

U.S. Government, it is a step backwards, with substantial cuts in areas that for the most part are going to hurt a lot of women and children in poor nations, and it is not something that our Government, our Congress, ought to be behind.

For that reason, I hope that the Congress votes the rule down and votes the bill down.

□ 1330

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

I have no further requests for time. Before yielding back the balance of my time, I would just simply like to say that this act is called the American Overseas Interests Act. Usually the labels that we have on a lot of our legislation around here are somewhat grandiose. I think this label actually means something.

I think we are making a shift from what we used to call foreign aid to put the emphasis on something that is truly what are America's interests overseas. I think that is a major departure from some of the direction that we have been struggling with in the past 10 years or so here. It is one of the reasons why we have not gotten the bill through.

I think this is a new time, and I think that justifies in part this extra debate time which is really an extraordinary amount of time, almost 20 hours when we count the rules and general debate, that is an awful lot of time.

With regard to the observation of the gentleman from Maryland that there probably is no greater time or no more important thing right now than discussing Bosnia, there, of course is another avenue, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations has pointed out. And the thing about what goes on in the world is that every day there is always something new anyway that is very important for us, not that Bosnia is not critically important, but there will be other things that are critically important.

We have to make sure we have a process to bring those things forward. But the basis, the structure, the foundation of what we are trying to signal here in this legislation are American overseas interests and to provide for them appropriately, well aware of the message that we have had from our American constituency that says we have got to be a little bit more careful about how we spend our money, make sure it really counts for national security and true interests overseas and we are not in the business of being the world's policemen or the world's welfare source.

I think that this bill goes a long way in dealing with that.

The ranking Member and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], a wonderful man and a good friend, has said we need more time, more debate, and that we might not even have enough after this 20

hours. I do not know how much debate is enough debate on any particular bill, but it seems to me this is an extraordinary amount of time for a very important subject, where we are having a change of direction which is part of the change that was promised in the November 8 elections. I believe that we have got it pretty well covered now. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed until later today.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will that vote be automatically called by the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct; the yeas and nays have been ordered, and it will automatically be called later today.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear, but was a time certain set for that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be after the three fish hatchery bills, which are next on the calendar.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the Chair.

#### CORNING NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 144 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 535.

□ 1338

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 535) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this noncontroversial legislation.

H.R. 535 seeks to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas. Mrs. LINCOLN, the sponsor of the bill, will fully explain the need for this legislation. Briefly, the State of Arkansas has been operating and maintaining the Corning hatchery since 1983. Arkansas has recognized the need to modernize the facility, but cannot obtain the necessary funding to do so because the State does not hold title to the hatchery. The Fish and Wildlife Service, which does hold title, fully supports the conveyance of the title to the State of Arkansas.

During our subcommittee markup, I offered an amendment—which was adopted unanimously—to expand the mission of the hatchery. In that way, the Corning facility would not be limited to fish cultures only and would be able to perform a broader range of fishery-related activities. In addition, the amendment ensures that if this property ever reverts to the Federal Government, it will be in the same or better condition as the time of the transfer. These changes are reflected in the bill pending before the House today.

I am confident that H.R. 535 as written will satisfy the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State of Arkansas. I urge you to support H.R. 535 without amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey has said it all. This is a bill without controversy. It is very much like many others we have passed in years gone by. I must say for the life of me I cannot figure out what it is doing under a rule. If there was ever a bill that was ready for suspension, it would be these three. They are routine. They are without controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 535, a bill to transfer title of the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas.

The Corning hatchery, which has been operated by the State of Arkansas under a memorandum of understanding with the Fish and Wildlife Service since 1983, produces bass, bluegill, sunfish, crappies, and catfish for State fishery programs.

While the State has made minor improvements to the facility, it is now interested in making more significant capital investments and would like title to the property before doing so. This bill would give title to the State, while protecting the interests of the Federal Government by requiring that title revert to the Fish and Wildlife Service in the event that Arkansas no longer wants to operate the facility as a fish hatchery.

This is standard language we have used to transfer many facilities in the past. It is supported by both the State and the administration, and I urge Members to support it today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], the author of the bill.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 535. Before I list all the reasons why my colleagues should support this bill, I first want to extend my deepest thanks to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. YOUNG, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SAXTON, and the ranking minority member of the Fisheries Subcommittee, Mr. STUDDS, for taking action on this bill in such a prompt manner. I worked with all these distinguished gentlemen last year on the Merchant Marine Committee, and I certainly must say that I miss working with them on a more regular basis.

I urge my colleagues to support this non-controversial bill. H.R. 535 would transfer property rights in the Corning National Fish Hatchery from the Federal Government to the State of Arkansas. Due to previous Federal budget cuts, the fish hatchery was closed in early 1983. However, the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission resumed hatchery fish production in May 1983 after entering into an agreement with the fish and wildlife service. The fish hatchery has been operating since 1983 as William H. Donham State Fish Hatchery. With funds provided by the State of Arkansas

This fish hatchery has become an important part of the Arkansas Fisheries Division Fish Culture Program and I believe that this transfer will greatly benefit the sportsmen and women of Arkansas and the Nation. This warm water hatchery is very active and successful, producing up to 1,000,000 fish annually.

Currently, and since 1983 no Federal funds are used to operate or maintain the Corning National Fish Hatchery. Let me repeat, this fish hatchery does not cost Federal taxpayers a red cent. It is financed solely by funds derived from resident and non-resident fishing licenses sales. This transfer of ownership has the support from both the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is appropriate to transfer the property to the State of Arkansas since the funds used to finance the hatchery's programs are raised within the borders of Arkansas. In addition, without this transfer, Arkansas would be unable to make long-term commitments as to the direction the hatchery will take in its operations or risk of abandonment.

Identical legislation passed both the House and the Senate last Congress only to be stymied in the Senate during the last minutes of the 103d. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 535 and to oppose any amendments.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, those who have spoken already quite properly represent the presentation of this legislation and they, in fact, are not controversial. I do have an amendment to the legislation that would require that prior to the transfer of these facilities, prior to the transfer of title from the Federal Government to the State government that the Federal Government would get an appraisal as to the fair market value and the State would in fact pay the Federal Government in the fair market value for these assets.

The fact is that we have been transferring these assets historically for many, many years from the Federal Government to the states without questioning the value of the property being transferred or the Federal taxpayer investment in these properties. But today is not the same as it has been in the last 20 years. That is, this is the first Congress that is operating under a firm target of balancing the Federal budget in the next 7 years.

We see a whole hose of programs that are being cut, some much smaller in value than the value of these hatcheries, but the point is this, that no longer are we in a position simply to transfer assets of the Federal Government and receive nothing in return at a time when we are trying to balance the budget. So the amendment that I will offer to all three of these bills later on is an amendment to require an appraisal and a fair market value assessment, crediting the State with the cost of some of their improvements that they have made and then making sure that the State either pay the Federal Government in cash or in in-kind contribution for that fair market value.

I think this is fair to the taxpayers of the country. I think it is fair to other committees that are making cuts in very vital programs and that we ought to do our share. The value of these assets, of these hatcheries, we really do not know. There are no current appraisals of these. Appraisals were done in 1983, back in 1979. We have comparable sales in some cases for much smaller parcels adjacent to these lands that were transferred earlier that have been sold in some cases for higher value than the appraised value of the hatcheries.

Let us remember that in fact when the hatcheries are, they have been run for the benefit of the States, so the fact that the State has been running this at their cost should be no mystery to us or surprise us because in fact the State has been the beneficiary of the programs being run there and the State will continue to do so.

If the Federal Government is going to back out of this and we are going to turn these assets over, I think the least

that we can do is ask that we return to the Treasury some ability to recapture the cost that the Federal Government has spent on these assets.

Finally, let me make this point, Mr. Chairman: This is only the beginning of a whole series of assets that will be coming to the floor seeking transfer from the Federal Government either to the private sector and/or to other segments of the Government. I think it is very important that we understand that when we do make these transfers to these other entities, that we ought to make some effort to try and recapture the fair market value of those assets.

There will be assets developed in the energy area, in the mineral area, in the timber area, in a whole range of programs that the Federal Government is currently engaged in, mainly throughout the western United States, but in some cases, as we see with these hatcheries, in other areas of the Federal Government. I would hope that Members would support these very commonsense and very-fair-to-the-taxpayer amendments asking for fair market value.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 535, a bill to transfer title of the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas for use by the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission.

The Corning National Fish Hatchery includes approximately 137 acres, buildings, structures, and related equipment. It is a warm water hatchery that produces between 250,000 to 1,000,000 fish each year. About 95 percent of these hatchery-reared fish are stocked in new or renovated public lakes, providing recreational opportunities for thousands of Americans.

It is my understanding that the State of Arkansas has been effectively operating this hatchery facility since 1983, under an agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The State has spent in excess of \$1.5 million to maintain it. H.R. 535 would simply convey all right, title, and interest of the United States to the State of Arkansas.

Finally, this legislation contains language providing that the property revert back to the Federal Government if the State of Arkansas no longer wishes to use the facility as part of its fisheries resources management program. It also stipulates that the property be returned in substantially the same or better condition than it was in at the time it was transferred to the State.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service supports this transfer and I compliment the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] for bringing this matter to our attention.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill and the amendment printed in the bill are considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 535 is as follows:

H.R. 535

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act".

**SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF CORNING NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.**

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIREMENT.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Arkansas without reimbursement all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b), for use by the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission as part of the State of Arkansas culture program.

(b) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The property referred to in subsection (a) is the property known as the Corning National Fish Hatchery (popularly known as the William H. Donham State Fish Hatchery), located one mile west of Corning, Arkansas, on Arkansas State Highway 67 in Clay County, Arkansas, consisting of 137.34 acres (more or less), and all improvements and related personal property under the control of the Secretary that is located on that property, including buildings, structures, and equipment.

(c) REVERSIONARY INTEREST OF UNITED STATES.—All right, title, and interest in property described in subsection (b) shall revert to the United States if the property ceases to be used as part of the State of Arkansas fish culture program. The State of Arkansas shall ensure that the property reverting to the United States is in substantially the same or better condition as at the time of transfer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the committee amendment.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 21, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) USE AND REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The property conveyed to the State of Arkansas pursuant to this section shall be used by the State for purposes of fishery resources management, and if it is used for any other purposes all right, title, and interest in an to all property conveyed pursuant to this section shall revert to the United States. The State of Arkansas shall ensure that the property reverting to the United States is in substantially the same or better condition as at the time of transfer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

□ 1345

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: In section 2(a) (page 2, beginning at line 3), strike "Within" and all that follows through "without reimbursement", and insert "Upon the provision of consideration by the State of Arkansas in accordance with subsection (c) within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Arkansas".

Amend section 2(c) (page 3, beginning at line 3) to read as follows:

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall require that, as consideration for any property conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a), the State of Arkansas shall—

(A) pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a), reduced in accordance with paragraph (3); or

(B) convey to the United States real property that the Secretary determines—

(i) has a fair market value not less than an amount equal to the fair market value of the property conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a), reduced in accordance with paragraph (3); and

(ii) is useful for promoting fish restoration and management.

(2) APPRAISAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall determine fair market value of property for purposes of this subsection after considering an appraisal of the property prepared for the Secretary after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) REDUCTION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY CONVEYED.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B)(i) of paragraph (1), the fair market value of property conveyed under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the value of any capital improvements to the property that were made by the State of Arkansas before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) DEPOSIT OF PAYMENT.—

(A) DEPOSIT.—Amounts received by the United States as payment under this subsection shall be deposited into the Sport Fish Restoration Account of the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund established by section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9504), commonly referred to as the Wallop-Breaux Fund.

(B) LIMITATION ON USE OF DEPOSITS FOR PURPOSES NOT RELATED TO FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT.—Section 9504(b)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9504(b)(2)(B)) does not apply to amounts deposited under this paragraph.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that as consideration for the fish hatchery conveyed to the State of Arkansas, that the State pay the Federal Government the fair market value based on an updated appraisal.

That payment shall not include the value of any capital improvements made by the State. The amendment also strikes the clause in the bill which would have the property revert to the Federal Government if not used by the State as a hatchery. In other words, the State would receive clear title.

The amendment gives the State the option to pay cash equivalent to fair market value or to exchange property with the Fish and Wildlife Service which must be useful for promoting fish restoration and management.

If the State pays cash, the amendment provides that the proceeds would be deposited in the sport fish restoration account which is better known as the Wallop-Breaux Fund. Every State receives Wallop-Breaux funds which are dedicated to improving sport fishing opportunities. The amounts devoted to fish restoration are decreasing, so this amendment will help assure that all of our constituents continue to benefit from this fund.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier in the general debate on this legislation, I think this is simply a matter of equity for the taxpayers, that they receive some semblance, and hopefully will receive, in fact, fair market value for these Federal assets that the Federal Government has built and developed, when they transfer them to the State.

It also provides the additional benefit that the funds received not only will return to the Federal Treasury, but they will help fund those portions of the Federal programs and cooperative programs between the States and the Federal Government that come under the Wallop-Breaux funds for the improvement of this Nation's sport fisheries.

Again, the amounts of money are not large, but I think the principle is sound. I think the principle is fundamental as we continue upon our legislative journey, living under the hard cap of going to a balanced budget in the next 7 years. Every committee, every Member of Congress, and all of our constituencies are going to have to make sacrifices to deal with that.

Quite clearly, we have been transferring these assets for the past 20 years. That has become what we believe is normal. These are not normal times. We believed that highway demonstration projects were normal up until this year. They no longer are normal, because we cannot justify the expenditure of those moneys and the need to balance the budget and to meet higher priorities of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope, again, that the Members of Congress would support this amendment to provide for a return of fair market value to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. SEXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman well knows, we have discussed this amendment at length at the subcommittee level, and I believe at the full committee level as well. While I would generally tend to agree with the gentleman, that certainly if this is an early version of many transfers that will occur as part of the budget-balancing process that we will go through during the months and years ahead, certainly it would be good to start this in a way that is the most fiscally prudent. That is exactly the reason that I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

It is noteworthy, I believe, to point out here that it was in 1983 that the Federal Government decided that we

no longer had the resources to justify the implementation of a Federal program at this hatchery. In that year, the State of Arkansas decided that since it was a very important program to that region of the country, that the State of Arkansas would supplement what the Federal Government had previously spent, and continue the program on forward.

To the extent that this bill changes that situation, it does so for one very good reason. That is that the hatchery is in dire need of upgrading and renovation, and perhaps some additional facilities to be built on the premises which require financial considerations. Those considerations can be forthcoming only when the State of Arkansas has title to the property.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this bill becomes very necessary. In order to ensure the Federal equity position, however, it is noted in the bill that there is a clause which ensures that if the hatcheries would ever revert to the Federal Government, that they would be in as good or better condition than they are at the time of transfer.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other reasons that I could go on and explain at some length, but certainly the gentleman will have ample opportunity to help Members on both sides of the aisle find savings as we make our way through this budget process. This, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is not the place to be penny-wise and dollar foolish, and risk the very existence of this very vital hatchery facility.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I find myself differing from the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. We did, as the gentleman has indicated, go through this in subcommittee and in full. I am the first to concede that this is not one of the more cosmic issues of our day, and really ought not to be taking up a great deal of time, with all due respect to the State and the gentlewoman who represents it.

However, let me just say that I think I know what the gentleman from California is concerned about as he looks down in the future here. I share his concern of what may be coming. There may be attempts for the Federal Government to divest itself of some of our great national parks and forests and resources, and God knows to whom and when. However, I will be at this side if and when that battle occurs.

However, there is nothing devious here. This is a State that is willing to assume the purpose for which the Federal Government acquired these facilities in the first place. It is perfectly consistent with the normal process of excessing Federal property. We do not, as I understand it, normally charge the States if they bid on and receive land

which has been excessed by the Federal Government.

There is ample precedent for this in the past. There are any number of facilities in different States that I think we will be dealing with in the future. I do not think that we risk setting some kind of precedent for the very real concerns of the gentleman from California. For that reason, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I would point out to all here on the floor and other interested parties that, as a matter of fact, it could well be the case that the State of Arkansas could well not afford to be able to purchase the facility, in which case the entire program would be jeopardized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

I think there are many issues here to be debated. One point that was just brought up, in terms of preservation, if what we want to do is preserve some of the wonderful natural resources we have in this Nation, we do have to give the States the capability. The fact is most States, and I think we have heard from many of our fish and wildlife agency representatives, the States cannot afford it.

The other point that I would make is the value of the property has changed considerably since 1983. If you are going to talk about the fair market value, since 1983 the State of Arkansas has put well over \$2 million, almost \$2.5 million into the property, which has enhanced its value. If it had been abandoned in 1983 by the Federal Government, it would be worth next to nothing at this point right now anyway.

In terms of the justification given by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in terms of what he is trying to do, I do not disagree. I tend to find myself very fiscally responsible as well and wanting desperately to balance the budget, but I do feel he has chosen a poor target in this area.

This is an industry, quite frankly, where we are producing fish for an industry of tourism and sport fishing. It is one of the largest in our State. It is one across the Nation that does have a tremendous amount of return on the dollars that are invested. I do think it is a poor target.

The property is the Federal Government's, but they did give it up an awful long time ago. We are simply legalizing this situation to make sure that the State of Arkansas can adequately prepare and make the necessary decisions that they need to keep it a productive

industry. Again, I would certainly focus that that is exactly what it is.

Mr. Chairman, I would just ask my colleagues to reason in terms of fiscal responsibility. This is a good industry for us across the Nation, and the fish hatcheries are a big part of that. We have invested a great deal in the State of Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Again, Mr. Chairman, the proceeds from the industry in sport fishing far exceed the cost of what we are talking here. I do think it is important in terms of making sure we are able to preserve these wonderful facilities that we have in the Federal Government to allow the States to do that.

The chairman of the subcommittee did point out there is a reversion clause. If by any chance the States do not use these facilities for what they were intended, they do revert back to the Federal Government.

As I said before, I think in all good intentions that my colleague, the gentleman from California, may have had, I do think that this is a poor target in terms of trying to make a point of saving money and in terms of billing the States, who cannot afford it, in losing the preservation of these natural resources that we have.

I just urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and pass this bill and the other two, which are really non-controversial bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 315, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—96

Ackerman	DeFazio	Jacobs
Andrews	DeLauro	Johnson (SD)
Barrett (WI)	Dellums	Kaptur
Becerra	Deutsch	Kennelly
Beilenson	Dixon	Kildee
Berman	Doggett	Klug
Bonior	Durbin	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Bryant (TX)	Fattah	Lowe
Clay	Flake	Maloney
Clayton	Ford	Martinez
Coble	Franks (NJ)	Martini
Coleman	Furse	McDermott
Collins (IL)	Gejdenson	McKinney
Conyers	Gutierrez	Meehan
Costello	Harman	Meek
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Danner	Hinchey	Miller (CA)

Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Stokes
Mink	Royce	Torres
Nadler	Rush	Upton
Neal	Sanders	Velazquez
Neumann	Sanford	Visclosky
Owens	Scarborough	Waters
Pastor	Schroeder	Watt (NC)
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Waxman
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Poshard	Serrano	Wyden
Reynolds	Shays	Wynn
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Yates
Roth	Stark	Zimmer

## NOES—315

Abercrombie	Ensign	LaTourette
Allard	Evans	Laughlin
Archer	Everett	Lazio
Armey	Ewing	Leach
Bachus	Farr	Levin
Baesler	Fawell	Lewis (CA)
Baker (CA)	Fazio	Lewis (KY)
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Lightfoot
Baldacci	Filner	Lincoln
Balleger	Flanagan	Linder
Barcia	Foglietta	Lipinski
Barrett (NE)	Foley	Livingston
Bartlett	Forbes	Longley
Barton	Fowler	Luther
Bass	Fox	Manton
Bateman	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Bentsen	Franks (CT)	Markey
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	Mascara
Bevill	Frisa	Matsui
Bilbray	Frost	McCarthy
Bilirakis	Funderburk	McCollum
Bishop	Gallegly	McCrery
Bliley	Ganske	McDade
Blute	Gekas	McHale
Boehlert	Geren	McHugh
Boehner	Gibbons	McInnis
Bono	Gillmor	McIntosh
Borski	Gilman	McKeon
Boucher	Gonzalez	McNulty
Brewster	Goodlatte	Menendez
Browder	Goodling	Metcalfe
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Meyers
Brownback	Goss	Mica
Bryant (TN)	Graham	Miller (FL)
Bunn	Greenwood	Minge
Bunning	Gunderson	Moakley
Burr	Gutknecht	Molinari
Burton	Hall (OH)	Mollohan
Buyer	Hall (TX)	Montgomery
Callahan	Hamilton	Moorhead
Calvert	Hancock	Moran
Camp	Hansen	Morella
Canady	Hastert	Murtha
Cardin	Hastings (WA)	Myers
Castle	Hayes	Myrick
Chabot	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Chambliss	Hefley	Ney
Chenoweth	Heineman	Norwood
Christensen	Hergert	Nussle
Chrysler	Hilleary	Oberstar
Clement	Hilliard	Obey
Clinger	Hobson	Olver
Coburn	Hoekstra	Ortiz
Collins (GA)	Hoke	Orton
Collins (MI)	Holden	Oxley
Combest	Horn	Packard
Condit	Hostettler	Pallone
Cooley	Houghton	Parker
Cox	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Cramer	Hunter	Peterson (MN)
Crane	Hutchinson	Pickett
Crapo	Hyde	Pombo
Cremeans	Inglis	Pomeroy
Cunningham	Istook	Portman
Davis	Jackson-Lee	Pryce
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quillen
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
DeLay	Johnson, E.B.	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Dickey	Johnston	Ramstad
Dicks	Jones	Rangel
Dingell	Kasich	Reed
Dooley	Kelly	Regula
Doolittle	Kennedy (MA)	Riggs
Dornan	Kim	Rivers
Doyle	King	Roberts
Dreier	Kingston	Roemer
Duncan	Klink	Rogers
Dunn	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards	Kolbe	Rose
Ehrlich	LaFalce	Roukema
Emerson	LaHood	Sabo
Engel	Largent	Salmon
English	Latham	Sawyer

Saxton	Stockman	Tucker
Schaefer	Studds	Vento
Schiff	Stump	Volkmeyer
Scott	Stupak	Vucanovich
Skeen	Talent	Walker
Seastrand	Tanner	Walsh
Shadegg	Tate	Wamp
Shuster	Tauzin	Ward
Sisisky	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Skaggs	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Skeen	Tejeda	Weller
Skelton	Thomas	White
Smith (MI)	Thompson	Whitfield
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Wicker
Smith (TX)	Thornton	Williams
Smith (WA)	Thurman	Wilson
Solomon	Tiahrt	Wise
Souder	Torkildsen	Wolf
Spence	Torricelli	Young (AK)
Spratt	Towns	Young (FL)
Stearns	Traficant	Zeliff
Stenholm		

## NOT VOTING—23

Barr	Green	Pelosi
Bonilla	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Kanjorski	Porter
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Richardson
Cubin	Kleccka	Shaw
Fields (LA)	Lofgren	Waldholtz
Gephardt	Lucas	Watts (OK)
Gilchrist	Paxon	

## □ 1419

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas for, with Mr. WATTS against.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana for, with Mrs. WALDHOLTZ against.

Messrs. HOLDEN FAWELL, and HORN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. LOWEY and Messrs. NADLER, ROHRABACHER, STOKES, and NEAL of Massachusetts changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I was attending a drug-free schools and communities event at the White House and was not able to make rollcall vote 356. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I also missed rollcall vote 356. I was attending a drug free schools event at the White House. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, 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. 535) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas, pursuant to House Resolution 144, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONVEYANCE OF THE FAIRPORT NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY TO THE STATE OF IOWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 145 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 584.

## □ 1421

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 584) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this noncontroversial legislation.

H.R. 584 was introduced by Mr. LEACH. It would convey the Fairport National Fish Hatchery from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the State of Iowa. It is my understanding that this facility was built in the 1930's, and as you can imagine, it is in need of improvement. Due to Federal budget constraints, the State of Iowa agreed to assume operational control of the facility in 1973. The State of Iowa has managed, maintained, and staffed the Fairport Fish Hatchery for the past 22 years, and has made some cosmetic changes. If the State of Iowa had not stepped in when the Federal Government found its management too costly, this hatchery would have closed and its fishery resources would have ceased to exist.

Now the State of Iowa would like the authority to modernize the facility, which would be accomplished by this legislation. H.R. 584 will formalize a permanent transfer of title between the Federal and State Government. The State of Iowa has committed over \$2 million to the operation of this facility over the past 22 years. Further, it has spent \$220,000 on necessary improvements to the hatchery.

This is a noncontroversial bill and will accomplish its goal without