for it. And when you harvest the timber, let us make a buck at it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that we have spent the last year and a half discussing timber, cattle grazing, mining. And the difficulty I have with all of this is that I never find a time when those who are interested in these industries are willing to give at all in solving some of our budgetary problems in this country. No, we have to continue to subsidize the timber industry. We have to continue to subsidize the cattle ranchers. We cannot change that. We have to continue to subsidize mining interests in our country. There is never any give to solve our country's problems. I wish I could say that there was.

Here we are asking simply to cut \$50 million to build 550 miles of new road on top of 379,000 miles of existing road, as Mr. KLUG just said, eight times, eight times longer than the interstate highway system. And we are saying, why not forgo this, why do we not just do this for a year. There are plenty of roads out there that are already in existence. Yet, no, no, we cannot do that.

We are already subsidizing them and we have to continue to do it.

I believe very strongly that it is time we look at all of these kinds of subsidies and we say, hey, the Federal taxpayers do not have an obligation to the U.S. timber industry. They do not have an obligation to cattle ranchers to subsidize, nor do they have an obligation to the mining industry.

We have a mining law that has been in existence since 1872, subsidizing an industry. Let us have a time when the interests who come up here and say, yes, we have to balance the budget, but we have got to do it on everybody else's interests but ours, we are going to protect ours ad infinitum. I think it is time that contributions be made.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that after having hearings on each one of those issues you mentioned, we are trying to come up with a grazing bill that pays more. We have had more hearings that say that they are not being subsidized in both timber, mining and grazing than we have otherwise. I do not know where the gentleman comes up with those figures, because they are surely not the figures we get in front of the committee. That is the line of extreme environmentalists. We do not get that. We sit there for hour after hour after hour going through this. I would like to know where these figures come that you are talking about. I have never seen them, and I have been on that committee for 16 long years.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean that we are not subsidizing these industries?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are at all. In fact, the facts we have, we are making money on this timber industry to the tune of \$600 million this year.

Mr. PORTER. I find the gentleman's arguments incredible, frankly.

Mr. HANSEN. Well, come to the committee then.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me explain to the gentleman from Illinois, I hold him in high regard, obviously, he is chairman of one of the subcommittees on which I serve on the Committee on Appropriations, but I have to point out in all fairness that the gentleman makes no bones about his environmental bent. He is an opponent of timber salvage harvesting, the idea of harvesting even a dead, dying or diseased tree.

I just want to bring a little bit more factual light to bear on this particular debate. We have had reference made here on this floor tonight to the GAO study. This diagram refers to the GAO study. It talks about the distribution of timber sale receipts for the Federal fiscal years 1992 through 1994. Initial distribution of timber sale receipts

which totaled \$2.995 billion goes into six funds or accounts.

One is the national forest fund. We will talk more about that in a moment. Second is for reforestation, \$736 million. Third, preparation of salvage sales, again, many of the Members making this argument tonight are opposed to the idea of salvaging even dead, dying and diseased trees on national forest lands, even though we have had scientific testimony that it is good for fire suppression purposes and the health of the forest.

One hundred thirty-four million dollars for brush removal and erosion control. Last, the credits that the gentleman from Washington referred to for purchaser built roads, \$221 million and 5 million for interest and penalties assessed.

This is the interesting figure over here, and it should concern the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, because of the \$1.34 billion that goes into the national forest fund, \$886 million is going to States in which those forests are located. Those are payments in lieu of taxes. Those are going primarily for local public education in those States. Another \$134 million is going to roads and trails and \$22 million to the Forest Service for road building purposes.

But here is the bottom line; here is the net figure. Defy this number, defy this number. Remaining funds to the Department of Treasury. Could that be any more clear? Two hundred ninety-seven million dollars going to the Department of Treasury. It is a net, it is a net revenue generator to the Federal treasury.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I know that paper came out of the GAO report. There is a \$1.3 billion cost in addition, so that the net cost to the Federal Government is almost \$1 billion. This is the revenue, where it goes.

There is only \$300 million going to the Federal Government, but you do not take into consideration on the next page from that chart which shows that \$1.3 billion cost. The GAO says there is a net cost of timber sales, not net revenues.

Mr. RIGGS. You are saying there is \$1.3 billion in addition to this?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Of cost to the Federal Government to run the program. Look at the next page of the report.

Mr. RIGGS. This comes right out of the GAO report. As we talked about earlier, I also want to point out that one of the reasons that we have so-called below cost sales is because we do not salvage or harvest these trees in a timely manner. They begin to lose a lot of their monetary value. This is merchantable timber, but if we do not

harvest it when it has a monetary value, then of course we are not getting the best return on that particular timber.

One other thing I want to say. I want to ask my colleagues about this. I see that the forest health bill in the other body is now held up over the debate about whether or not we would permit forest health type selective harvesting on Federal forest lands in so-called roadless areas. This amendment prevents us from building any new roads in Federal forest lands. So it is part and parcel of the movement again to turn Federal forest lands into national parklands.

The point I want to make in conclusion, Mr. MILLER and others, you have joined together in your pork busters coalition or the green scissors coalition, do you support the position of the Sierra Club, which is part of the green scissors coalition, which has come out by a vote of 2 to 1 of its membership in favor of a complete ban on all logging on Federal forest lands, an extreme position to put it mildly, a position that says we are not even going to harvest a dead, dying or diseased tree. Does the gentleman from Florida support that position?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I support Mr. TAYLOR, and his amendment on salvaging timber. That is not the issue we are talking about. The issue we are talking about here is costing the Federal taxpayers money.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is aligned in the green scissors coalition with the Sierra Club which has now taken the position of favoring a complete ban on all foresting on Federal forest lands.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman know that Citizens Against Government Waste favors this amendment. This is not strictly a green scissors vote. It is a green scissor vote and it is a fiscally conservative vote, too.

Mr. RIGGS. I will simply point out that my colleagues, I know they are sincere about this, my colleagues who are behind this, they have not come to those of us who represent these congressional districts to discuss this. You might talk to inside the beltway groups, whether it be Citizens Against Government Waste or the Sierra Club, but you do not come to us and say, tell us about the impacts of doing this, as high-minded and well-intentioned as this might be, Tell us about the economic consequences.

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

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RIGGS. You do not come to us. Instead you rise on the floor in a very high-minded fashion, but you do not consult those of us who represent these districts which are disproportionately impacted by these well-intentioned amendments on the House floor.

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

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

□ 2200

Mr. DICKS. Now, one of the things that is confusing here: the study that was done by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] shows that in the National Forest Fund over that 3-year period we get 1.3 billion. That is, I think that is, the gentleman's figure there on the far right. But then the law requires us to do some things that I would consider kind of good government things with that money if we sent back 25 percent of it to the States. That is 886.7 million.

We then provide roads and trail funds, 134.2 million, and the Forest Service for road building purposes, 22.9. The remaining funds went to the Treasury, 297.7. So those cannot be considered; I mean I do not think those should be considered cost to the programs. Those were Congress' decision to take care of the communities, the counties, where this timber harvesting was done. That is where the vast amount of that money went. And if we look at it from that perspective, we even have a bigger return than the 297.7 in the Treasury. We have a return that looks to me roughly about 1.3 billion.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, would the gentleman say that figure one more time?

Mr. DICKS. 1.3 billion.

Mr. RIGGS. Would that be roughly equal to the 1.3 billion that the gentleman from Florida just claimed was the actual outlay by Federal taxpayers for this program?

Mr. DICKS. I think what we have here is about 1.3 in outlays and 1.7 in total dollars that come in above that, so it will be a total of 3 billion.

We have a major return on investment here that was documented by the GAO. The problem is people want to twist these figures and not look at where this money goes. The money went to good government purposes, not the cost of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me yield first to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and then I wish to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a lot of confusion about how to read these charts and these numbers. The truth of the matter is that the total timber sales receipts were \$2.995 billion. They went to the purposes on the chart which the gentleman had showed us in the well. But what he does not show us is that in addition to the timber sales receipts there is another 1.2 billion that went into the fund from the general fund of the United States of America. So that is why, when we add the two together and—excuse me—it is my time here.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida would continue to yield, the truth is that if we add both figures together, we come up with the total amount of revenues that come into the forest system. At that point, then discount the costs that are mandated by the Congress for various actions that we deem as appropriate for the Forest Service to take, and they are substantial, and as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has already indicated, there are things that all of us have signed off on. Then what is done, if we look at the cost of how much we put into the forest versus how much we subtract out of the forest as a result of selling the trees, and it comes out according to—and listen, this thing is on the same page of the GAO account. Here is the cost structure, and here is how much it costs the taxpayer. And according to this report, it costs the taxpayer, 1992, \$339.6 million; in 1993, \$377.2 million; in 1994, \$278.6 million, for a grand 3-year total of \$995 million, and that is the true story.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up on what my colleague from Massachusetts said. He is right on track and because he is right on track there are a number of organizations that have followed this very closely. These are fiscal watchdog groups, and they support this amendment.

I might point out it is Taxpayers for Common Sense, Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayer Assets Program. They are all in favor of this amendment, as too are all of the significant environmental groups like the Wilderness Society and the Natural Resources Defense Council. For good reason, they are all concerned with the responsible management of public lands.

As we work to cut unnecessary spending and balance the budget, it makes good sense to cut those programs that target assistance to large corporations and harm the environment.

That's the opportunity that we have before us today through support of this amendment. Road building is one of the most fiscally and environmentally irresponsible components of the Forest Service's timber sale program.

The Forest Service is supposed to serve the interests of the entire general public that appreciates and values our National Forests, yet 95 percent of the roads constructed under the Forest Service program are used for logging, not recreational or other general purposes. Taxpayers must therefore pay twice—once for road subsidies and again for the environmental damage that results.

Taxpayers have already subsidized a network of forest roads eight times the size of the interstate highway system. This amendment simply prevents the expenditure of taxpayer dollars to build new forest service roads. Funding for maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing 1,850 miles of logging road for

use in the fiscal year 1997 timber harvest program will not be affected by this amendment. Nor will the ability of private companies to build new roads with their own money.

An amendment as sensible as this has garnered the support of both fiscal watchdog groups, such as Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayer Assets Program, and Citizens Against Government Waste, and of environmental groups, such as the Wilderness Society and the Natural Resources Defense Council, for good reason. They are all concerned with the responsible management of public lands.

Support U.S. taxpayers and the environment. Support the Kennedy-Porter-Miller-Minge-Royce-Klug-Hostettler amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to cut spending for Forest Service road construction. This amendment represents exactly what the American people sent us here to do. It is a bipartisan amendment to eliminate wasteful spending. Before we appropriate taxpayer dollars, we must ask the question: Is this the proper function of Federal Government? And should working Americans be forced to spend their hard-earned dollars on this program?

I do not believe that Government needs to provide subsidies to the logging companies. Logging is an important industry, I realize, but it does not need a subsidy. We do not subsidize aluminum companies or concrete companies or brick companies, and yet we have adequate supplies for home construction from those industries. If logging in the national forest makes national economic sense, then let us let market economics establish that. There is the real debate, where logging in many parts of our national forest is economically rational. We can settle that argument very easily by stopping the market-distorting Federal subsidy.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] read from the GAO report. It is a \$995 million loss for 3 years.

Now we can come up with, oh, this expert said this and this expert said that. That is the reason we have the General Accounting Office, to come up with an arbitrary unbiased statement of what the real costs are. It is costing the American taxpayers.

This is a simple amendment to save \$30 million, and we need to send a message to the Forest Service. The Forest Service, and there is a report recently, just as matter of fact today that a letter was sent from the General Accounting Office, saying the books of the Forest Service are a mess. They cannot even tell us, the Forest Service, what it is actually costing. So we have to send a message to get their books in order.

This is a good amendment. It is a fiscally conservative amendment. It cuts spending. It does not shift it to another area. It does not ban logging in the national forest. It is just saving the taxpayers money, and that is what we are here for.

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

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

Mr. RIGGS. I notice that our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], when he was talking about the environmental organizations that have endorsed my colleague's amendment skipped right over the Sierra Club, and yet I am looking at an article, a very recent newspaper article, says the Sierra Club, by voting for the first time in its 104-year history supports an end to commercial logging in national forests. Does the gentleman agree with that position?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. That is not the question here. The question is saving the taxpayers money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to start out by saying I am not opposed to logging on public lands. I am not opposed to timber salvage. I think forestry-related industries are very important to our national and local economies.

But as much as I am for these things, I am against corporate welfare. Mr. Chairman this country is still in the midst of a fiscal crisis. With more than \$5 trillion in national debt, we, the elected representatives of this country, are charged with making the choices in priority that will bring the budget into balance. I know very well that these choices are not always popular. But Mr. Chairman, we simply must take stands if we are going to balance the budget—and we must, balance the budget.

This amendment which I am helping offer is a simple solution to a somewhat convoluted Federal program. The amendment strikes \$12 million in administrative funding and \$30 million in purchaser credits through which the Forest Service subsidizes timber companies as they log on public lands. The subsidy, which of course really comes from the taxpayer, reimburses the companies after they build the necessary roads to harvest timber in national forests.

Now, when a company harvests on privately owned land—they pay for the roads themselves, they pay for the land—and then they sell the product. Well, they get to sell the product they harvest on public land—and they do make a bid for the rights to harvest—but they get all of this help—\$30 million of free lumber in 1997, to build the access roads. This is pure corporate welfare.

These roads are not recreational or fire roads, because there are separate line items for these types of roads. And these are not existing roads—as the funding to maintain those is intentionally left alone by the amendment.

Perhaps most importantly, there is nothing in this amendment which would prohibit private companies from paying for their own roads should they wish. Some oppose this amendment by

saying that if the amendment becomes law, companies may decide it is not fiscally prudent to build such roads. If this happens, I would ask on behalf of the taxpayers in my district, if the companies don't think it makes sense, why should the Federal Government be doing it?

I help offer this amendment because we need to be diligent in rooting out this kind of spending, if we are to give the taxpayers of this country what, at the very minimum we should give them—a balanced budget. A vote for the amendment is a vote of fiscal responsibility, toward a balanced budget and against corporate welfare.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate. I listened as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] said that only 4 percent of the timber is off the Federal lands, and maybe that does not have a very big impact to Massachusetts, but in Detroit, OR, in Mill City, OR, and Idanha, OR, communities that I represent that are surrounded by Federal forest land, it makes a real big impact, and when they are trying to keep their schools open and they are trying to keep their businesses open, it does have a huge impact on those people.

Earlier we saw a picture of a forest road that had erosion problems, and I think that that is significant, and one of the things that is significant about that is we have changed the method of building the roads, we have increased the cost to prevent the erosion that was pictured there, and, as my colleagues know, if it is simply a question of getting the timber out, timber companies can get in and haul logs out for a fraction of the cost that we demand that they pay, but because we want those roads to be there for years, because we want those roads to be available for camping and hunting and fishing, and I have gone into the national forest, and I have gone hunting and I have gone camping, and I have gone fishing on those lands, on those roads that were paid for with the logging moneys. Those are multiple use, and there may be money in the budget that is designed for recreation, but the money that we require the logging companies to pay to build these roads is also being used for those multiple uses. It is also being used for fire fighting, pulling the logs out.

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, it is interesting to hear the gentleman talk about, and I think eloquently, about the fact that he is concerned about the people in his district and how they are going to be affected by a budget cut which is costing the taxpayer money by providing corporate subsidies to the lumber industry, and all I am pointing

out to my colleagues is that we have heard an awful lot of rhetoric in this Chamber about how we ought to be getting rid of the budget deficit.

Now, when they do that, when they cut the health care and the Medicare and Medicaid fund, when they cut the education fund, and when they cut the research and development fund, that comes out of my district, and the people of my district, the poor kids and the working class families in my district get hurt, and all of a sudden when the shoe comes on their foot, all of a sudden, oh, no, no, no. We got to protect that.

All I am trying to point out is what hurts us. It also ought to be shared with people in other parts of the country.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, we do feel those same cuts to health care, and we do feel the same cuts the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about, but the thing that he is not talking about is that road is far more than hauling a log to the mill. That road is for fire protection. That road is for hunting and fishing and recreation, and that is not a cost.

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman again I appreciate what the gentleman has said here. The bottom line here is the Kennedy amendment will cut timber harvesting on a Federal forest from 4.9 to 3.2 or 1.7 million reduction, and that means a loss of revenue, a loss of jobs, and a very significant impact. And the gentleman simply does not have it understood that there is no subsidy here.

I mean we tried to explain it to him over and over again, but there is no subsidy. People bid on these contracts, they bid on these contracts, and in purchaser credits they bid lower because they have to build the roads.

In the other case they bid more, bid more for the timber, because the Government pays for the roads, and the GAO report says that overall, when we net it all out, we still made \$300 million even though we spent \$900 million in payments back to the counties when we spent it in two or three other categories that should not be considered cost of producing the timber.

□ 2215

This was done because we decided that they deserved part of the receipts. We could have put them all in the Treasury. If they all went in the Treasury it would be over 23 to 1 in a positive cash flow. So I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would urge us to get on and let us vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the point is, we are subsidizing, according to the GAO, \$330 billion to this industry. I feel sorry for the people who potentially lose their jobs as a result, but the truth of the matter is if we want a balanced budget, it has to be shared equally by a lot of people. Cutting this corporate subsidy I think is a step in the right direction.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I would like to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that we have made significant cuts in our committee to make sure we do our part to balance the budget, and the GAO does nothing to recognize the subsidy that the timber industry does for recreational industries.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to try this one more time. I beg the indulgence and patience of my colleagues. If we reduce the number of timber sales on Federal forestlands, we reduce the number of timber sales receipts. That is pretty easy to follow. If we reduce the number of timber sales receipts, we reduce funding for reforestation, salvage, road building purposes, and we reduce the timber yield taxes, which, as the gentleman from Washington just pointed out, go to local counties to help compensate, to help mitigate for the fact that so much of their tax base and land mass is in Federal ownership.

That is where the corporate subsidies are coming into play. That is money that is coming from the successful purchases of these timber sales. If we did not have private parties bidding on these sales and purchasing this timber, much of this money would have to be paid for by the taxpayer out of general revenues. That is the point we have been trying to stress all night when we say this is not a net loss program to the taxpayer. It does not involve a taxpayer subsidy.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct something I said. I wanted to say, and I want to make clear, it is 1.7 billion board feet reduction from 4.9 to 3.2. It will cost us hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue. It is 1.7 million if we do not have these roads. We have to have the road structure in order to do these things.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say, to clarify what the gentleman is saying, he is saying if we reduce the number of sales that we are going to have less money coming in?

Mr. RIGGS. That is correct.

Mr. POMBO. It is going to cost the Government more money to run the

program because they are not having any money coming in?

Mr. RIGGS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. POMBO. The gentleman is telling me that all of the money that goes to the schools and fire suppression and everything else is still going to be paid for by the taxpayer?

Mr. RIGGS. That is correct.

Mr. POMBO. The money that is coming in from private industry, that is creating thousands of jobs, regardless of the efforts of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, they still have some timber jobs, that if that money does not come in, that the taxpayer is actually going to get hit worse because there is no more private industry?

Mr. RIGGS. Yes, the gentleman is correct, if the gentleman will continue to yield. If we do not permit any new roads into roadless areas, if we do not permit new sales, then obviously timber sale receipts are going to decline and the distribution of those receipts, much of which goes for many important purposes, not least of which, again, is timber yield taxes to local counties, revenue is going to decline and some of it, not all of it, but some of it obviously will have to be made up by the taxpayers out of general revenues.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that at the end of the day we put \$300 million in the Treasury. I think that is remarkable. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], but I would first like to ask him a question.

If many people have fought very hard to preserve these areas for future generations, in that it is extremely important that we preserve our natural heritage and that we preserve those areas for future generations, but if we do not have any access points into these areas, if we do not have any roads into those areas, how are future generations going to get in to see them?

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

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would point out to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that right now he has have 379,000 miles.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the roads that the gentleman is specifically saying that we will not build.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, what I am trying to suggest is that in existence today in the national forest system are 379,000 miles of roads.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the roads that are built already. I am not talking about the roads in existence, not the roads that we have already built. We are talking

about the roads that the gentleman wants to stop us from building. How are we going to get into those areas for the public to enjoy them?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, this amendment allows, when private companies want to build a road to go harvest lumber, they can go right ahead. They can go right ahead.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is saying that he does not want them to do this.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, let me just say this: The gentleman is cutting the timber purchaser credit program by 60 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Baloney.

Mr. DICKS. He is taking that out of the program.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. chairman, I object.

Mr. DICKS. Did somebody object?

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, the fact is the program the gentleman is cutting by \$30 million is the program called timber purchaser credits, where the timber companies build the roads and then they bid less for the timber to compensate themselves for the roads that have been constructed, so I would say the gentleman is cutting that program by 60 percent. That is hardly a de minimis act. He ought to be adding money to the program, not cutting it.

Mr. POMBO. Reclaiming my time, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that this is nothing more than furthering the agenda of locking up our public lands, locking them up to using them for any resources extraction, as well as locking them up so that the American public does not have an opportunity to enjoy our public lands. That is all it is. It is furthering an extremist agenda.

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

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

We have heard an awful lot of talk and yakking this evening about this issue. What I would like to point out is that in any way we add up the numbers, when the GAO finished dealing with all of the numbers, they recognized that there were hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of losses in timber sales that are going to companies that are making very fine profits.

We are in a situation where only 4 percent of the lumber that is harvested in the United States of America comes out of our national forests. We have 379,000 miles of existing roads. In this appropriations bill, there is another 1,400 miles of additional roads that they want to fix up. We did not touch them. They want more money to build up roads for recreational purposes. We said fine. All we did was target specifically the new roads that are going to lose money for the American taxpayer. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I would just point out if we go through the \$2.9 billion in receipts, \$1.3 billion for general appropriations and timber sales, \$736 million for reforestation of timber sales, \$555 million for timber salvage sales, \$134 million for timber brush removal and erosion, \$221 million for purchaser road credits, we are already up to the \$2.9 billion dollars.

It does not in fact account for the \$886.7 million to the State program, it does not take into account the fund for \$134 million to build roads and trails, and it does not take into account the \$22.9 million, and that then adds up to the \$297.7 million in losses.

That is a lot to take in, but the GAO report does not lie. This report tells it like it is. The American taxpayer loses \$300 million a year as a result of these tax subsidies that go to these companies, plain and simple. We can dress it up any way we want, but the monkey still dances to the way the music plays, and that tells us that we lose \$300 million.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, this is where the gentleman is wrong. Let us say, instead of taking that money and putting it to the national forest fund which takes care of the payment to counties, let us say we put all of that money into the Treasury and then appropriated it for those specific purposes. Then the gentleman would say that the amount going into the Treasury, instead of being \$300 million, would be roughly \$1.3 billion, and then that would have been the return compared to the cost of the program. The rest of it went to legitimate government purposes. The fact that we took it out of the program and took care of those purposes without sending it to

the Treasury is where I think the gentleman confuses himself. Those are legitimate government purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the fact is there are legitimate government purposes, for which this body has already passed laws, that says certain sales percentages are going to be distributed to the localities.

Mr. DICKS. Then do not treat that as a cost of the program.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is a cost of the program. The truth of the matter is you might have differences, you might want to cut out certain costs. Those you might want to do. If you want to cut out the money going to cities and towns, go right ahead and do that. Right now that is not possible. What is possible is to get rid of the subsidy program that goes to these companies, and that is what this amendment tries to do, plain and simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy with the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, I have traditionally offered amendments to this appropriations bill to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. I was considering offering an amendment again this year. However, I understand that the Committee on Appropriations set the funding level for the NEA in this bill at \$99.5 million for fiscal year 1997. This funding level conforms to the understanding that was reached last year with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and your chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, regarding future funding levels for the NEA.

Under that agreement, the House would fund the NEA at \$99.5 million for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and then zero out funding for the NEA in fiscal year 1998. I have spoken to Chairman LIVINGSTON and he has indicated that he is committed to last year's agreement, and that it would be his intention next year to report out an Interior appropriations bill which would contain zero funding for the NEA in fiscal year 1998. I simply want to inquire of the gentleman whether this would be his in-

attention as well as that of the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. CRANE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as myself and, I think, the other members or many members of the subcommittee, that certainly is the intention.

Mr. CRANE. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, I will not offer my amendment this year. Instead, I will simply commend the gentleman from Arizona and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], for his hard work on this bill, and for standing by last year's NEA agreement.

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

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wish to observe that the agreement being referenced in the gentleman's colloquy was an agreement between the minority and the majority, and the majority and the majority, but not anybody in the minority of the minority, and therefore we did not want it to appear to have been an agreement encompassing the views of the entire body.

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

I would like to engage my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], in a colloquy.

□ 2230

Mr. Chairman, recently concluded scientific studies of forests within the Sierra Nevada mountains of California indicate that timber harvests, when accompanied by forest thinning, biomass removal and other natural fuels prescriptions, can reduce fire risk and aid overall forest health conditions. These same studies indicate that natural fuels prescriptions are essential to the success of larger fire management strategies, such as developing systems of defensible fuels profile zones. Coordinated efforts of this kind, particularly when mechanical and natural fuel treatments are utilized, can also provide economic benefits to forest dependent communities in the form of merchantable fiber for mills, fuel for biomass cogeneration plants, and other valuable wood products.

Mr. Chairman, is it therefore the gentleman's expectation that funds allocated to H.R. 3662 for forest health and natural fuels treatment in region 5 of the Forest Service should be used, to the extent feasible, for those prescriptions which both achieve forest health objectives and provide useful wood products for forest dependent communities? And is it also the gentleman's expectation that these prescriptions be carried out in the most cost-effective manner possible and as part of larger developed management strategies like timber harvest and large scale fire management plans?

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

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can speak for the chairman of the subcommittee in saying that the gentleman is correct in his statement. The Forest Service should undertake fuels management actions which are done in conjunction with larger management strategies, integrated into national forest plans, and which include treatments such as timber harvest and large-scale fire management planning. The Forest Service needs to integrate its fire management and fuels management activities into a coordinated effort to maximize forest health benefits, economic benefits and overall cost effectiveness.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PARKER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. PARKER: In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—ENERGY CONSERVATION"—

(1) after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$18,204,000)"; and

(2) after the third dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$11,764,000)"; and

(3) after the fourth dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$6,440,000)".

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania and I are offering represents a simple case for restoring a degree of equity to the funding levels contained in the Energy Conservation Program at the Department of Energy.

The Energy Conservation Program is funded at \$499 million fiscal year 1997. This represents a 7-percent reduction from fiscal year 1996 and a 39-percent reduction from fiscal year 1995. The Energy Conservation Program is divided into a number of functional sectors or subprograms with the funding levels for each one outlined by the Interior Subcommittee.

Neither Mr. FOX nor I are advocating a restoration of funding to prior year levels. We accept and support the original \$499 million funding level recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

What we do not accept, and which we seek to address with this amendment is the breakdown of that overall funding level and the allocation of funds to the various sectors within the Energy Conservation Program that has been recommended by the committee.

One of the sectors within the Energy Conservation Program is the State and Community Grants Sector. This is composed primarily of the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program.

The State Energy Program basically involves the Department of Energy providing grants to the State Energy

Offices who then use these funds to implement State and Federal programs designed to save energy.

Under the Weatherization Assistance Program, the Department of Energy makes grants to the States which are then used to weatherize low-income housing to make them more energy efficient.

Both of these programs offer immediate energy saving potential. Both of them are designed to assist people at the grassroots. Both of these programs represent what I believe is a primary focus of this Congress—sending taxpayer dollars out of Washington and back to the people.

We can accomplish this by simply making further, and I might add, reasonable reductions in two other sectors of the Energy and Conservation Program. We can reduce the industry and transportation sectors by 8 percent below the fiscal year 1997 committee recommendation and move that money to the Weatherization and State Energy Programs.

The industry and transportation Sectors are primarily energy research programs that are largely comprised of partnerships between DOE and the private sector. For example DOE may partner with an automobile manufacturer to develop new electric car technology.

These too are worth endeavors. However, it is not fair to make the level of reductions in the people-oriented programs, like low-income weatherization assistance, in order to limit the reductions to these bureaucracy-oriented research programs.

Since fiscal year 1995, the State Energy Program and the Weatherization Assistance Program combined have taken a reduction of over 53 percent in their level of funding.

On the other hand, the Industry Sector has been reduced about 21 percent from its fiscal year 1995 level, and the Transportation Sector has been reduced 16.5 percent.

The bottom line is that we are seeking with this amendment to show a sense of fairness and to spread these reductions in funding across the spectrum of the programs within the Energy Conservation Program in a more equitable manner.

The \$18 million that this amendment reallocates does not even approach the recommendation of the budget resolution for these two people programs nor does it establish actual equity between all of the energy conservation programs. However, it does move toward a fairer distribution of declining funds, it provides the State and Weatherization Programs with a funding level that allows for a degree of continuity in their programs, and it directly assists people—low-income people.

There is no justifiable reason that this amendment should not receive broad bipartisan support and I urge its adoption.

What we are simply saving is that this amendment moves money out of

Washington and it sends it back to the States. With this amendment, you have a choice between supporting the Washington Department of Energy bureaucracy and voting "no" or supporting the only Department of Energy programs in this bill which go directly to our constituents by voting "yes."

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor of this amendment with Congressman PARKER which would restore critical funding to the weatherization assistance and State energy conservation grant programs. I would like to commend Chairman REGULA and the committee for their outstanding work on this bill which they have again developed under some of the most stringent budgetary conditions in a long time.

Congressman PARKER and I are offering this amendment to increase funding for the important low-income weatherization assistance and State energy conservation grant programs. Our intention is to increase the level for weatherization to the fiscal year 1996 enacted level and the State Energy Conservation Program [SECP] to the fiscal year 1996 Senate appropriated level. In fiscal year 1996, weatherization assistance took a serious cut of approximately 50 percent—something we did not agree with.

Both the House Budget and Commerce Committees have supported full funding of these programs. There is no consensus to reduce funding for these programs and turn them over to the States. The States need the Federal support of these programs at least at the levels we are attempting to provide through our amendment.

The weatherization program is a cost-conscious, energy conservation program which makes renovations to low-income homes to increase energy efficiency and make health and safety improvements. These improvements make a significant difference in the home heating bills of thousands of families every year. For instance, in the cold climate region, a 1989 study found that first year net savings for natural gas consumption represent a 25 percent reduction in gas used for space heating and an 18 percent reduction in total gas usage. This program can be the difference in whether or not an elderly couple maintains their independence and are able to stay in their own home. Furthermore, regardless of how you feel about LIHEAP, the Weatherization Assistance Program reduces the dependence on LIHEAP funds.

The State Energy Conservation program permits a wide variety of targeted programs to be implemented at the State level, ranging from pollution prevention—such as recycling, small business energy and economic development programs, financing of energy efficiency projects, agricultural energy programs, energy emergency preparedness, etc. For example, these activities help every American by making

schools and hospitals more energy efficient which allows more resources to go into education and medical care. A survey recently showed that for every Federal dollar invested, \$19 in non-Federal governmental and private funds have been dedicated to these projects.

The gentleman from Mississippi and I are merely attempting to create a more equitable distribution of the budget cuts which have taken place over the last 2 years.

The State grant programs, which are people oriented programs have endured disproportionate cuts, as you can see from this chart. The other sectors are examples of Department of Energy bureaucracy-oriented programs and we feel that this amendment will restore equity to this section of the bill.

I urge Members to support our amendment and these important programs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is a national disgrace that large numbers of people in this country, including many elderly people, go cold in the wintertime. That is not what this country is supposed to be about. It is especially stupid that we have a situation where people are living in extremely energy inefficient homes. They lack storm windows, they have cracks in their walls, and they have inadequate heating systems so that the little amount of money that they have that goes into heat ends up being used very inefficiently.

The weatherization program is an intelligent, cost-effective program. It saves money and it helps a lot of people. I commend the authors of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, offered by Mr. FOX, which will restore funding for the Weatherization Assistance Program.

The Weatherization Assistance Program provides assistance to families who are in the greatest need, particularly the elderly, those with disabilities, and families with children. The assistance provided to these families comes in the form of home insulation improvement, repair and maintenance of heating and air conditioning units, and any number of other home repairs that keep families in their homes.

Mr. Chairman, one of the best ways to conserve energy is to repair damaged or aging roofs, windows, and insulation in any home. Too often, lower income families don't have the resources necessary to make these repairs. The Weatherization Assistance Program has proven effective in ensuring that resources are available, leading to more energy-efficient homes and lower utility bills for those who need it the most.

In 1995, my own State of Florida received close to \$2 million, serving 976

homes. Those numbers were literally cut in half for 1996, serving 502 homes. The current 1997 proposals for the Weatherization Assistance Program are cut by an additional \$12 million, eliminating service to an additional 50 homes. The amendment by Mr. FOX simply restores funding to last year's level, for a total of \$112 million.

I strongly support Mr. FOX's amendment to restore funding to last year's level, and urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. Chairman, the Weatherization Assistance Program is used to increase the energy efficiency of residences occupied by low-income individuals. I know that there are a number of changes that many in this body would like to see made to these programs, but for whatever reason, those changes are not going to be occurring. On that basis, I think it is appropriate to seek some level of stability in funding for these programs so that to the extent that there are disagreements between the administration and the Congress, that those who are in need of this assistance are not caught in the cross-fire. On that basis, I would support the amendment which will introduce consistency and stability in the funding of this very important program.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is very seductive to take the money out of conservation and put it into weatherization. It has a great appeal. But just remember this. Energy conservation is for all the people. The Energy Conservation Research Program affects everyone, because it means that we save our energy resources so that they are there for future generations.

□ 2245

It means that we develop automobiles that will give us many more miles per gallon. Weatherization affects a very limited number of people and does not solve the problem. I think in terms of national policy, the conservation program has a far greater long-lasting impact, an important and valuable impact that will be beneficial to everyone as opposed to putting some more money on weatherization.

Keep in mind we have already cut substantially from the conservation program. We have funded weatherization, it is four times greater than it was in 1977. We have the State grants of \$25 million, and we have tried to have a balance. We have tried to say let us do the research that will develop vehicles that will go many more miles per gallon, that will save energy, that means jobs for the future, that will

mean the ability to export our products and compete in the world market, that will be beneficial to the entire economy in the United States, as opposed to weatherization, which has a limited impact.

We have done, I think, very well by weatherization in this bill, and we have tried to have a realistic balance between conservation, fossil energy research, and weatherization. I know it has a great appeal.

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

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

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, One of the problems we had was the DOE made decisions, especially in the last few years, where they have maintained their bureaucracy here in Washington at the expense of programs that we were sending back home. They have drastically cut the amounts of money that would go to the States, especially from the weatherization side and also from our State energy officials, and those go directly to our constituents. That is the biggest problem we have got. The DOE, we are just talking about equity here. We are not talking about cutting out the programs that DOE has. We are just talking about being fair about it and having more go to the State, make up some of the difference as far as the losses that we have had because they have cut us so much more drastically than they have cut their own bureaucracy in Washington.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would advise the gentleman that we have taken out the administrative costs so that the entire \$100 million we provide in the bill actually goes out to the weatherization programs in the states. So we have tried to address the very thing that he is describing, and in that process, we have, I think, struck a reasonable balance between conserving energy, doing the research that is necessary to do so, doing the fossil programs and weatherization. So my objection here is that we have already tried to get something that reflects priorities of this Nation in a balanced way.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. REGULA. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PARKER. I appreciate what has been done in trying to strike that balance. I do not feel we have gone far enough and I think we have short-changed our States. We have short-changed our citizens out there, where in this part of the bill which deals with DOE, we have not sent enough back home. That is one of the purposes of this amendment, to I think rectify that situation.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, I think we short-change our citizens if we do not continue developing conservation programs, because in the long haul, conservation of energy will

be vitally important to this Nation because of our great dependency on energy for economic growth. We hear a lot of people talking about economic growth as the solution to our budget deficits, to the unemployment, to our trade balance. To get economic growth, we have to get energy and we have to use it in a very efficient way. That is the purpose of the conservation program.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I agree totally with the gentleman about conservation programs and they need to be maintained. One of the problems is that from a percentage standpoint, we have cut these programs going to the States by over 50 percent, whereas on the amount that is staying in the bureaucracy in Washington, we have only cut it around an average of 25 to 30 percent. There needs to be some equity there and we are only making an 8-percent variation there from the standpoint of making that change.

Mr. REGULA. Let me reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman, and simply say that the energy conservation programs are not money going to the Washington bureaucracy. It is going out on matching programs with the private sector that develop, such as the auto industry, to develop fuel-efficient automobiles, which is a great plus for the entire population.

All I am simply saying, as I said earlier, is the conservation programs are beneficial to everybody. They are beneficial to economic growth and so on. Weatherization has a narrow, relatively narrow constituency and we feel that policywise we have struck a good balance in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I have, of course, no objections whatsoever to the weatherization program. I wish we could strengthen it. But if I read the figures correctly in this bill, what the committee has done is to reduce the energy research and development budget by 10 percent from last year and then by 25 percent from what the President requested, which means about a 35-percent reduction below the President's request, somewhere in that range. Am I correct on that point?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I think the chair of the subcommittee has correctly pointed out that the importance of the energy research and development program is that this is really an investment in the improved efficiency of our economy. This benefits everyone in this country, not the few, important as they may be, who cannot afford adequate weatherization of their homes or who need the additional protection to protect themselves from the extremes of either heat or cold. I want to do something for these people, but I am

more interested in helping them and the rest of the people of this country to improve our ability to create jobs, to improve our economy, to be competitive in the world economy. I think this is what in the long run is going to benefit us more than anything else. So I strongly support the position of the committee. I really should not say strongly support. I think we have cut energy R&D too much already and the amendment of the gentleman would take that even further than it has.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PARKER. Just to put the figures into perspective, if we look at the three basic divisions that are in this bill, we are talking about State grants and weatherization, DOE, industrial programs in DOE transportation programs. The State grants and weatherization, what we are talking about here, the changes that would be made from 1995 to 1996, excuse me, from 1995 to 1997, it has been cut 46.31 percent. On the DOE industrial programs, it has been cut 26.81. On the transportation programs, 22.21. We are talking about equity here as far as when we are talking about the difference between 22 and 46 percent, that is a major difference, and we are talking about just making up some of the difference, that is all. It is not a major thing.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the argument of equity that the gentleman makes, and in a perfect world I would probably go along with it, but this is not a perfect world. I have spent too many years trying to further the development of these very important research and development programs in energy to be comfortable seeing them cut by 30 to 35 percent, as they already are in this bill. So again I take the position of supporting.

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

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

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

In the administration's position, they say and I quote: Energy conservation programs not only work to improve society's energy efficiency, they also provide a successful means of pollution prevention.

As the gentleman pointed out, not only is it jobs, competitiveness, but we are all concerned about pollution. These conservation programs do a great deal in reducing pollution from our energy sources.

Mr. BROWN of California. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is truly a great statesman, and I appreciate that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I won't take the full 5 minutes, but I come down a little bit different than the gentleman from California on this, because I know from personal relations with many people in my district that the weatherization

program has been a very good program, especially for those who cannot afford to fix up their own place. Different from Mississippi where he has the heat, we have got the cold.

When I look at this amendment, the areas that the gentleman from Mississippi is taking the money from is much needed. The weatherization program is much needed money. I see that we are forced into a choice that many of us would not like to have to make, solely because of the budget that has been driven in order to reduce funds, in order to give money to the wealthy. That is all it amounts to. These cuts are not necessary if we just forget the tax bill.

Let us just forget the tax bill, not have one. Then we can have the weatherization, can still reduce the deficits. The Blue Dog budget, the coalition budget provides it, and we can have the energy research programs that we need. But because you all want to have the big tax cut, we cannot do it. So we have to make a choice between making the poor hot in the summertime in the South where they cannot afford air conditioners, they cannot afford any fans, or in the North, where I am from, they can freeze in the winter. Between that, which I do not like, and cutting back on research and development in energy and conservation programs, which I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee, I agree with the gentleman from California, they are very much needed programs, they are the future.

But what you have done with your budget and with your proposed cuts in order to give taxes to the wealthy, you have forced us into this dilemma. I am just going to ask the gentleman on my right, please, let us just forget the tax bill and let us do a budget without the tax bill so that we can still reduce the deficits and we can still have a good weatherization program for the poor and we can still have sufficient funds for research and development.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill that cuts taxes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Reclaiming my time, I know that. I know it is in your budget. I know why you had to make these cuts.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we made these cuts because we do not want our children and grandchildren to pay for today's programs.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman would not have to do that. If he would have taken the coalition or the Blue Dog budget, he would not have had to do that. We would not be here today making this decision on these type of amendments if you would just forget the tax cut, forget it. Why do you not just forget it? We would not have to make these terrible decisions between choices of very good programs just so you can give money in a tax cut bill.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is directing his statements to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VOLKMER. No, I am addressing my statement to all of the Members on that side because they almost all voted for that budget that calls for the tax cut in it. I say forget it.

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think that speech should be given on the budget.

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I realize it is late and I am not going to take all of my time, and I am concerned about the recommendation to cut \$411.8 million from the weatherization program for next year. Keep in mind, we have cut this program, the weatherization program, almost in half right now and we are asked to strike yet another blow to, I think, a program that is very, very important.

We have just had a very harsh winter. This is a program that is used essentially by the elderly and the disadvantaged, and I think we should try to continue at level funding, which is reasonable considering that we have drastically cut the funding in this year's program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I am deeply concerned about the Appropriation Committee's recommendation to cut \$11.8 million in weatherization funds for next year. This year, the weatherization program was cut almost in half and now, we are asked to strike another blow to this important program.

I would like to remind my colleagues of the particularly harsh winter we just suffered. Furthermore, let's not forget last year's summer which saw hundreds of our frail citizens die in their apartments while trying to escape the heat. The weatherization program is essential for preventing these tragedies by helping to keep our poor and elderly in a safe environment in the extreme heat of the summer and the bitter cold of the winter.

I understand the need to cut spending and balance the budget. And we all know that balancing the budget isn't easy as almost every program is going to take some cuts. However, I believe that the weatherization program has already taken more than its share of cuts, and further cuts will only serve to threaten the safety and welfare of our poor and elderly neighbors.

I urge passage of this amendment to fund the weatherization program at last year's level.

□ 2300

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, what we anticipate doing here is having a

vote on the Kennedy amendment, and that will be the last vote of the evening. Then the Sanders amendment will be offered rolled over until tomorrow, along with the vote on this amendment. There will be one more vote, and then we will do colloquies. Once we vote on the Kennedy amendment, we will be done voting for tonight.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 210, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—211

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Hefner
Ackerman	Dingell	Hillary
Andrews	Dixon	Hilliard
Baessler	Doggett	Hinchey
Baldacci	Duncan	Hobson
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Hoekstra
Becerra	Ehlers	Horn
Beilenson	Engel	Hostettler
Berman	English	Hoyer
Bilbray	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Bilirakis	Evans	Jacobs
Blumenauer	Ewing	Jefferson
Blute	Farr	Johnson (SD)
Boehrlert	Fattah	Johnson, E. B.
Bonior	Fawell	Johnston
Borski	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Boucher	Filner	Kasich
Brown (CA)	Flanagan	Kelly
Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)
Brown (OH)	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Bryant (TX)	Forbes	Kennelly
Campbell	Ford	Kildee
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Kleczka
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Klug
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Chrysler	Furse	LaHood
Clay	Ganske	LaTourette
Clement	Gejdenson	Lazio
Clyburn	Gephardt	Leach
Coleman	Gibbons	Levin
Collins (IL)	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Collins (MI)	Gilman	Linder
Conyers	Goodling	LoBiondo
Costello	Gordon	Lofgren
Coyne	Goss	Lowe
Cummings	Greenwood	Luther
Davis	Gutierrez	Maloney
DeLauro	Hall (OH)	Manton
Dellums	Harman	Manzullo
Deutsch	Hastings (FL)	Markey

Martinez	Petri	Skaggs
Martini	Pomeroy	Slaughter
Matsui	Porter	Smith (MI)
McDermott	Portman	Smith (NJ)
McHale	Poshard	Smith (TX)
McKinney	Quinn	Souder
McNulty	Rahall	Spratt
Meehan	Rangel	Stark
Meek	Reed	Stokes
Menendez	Richardson	Studds
Meyers	Rivers	Talent
Millender-	Roemer	Thompson
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Torres
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Mink	Royce	Upton
Moakley	Rush	Velazquez
Molinari	Sabo	Vento
Moran	Salmon	Visclosky
Morella	Sanders	Walker
Myrick	Sanford	Wamp
Nadler	Sawyer	Ward
Neal	Saxton	Waters
Neumann	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Olver	Schroeder	Waxman
Owens	Schumer	Weldon (PA)
Pallone	Scott	Woolsey
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Payne (NJ)	Shaw	Zimmer
Pelosi	Shays	

NOES—210

Allard	Ehrlich	McCrery
Archer	Ensign	McHugh
Armey	Everett	McInnis
Bachus	Fazio	McIntosh
Baker (CA)	Flake	McKeon
Baker (LA)	Fowler	Metcalfe
Ballenger	Fox	Mica
Barcia	Franks (CT)	Mollohan
Barr	Frisa	Montgomery
Barrett (NE)	Frost	Moorhead
Bartlett	Funderburk	Murtha
Barton	Gekas	Myers
Bass	Geren	Nethercutt
Bateman	Gillmor	Ney
Bentsen	Gingrich	Norwood
Bereuter	Gonzalez	Nussle
Bevill	Goodlatte	Oberstar
Bishop	Graham	Obey
Bliley	Green (TX)	Ortiz
Boehner	Greene (UT)	Orton
Bonilla	Gunderson	Oxley
Bono	Gutknecht	Packard
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Parker
Browder	Hamilton	Paxon
Bryant (TN)	Hancock	Payne (VA)
Bunn	Hansen	Peterson (MN)
Bunning	Hastert	Pickett
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Burton	Hayes	Pryce
Buyer	Hayworth	Quillen
Callahan	Hefley	Radanovich
Calvert	Heineman	Regula
Camp	Herger	Riggs
Canady	Hoke	Roberts
Chambliss	Holden	Rogers
Chapman	Houghton	Roth
Chenoweth	Hunter	Scarborough
Christensen	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Clayton	Hyde	Seastrand
Clinger	Inglis	Serrano
Coble	Istook	Shadegg
Coburn	Jackson-Lee	Shuster
Collins (GA)	(TX)	Sisisky
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Skeen
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Cooley	Jones	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Kanjorski	Solomon
Crane	Kim	Spence
Crapo	King	Stearns
Creameans	Kingston	Stenholm
Cubin	Klug	Stockman
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Stump
Danner	Kolbe	Stupak
de la Garza	Largent	Tanner
Deal	Latham	Tate
DeFazio	Laughlin	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Tejeda
Dicks	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dooley	Lipinski	Thornberry
Doolittle	Livingston	Thornton
Dornan	Longley	Tiahrt
Doyle	Lucas	Traficant
Dreier	Mascara	Volkmer
Dunn	McCarthy	Vucanovich
Edwards	McCollum	Walsh

Watts (OK)	Wicker	Wynn
Weldon (FL)	Williams	Young (AK)
Weller	Wilson	Zeliff
White	Wise	
Whitfield	Wolf	

NOT VOTING—14

Brownback	Lantos	Rose
Cox	Lincoln	Tauzin
Emerson	McDade	Torricelli
Fields (TX)	Peterson (FL)	Yates
Gallegly	Ramstad	

□ 2318

Messrs. HEINEMAN, FLAKE, SCARBOROUGH, and MCCOLLUM changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. LINDER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to do two things. First, I would like to enter a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and then I am going to offer an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Mr. REGULA regarding an issue that is very important to the State of Vermont and others interested in conservation and sustainable agriculture. Unfortunately, this bill does not provide funding for the Marsh-Billing National Historic Park that is located in Woodstock, VT. The planned opening for this park is 1998, and the administration's budget included \$340,000 in startup funding.

My understanding is that the gentleman would support funding for this historic park should the Senate include funds specifically for this purpose.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we included \$55 million in increases for the National Park Service specifically for operations and backlog maintenance. If our allocation had been greater, I would have recommended an additional \$13 million for 39 specific park units recommended in the 1997 budget. These units, including Marsh-Billing, are either new parks or units that have experienced unusually high visitation or boundary extensions.

Should the Senate include funding for this unit, either with a specific earmark or by providing for the \$13 million program, I will certainly give serious consideration to supporting the Senate position.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves", after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$11,764,000)".

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Energy Conservation", after

each of the first, second, and third dollar amounts, insert the following: "(increased by \$11,764,000)".

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3662) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3662, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 3662 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 455, one, the bill be considered as having been read; and, two, no amendment shall be in order except for the following amendments, which shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed:

Mr. SANDERS, regarding weatherization, 20 minutes; Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania regarding weatherization, 10 minutes; Mr. PARKER, regarding weatherization, 10 minutes; Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, regarding the red squirrel, 15 minutes; Mr. HOEKSTRA, regarding NEA, 10 minutes; Mr. SHADEGG regarding NEH, 30 minutes; Mr. KLUG or another Member regarding timber contracts, 10 minutes; Mr. DEFAZIO, regarding timber sourcing, 10 minutes; Mr. OLVER, regarding funding levels for codes and standards, 10 minutes; Mr. CONDIT, regarding the Endangered Species Act, 10 minutes; Mr. SANDERS, regarding PILT, 20 minutes; Ms. FURSE, Mr. PORTER, regarding timber salvage, 60 minutes; Mr. GUTKNECHT, regarding across-the-board cut, 20 minutes; Mrs. CHENOWETH, regarding grizzly bears, 10 minutes; and Mr. ISTOOK regarding BIA, 20 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am informed by staff that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] also had an amendment that he offered in committee which lost by one vote that relates to telecommunications. I do not know where on that list that amendment ought to be placed, but I would urge the gentleman to amend the motion to make

certain that that is provided for for 5 minutes on each side.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to the unanimous-consent request I would add an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on telecommunications for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 3675, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT 1997.

Mr. REGULA, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-631) on the bill (H.R. 3675) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

□ 2330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]