help or the Irvine Co. cannot get the help, they cannot get the help to solve this problem because somebody has decided they want a train wreck. They want a national crisis around the Endangered Species Act. It is absolutely mindless.

Let us hear for an amendment on that one. Come on. Do we have one?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it should be pointed out that what you have been addressing is the science, and if you could guarantee to me that every volunteer will be a Ph.D. scientist that is fine. Keep in mind that this does not restrict volunteers in the Fish and Wildlife Service or the Park Service, the BLM or any of the other agencies of Interior, only the natural resource science of the USGS. So I think we have to be very careful in the definition of our terms here.

Mr. MILLER of California. Why would we not allow this Government to engage volunteers to collect samples of habitat or to map out areas and give that to the scientists and let the scientists make their determination? It is mindless, again, when private companies are asking for the help. You do not say only scientists. You say no volunteers. You say nobody from NBS on private land.

Mr. REGULA. Because the ones you are talking about were used by the NBS, which is no longer funded in the bill. That is gone. And we have a natural resource science function in USGS. And if somebody is taking a blood sample of any of us, we want somebody that knows what they are doing to do it, not somebody that is just a volunteer and may lack appropriate training.

Mr. MILLER of California. You will not even let the science people. No amendment, RALPH?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Members are reminded they should refer to each other by State.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today as one of those Republicans who has consistently supported the arts and the National Endowment for the Arts. I happen to believe that in an increasingly intolerant and polarized society, the arts are playing an increasingly important role, not a diminished role. And what this Congress is doing has some long-term risks for American society.

Interestingly enough, when I opened my mail this morning, I had a letter from a constituent where she said, ''In spite of the openly expressed hostilities to the arts by this Congress, I still urge you to consider reauthorizing the NEA, at least to give it and the arts world a chance to reorganize their means of funding and setting of artistic priorities.''

We are here this morning for a couple of reasons. We are here because some of my friends on the Democratic side last night decided it was more important to kill the rule than to preserve a point of order against the NEA. That is your choice, and I understand that.

We are also here, unfortunately, because I think the arts community still does not get it. They are convinced that business as usual will survive. So if we get anything out of this today, I hope we get a clarion call to the arts community that business as usual will no longer survive and that we have got a few precious months in order to get an authorization bill that will allow this funding to go forward for fiscal year 1996, but, more importantly, to include a provision that would begin to create the kind of private endowment that would allow the privatization of the National Endowment for the Arts and the continued Federal commitment to the arts, albeit one without regular annual appropriations of the American taxpayer dollars.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, this is not going to be easy. If we want to come even close to the $167 million we presently appropriation, we would need well over a $1 billion endowment. We cannot get there from here in 2 years. I want everyone to understand that. That is why I am not all that excited by the discussions and the tentative understanding of the agreement in the House among many of our parties, including myself, last night. However, I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a start, and we ought to use the weeks and months ahead to make sure we save the mission so many of us believe in.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, before I comment on the pending rule, I do want to make a few comments that are, I think, required by conscience. I hope the House will indulge me. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] earlier indicated that yesterday we saw Bosnian Serb military forces in essence commit war crimes in places like Potocari and Srebrenica.

Mr. Speaker, I have one simple message for Gen. Ratko Mladic and his associates among the Bosnian Serbian leadership. It is a four-part message. You are sick pigs. You are sick pigs. You are an embarrassment to the human race. If the world has any conscience, you will one day be where you belong, in prison, rather than disgracing the military uniform that you wear.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to move on to the matter before us. This rule is really, in many ways, worse than the rule before us last night. It still violates normal House rules in order to allow a continued onslaught on environmental protection and reversal of environmental progress made by previous Congresses.

The bill, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] permits giving away Bureau of Mine facilities. The bill repeals the Outer Banks Protection Act of 1990. The bill includes Columbia River basin ecoregion assessment restrictions and directions which should not be in this bill. The bill reverses the progress that this Congress made last year in establishing the California Desert Act. In general, it contains many legislative provisions that should not be in a spending bill.

It also establishes a distinction between the arts and other unauthorized legislation which I think is both primitive and unfair. What is going on is simply this: The extreme conservatives on the Republican side of the aisle last night used their leverage which they had on the rule to try to further disadvantage the possibility for future funding for the arts.

I would say to our Republican moderate friends who claim to be supporters of the arts that they can stop this onslaught on the arts by voting against this rule, and insisting that the arts be treated precisely the same as other unauthorized programs in this bill. That is all they have to do. That is all they have to do.

They can then bring a bill to the floor which will allow us to have the normal debates on all of these programs without creating a special disadvantage for a tiny little program which has fallen victim both to the extremists of the right and to some of the extreme artists, that very tiny, uncivilized minority, who have, because of their thoughtlessness and their stupidity, allowed the enemies of arts funding to attack the entire program the Maplethorpes of this world, if you want, being joined in their extremism by the extremists on the other side, who together want to savage a program which is meant to increase the civility of this society by just a little bit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members to vote against this rule one more time, send it back to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules can do it right. It does not have to continue the onslaught on environmental legislation. It does not have to play this double standard game. We can pass a bill which is far more balanced and a product that is better than the one before us.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the rule that we have before us could very well begin the process of ending the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. I

stand in complete opposition to the rule and to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let us get our priorities straight and let us try to understand what this country is supposed to stand for. Art and culture are a vital part of human existence. The opportunity to enjoy the arts, to enjoy culture, must be open to all of our people, and not just those who can afford $100 for a concert ticket.

Mr. Speaker, the United States spends only 64 cents per person to support the arts endowment, 64 cents, 50 times less than our major allies. In contrast, we spend over $1,000 per person on the military, far more than our allies. Why is it that this Congress can lower taxes on the wealthiest people in America, do away with taxes for the largest corporations in America, but eliminate programs which bring art and culture into classrooms in the State of Vermont and all over this country? Why is it that this Congress can pour billions of dollars more into B–2 bombers that the Pentagon tells us that do not need, but we cut back on funding for symphony orchestras and threater groups all over America?

Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that one B–2 bomber costs $1.5 billion, 10 times the entire allocation for the National Endowment for the Arts. The entire endowment is 10 percent of one B–2 bomber, a B–2 bomber that the Pentagon tells us they do not need.

Mr. Speaker, where are our priorities? Let us speak up for the kids in this country. Let us speak up for all of the people who appreciate the arts, who appreciate culture. Let us defeat this rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio [Mr. REGULA], my great friend, and distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio. I want to commend the Committee on Rules for trying to bring out a balanced rule, recognizing there are a great number of differences of opinion as to how we should address this.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all the Members to support this rule. I recognize that because we had to take over a 10 percent cut, we cannot do everything that people would like to do. Nevertheless, we have done the best we could. We have been fair. I think it is a balanced bill, and I would certainly urge Members to support the rule so we can get on with the business.

Mr. Speaker, we have to keep in mind that the budget resolution has been adopted by both houses. This bill is responsive to that. I think it represents a commonsense addressing of that.

Mr. Speaker, we mentioned volunteers earlier. We will get into this more in general debate, but I would point out that there are a couple hundred thousand volunteers, and they will continue to be there in all the agencies of Interior. We can talk about that more later.

Let me say to the Members, my colleagues, that I know all of them are anxious to get out today. If we work at this with goodwill on both sides, I think there will be plenty of opportunity to debate the fundamental policy questions.

Under the Constitution we are charged with the responsibility to make policy for the people of the United States. It is the responsibility of the President and his team to execute that policy. There will be a number of amendments here that represent policy issues. Some I may agree with, some I may not. That is why we have votes.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, if we all work at it and take a goodwill approach, we can get out of here at a decent time and finish this bill. I am not going to take more time. I will not take a lot of time in general debate. I know we are all anxious to get ahead.

One last comment. That is that this is an appropriations bill. We do not do the authorizing. We communicated with the authorities as much as possible, and anything that is in here represents a consensus with authorizing committees in the House. However, basically, it is a bill to determine how much we are going to spend on the programs that have been established by the authorizing committees.

There will be an opportunity to vote on every dollar that is in the bill. People can offer amendments to cut or add to, and these will be subject to a vote. So as the chairman of the Committee on Rules said earlier, it is really an open rule. All the Members will have an opportunity through their votes to establish what they think are responsible policies for the administration of the public lands of this Nation: about one-third of the United States; it is owned by the people of this country, along with energy policies; along with policies affecting the Bureau of Indian Affairs, our responsibility to the native Americans; and a number of others. I think it is a perfect example of how our democracy should work.

We are representatives of the people. That is our title. We will have an opportunity to take care of that role today on the amendments and on the bill itself. I urge the Members to support the rule so we can get on with this and finish it in a timely hour today.

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

Mr. Speaker, since the rule itself executes a provision relating to the NEA appropriations level, I wonder if at this point I might ask the gentlewoman from Ohio, or perhaps through her, either the gentleman from Ohio or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, if it is her understanding that the self-executing provision in the rule will permit the appropriation of some amount of funding for the NEA, regardless of the level of funding provided in the authorization bill.

In other words, if the authorization bill provides less than the $99 million contained in this appropriations bill, will that lower authorized amount be appropriated, or will the funding for NEA be appropriated only if the authorization bill also provides for an appropriation of $99 million, the exact amount provided in this bill?

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEILENSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have had a ruling from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. BEILENSON. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding from the Parliamentarian that the authorizing bill would have to conform to the appropriation bill in the exact amount, and otherwise, it would eliminate the appropriation totally, so I think it is important that in coming with an authorizing bill, that it be consistent with what we are appropriating in this bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. I thank the gentleman for his response. I think it is different from the understanding we had last night and the arrangement you folks on that side of the aisle worked out. In other words, if the authorizing bill provides for any amount less than the $99 million, even if it is $97 million, that amount would not be appropriated under this bill.

Mr. REGULA. That is my understanding from the Parliamentarian, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct.

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

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

□ 1115

Mr. YATES. Does the arrangement respecting the appropriation to which you addressed yourself have the approval of the chairman of the authorizing committee of the House?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman from California who has the time will yield, members of the authorizing committee were a party to working out the rule, so I think the answer would be yes.

Mr. BEILENSON. If I may further pursue this, why are we treating this in a different manner than we usually treat appropriations? Ordinarily at least, a lower authorization would appropriate a certain amount of money if the Committee on Appropriations, as in this case, provided a higher amount.

Is there some particular reason for this that anybody can tell us about?

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I differ with the Parliamentarian's interpretation of this and I think it is just a matter of how it comes down to interpretation in the long run. I am not sure the intention

was there at the beginning. But the intention is to authorize in the amount that was provided for here.

Mr. BEILENSON. I appreciate the gentlewoman's response and also the gentleman's response. I simply want to point out to our colleagues and to the friends of the NEA, this is a little bit more complex and perhaps dicey situation, the one perhaps we are in, because it is dependent upon an authorization being exactly the same as the appropriation in this bill and any lower amount would result in no appropriation whatsoever for the NEA in the coming year; is that correct?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to say, the leadership on our side of the aisle has endorsed this and understands that. So I think that for those that are interested in the NEA, and that is what you are getting to, they can anticipate that we will be consistent on the authorization and the appropriation.

As the gentleman noted, it is self-enacting in that it limits the expenditure of funds in NEA to institutional grants. Of course I think that addresses the problem that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] discussed earlier in his remarks about some of the individual grants that have caused the NEA to have some problems.

Mr. BEILENSON. I appreciate the gentleman's response. It makes us feel a little bit better.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, suppose the other body does not agree with what is being provided as self-operating in this rule. Suppose the other body wants to change it, and the conference wants to change it. That can be done, can it not?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman from California will yield, obviously we will be part of the conference, and I think, at least I have to speak for myself, as a conferee I fully intend to respect the House's position and maintain it in a conference. Because I think we have an obligation to those who vote for the rule today to do that. I want to say right up front that conferees will be instructed to stay with the House amount, and that is exactly what we plan to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] has expired.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual request, but I wonder if our friends on the other side might yield us an additional 2½ minutes just to pursue this matter for a very short while because it is of some importance.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ additional minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask just one follow-up question for the gentleman from Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman very, very much.

With respect to the gentleman's response to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the only requirements of the rule before us has to do with the passage by the House of Representatives of a bill authorizing a certain amount.

I can only assume, and please tell us if I am correct in this, that once we get past the House authorization of an NEA appropriation for next year, let us assume it is the same amount as is included in this bill, that is all right. That is, whatever is determined finally in conference committee would in fact be authorized under a bill which might have a different amount?

Mr. REGULA. In response to the gentleman, let me just say that it is our every intention to respect the amount that is in the appropriation bill when we go to conference and, second, that will be in the authorizing bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. The principal point here is that if the $99 million is provided for in the bill, in the authorizing bill passed by this House, then that money, whatever eventual amount of money is decided upon can in fact be appropriated so long as it is within those parameters?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. BEILENSON. I thank the gentleman for his response and the gentlewoman for her great kindness.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I ask the gentleman a question: What happens if the authorizing committee of the other body does not agree and in their conference they come to a different conclusion than, as you say, the authorizing committee in the House?

Mr. REGULA. If the gentleman from California will yield further, the answer is that we made it subject only to the authorization by the House and not be the other body.

Mr. YATES. Does that mean that you have frozen the other body, you have compelled the other body to adhere to whatever you put into this rule?

Mr. REGULA. That will be the bottom line in a conference, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. But there is another conference that is coming along and that is on the authorizing committee, as well.

Mr. REGULA. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. So they cannot deviate from this is what you are saying?

Mr. REGULA. I think that our conferees on an authorization bill will feel obligated to hold to the amount that we have agreed upon in this appropriation.

Mr. YATES. Suppose the other body does not agree with you on this. That means that the whole thing may explode?

Mr. REGULA. I will respond to the gentleman by saying that that will be an interesting conference.

Mr. YATES. We may wind up with no bill, then.

Mr. REGULA. I hesitate to predict what might happen in this body. We can only deal with the circumstances before us today.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, again I thank the gentlewoman for her courteous generosity.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question in which if it is defeated I will offer an amendment to the rule which would make in order the lock box amendment and also strike the unusual restriction on NEA funding that we have just been discussing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] has again expired.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

I want to again congratulate her on superb management of this rule. It is a little easier today than it was last night, I will acknowledge, because we have, I believe, come to an agreement which will clearly be acceptable to a majority of this House.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have tried for a number of years to delete taxpayer funding of the National Endowment for the Arts, and that is obviously one of the major items of real controversy here. I will acknowledge there are other items that are very, very important in this measure, but the NEA on our side of the aisle especially has been a very, very contentious point.

We are going to, under this open rule, have an opportunity to in fact zero out the National Endowment for the Arts. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has offered that amendment in the past, he will have the chance to offer it again today when we proceed with the measure.

I believe that there is a very important signal that has been received. I will acknowledge that there was a little bump in the road last night when we did not quite get a majority vote for this rule, but this has been a very well thought out compromise which, as my friend from Illinois has just raised, in fact, insists that conferees on our side of the aisle adhere to the constraints that have been outlined in our proposal.

This is an open rule. It allows for the kinds of amendments that Members want to offer. I hope very much that we can now proceed and move as expeditiously as possible through this appropriations process, because we are trying desperately to maintain the kind of openness that we proposed at the beginning of this Congress. I believe this bill will be another great example of that.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule. It will get us back on track. It will give this body the healthy deliberation it needs on these issues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notice absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—230

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews
Bono
Collins (MI)
Dickey
Fields (TX)
Forbes
Hefner
Moakley
Reynolds
Tauzin

□ 1144

Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No 499]

AYES—229

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr

Fattah	Maloney	Roemer
Fazio	Manton	Rose
Fields (LA)	Markey	Roukema
Filner	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Flake	Mascara	Royce
Foglietta	Matsui	Rush
Ford	McCarthy	Sabo
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sanders
Frost	McHale	Sawyer
Gejdenson	McInnis	Schroeder
Gephardt	McKinney	Schumer
Geren	McNulty	Scott
Gibbons	Meehan	Serrano
Gonzalez	Meek	Sisisky
Gordon	Menendez	Skaggs
Green	Mfume	Skelton
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Hall (OH)	Mineta	Spratt
Hamilton	Minge	Stark
Harman	Mink	Stenholm
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Stokes
Hayes	Montgomery	Studds
Hilliard	Moran	Stupak
Hinchey	Murtha	Tanner
Holden	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Neal	Tejeda
Jackson-Lee	Neumann	Thompson
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thornton
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Torres
Johnston	Ortiz	Torricelli
Kanjorski	Orton	Towns
Kaptur	Owens	Tucker
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Velazquez
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Vento
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Visclosky
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Volkmer
Kleczka	Pelosi	Ward
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Waters
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Watt (NC)
Lantos	Pickett	Waxman
Levin	Pomeroy	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Poshard	Wilson
Lincoln	Rahall	Wise
Lipinski	Rangel	Woolsey
Lofgren	Reed	Wyden
Lowey	Richardson	Wynn
Luther	Rivers	Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Furse	Tauzin
Bono	Hefner	Young (FL)
Collins (MI)	Moakley	
Fields (TX)	Reynolds	

□ 1202

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1977, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 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. 1977.

□ 1203

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. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, first of all I want to thank those of my colleagues that supported the rule because I think we have a good bill here given the fact that we are under the constraints of the Budget Act which reduces our amount of money over 10 percent, and also I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle that we had a very bipartisan subcommittee. We worked well together. We tried to be as totally nonpartisan as we had to make these difficult choices, and we did as much as possible to address the challenges of the Interior and related agencies' responsibility with the funds that were available, and I think on balance we did a good job of achieving that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the whole team worked well; the staff and the associate staff worked as a team. We worked very closely with the authorizers. I say to my colleagues, ''There isn't anything in this bill that's not approved by at least the chairman and the members of the authorizing committee so that what we have here is a team effort.''

Mr. Chairman, obviously we are going to have differences, and that will be reflected in the amendments, some substantial policy issue differences. I will say at the outset, ''We'll do everything we can to expedite this so Members can get home but not in any way stifle debate in the process.''

I am going to be very brief in my opening comments here. I think it boiled down to three areas, as I would see it, given the constraints of the budget reductions.

First of all, we had the must-dos. The must-dos were keeping the parks open, keeping the Smithsonian open, keeping the visitor facilities at Fish and Wildlife and Bureau of Land Management open to the American people. Two hundred sixty million Americans enjoy the public lands, and they enjoy them in many ways. They enjoy them in terms of looking into the Grand Canyon and seeing a magnificent thing created by our Creator. They likewise enjoy going out and fishing in a stream or hunting in a national forest. They enjoy going to a Fish and Wildlife facility to see how we propagate the species of fish and how we nurture the fishing industry. They enjoy going to the Bureau of Land Management facilities, the millions of acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, we made every effort to do those things that the public enjoys, and we held the operating funds at roughly a flat level given our constraints, meaning that we would in no way restrict public access to these great facilities that people care a lot about, and about a third of the United States is public land owned by all of the people of this Nation, and we make every effort to insure that their experience with that will be very enjoyable, and that led to the second category of things, and that is the need-to-dos.

As I see it, the need-to-dos were to insure that sanitary facilities at our national parks, and forests and other facilities were good. The need-to-dos included fixing a road if it is in bad shape. It included finishing buildings that were under way. I say to my colleagues, ''You can't stop a construction job in midstream, and those things had to be taken care of, and we have done so.''

The third group was the nice-to-dos, things that are nice if we had the money. There are a lot of activities that we could no longer afford to do. Many of the grant programs had to be terminated, some of the research programs in energy. We had to downscale land acquisition 78 percent. We put in, of course, some money for emergencies, but essentially we will not be doing additional land acquisition because I tell my colleagues, ''When you buy lands, you have to take care of it, and that gives you enormous downstream costs.'' We did some construction where it was necessary to finish buildings, but we do limit new construction. We limit new programs so that we had some tough cuts that we had to make in the things that are nice to do.

Mr. Chairman, we just had a lot of discussion on the NEA, and of course the NEH is similar to that. We have had change. We eliminated the National Biological Survey, and rather than that we have a natural resource science arm in the U.S. Geological Survey. But we are not getting into that now because that will come up to the debate.

I think we have addressed energy security. We want to be sure that the United States will be secure in the future, that we will have energy independence, that we will not have to depend totally on foreign sources, and so we have addressed that in our bill to the best of our ability.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is our responsibility, and in the bill we said at the outset we are going to take care of education, the basic education, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the basic health. That is the responsibility