

that his opposition, which I believe is largely symbolic here today, will not succeed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not see my opposition as largely symbolic. I perceive it as very real, and those that talk to me about it know that it is not symbolism that I am seeking.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have just one additional observation.

I recognize fully what the gentleman from Louisiana said, and I understand the position of the gentleman from Maryland. I do not think it is reasonable to expect that the only people in America who never get a pay adjustment would be Members of Congress.

I make no apology for the efforts of the past that have been engaged in on a bipartisan basis in this House, in full view of the public, not in a midnight vote, as did occur in the other body, but in full view of the public, in the afternoon, an up-or-down vote after a long discussion. I make no apology for the fact that we decided that we would make the public our only paymaster, because I believe this place is a much cleaner place for having done that. And I have no argument with the suggestion that Members of Congress should be treated the same as other Federal employees with respect to cost-of-living increases. That is probably as good a guide as any.

Unfortunately we are stuck with the job, under the Constitution, of determining our own pay. I wish we did not have that job because it is a no-win situation, and so I think, if we are to set a guideline, what happens to other Federal employees is probably as good a guideline as we can find for what ought to happen to us in terms of pay. I would gladly have somebody else set that pay, but under the circumstances I think that it is appropriate this year, given what is happening with the budget, for the Congress to freeze its own pay.

I would note that that is unquestionably a lot easier for Members of the other body to do because, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] indicated, newspaper stories indicate that there are possibly up to 80 percent of the Senate that are millionaires. I regret that condition; I think we would be better off if we had a more even spread among income groups in the other body. But we do not, and I recognize it is much easier for them to do this than it is for those on this side of the Capitol, but I think under the circumstances this is the best course of action. I think Members understand that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Without objection, the previous questions is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 31, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 648]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie	Crane	Gunderson
Ackerman	Crapo	Gutierrez
Allard	Creameans	Gutknecht
Andrews	Cubin	Hall (OH)
Archer	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Armey	Danner	Hamilton
Bachus	Davis	Hancock
Baesler	de la Garza	Hansen
Baker (CA)	Deal	Harman
Baker (LA)	DeFazio	Hastert
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Ballenger	Dellums	Hayworth
Barcia	Deutsch	Hefley
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hefner
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Heineman
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Herger
Bartlett	Dixon	Hilleary
Barton	Doggett	Hilliard
Bass	Dooley	Hinchee
Bateman	Doolittle	Hobson
Beilenson	Dornan	Hoekstra
Bentsen	Doyle	Hoke
Bereuter	Dreier	Holden
Bevill	Duncan	Horn
Bilbray	Dunn	Hostettler
Bilirakis	Durbin	Hunter
Bishop	Edwards	Hutchinson
Bliley	Ehlers	Hyde
Blute	Ehrlich	Inglis
Boehner	Emerson	Istook
Bonilla	English	Jackson-Lee
Bonior	Ensign	Jacobs
Bono	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Boucher	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Browder	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Brown (CA)	Farr	Johnston
Brown (FL)	Fawell	Jones
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Kanjorski
Brownback	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Bryant (TN)	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bryant (TX)	Filner	Kelly
Bunn	Flanagan	Kennedy (MA)
Bunning	Foglietta	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Foley	Kennelly
Burton	Forbes	Kildee
Buyer	Ford	Kim
Callahan	Fowler	Kingston
Calvert	Fox	Klecicka
Camp	Frank (MA)	Klink
Canady	Franks (CT)	Klug
Cardin	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Chabot	Frisa	LaFalce
Chambliss	Frost	LaHood
Chapman	Funderburk	Lantos
Chenoweth	Furse	Largent
Christensen	Gallegly	Latham
Chrysler	Ganske	LaTourette
Clement	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Clinger	Gekas	Lazio
Clyburn	Gephardt	Leach
Coble	Geren	Levin
Coburn	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Coleman	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Collins (GA)	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Collins (IL)	Gilman	Lincoln
Combest	Goodlatte	Linder
Condit	Goodling	Lipinski
Cooley	Gordon	Livingston
Costello	Goss	LoBiondo
Cox	Graham	Lofgren
Coyne	Green	Longley
Cramer	Greenwood	Lowey

Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
Luther	Petri	Solomon
Manton	Pickett	Souder
Manzullo	Pombo	Spence
Markey	Pomeroy	Spratt
Martini	Porter	Stearns
Mascara	Portman	Stenholm
Matsui	Poshard	Stockman
McCarthy	Pryce	Studds
McCollum	Quillen	Stump
McCrery	Quinn	Stupak
McHale	Radanovich	Talent
McHugh	Rahall	Tanner
McInnis	Ramstad	Tate
McIntosh	Reed	Tauzin
McKeon	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Richardson	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Riggs	Tejeda
Meek	Rivers	Thompson
Menendez	Roberts	Thornberry
Metcalf	Roemer	Thornton
Meyers	Rogers	Thurman
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Miller (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Miller (FL)	Rose	Torres
Mineta	Roth	Torricelli
Minge	Roukema	Trafficant
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Molinari	Royce	Vento
Mollohan	Rush	Visclosky
Montgomery	Sabo	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Salmon	Walker
Myers	Sanders	Walsh
Myrick	Sanford	Wamp
Neal	Sawyer	Ward
Nethercutt	Saxton	Waters
Neumann	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Ney	Schaefer	Weldon (FL)
Norwood	Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Schroeder	Weller
Oberstar	Schumer	White
Obey	Scott	Whitfield
Olver	Seastrand	Wicker
Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Orton	Shadegg	Wilson
Owens	Shaw	Wise
Oxley	Shays	Wolf
Packard	Shuster	Woolsey
Pallone	Skaggs	Wyden
Parker	Skeen	Wynn
Pastor	Skelton	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Payne (VA)	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Peterson (FL)	Smith (TX)	Zimmer

NAYS—31

Berman	Gonzalez	Nadler
Boehrlert	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Brewster	Houghton	Serrano
Clay	Hoyer	Stark
Clayton	King	Thomas
Collins (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Conyers	Martinez	Velazquez
DeLay	McDermott	Watt (NC)
Engel	Mfume	Waxman
Fattah	Moran	
Flake	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra	McKinney	Stokes
Dingell	Moakley	Tucker
Hayes	Morella	Volkmer
Jefferson	Paxon	Waldholtz
Maloney	Reynolds	
McDade	Sisisky	

□ 1215

Messrs. TOWNS, STARK, FLAKE, and MFUME changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I was in a meeting on the Senate side of the Capitol during rollcall vote No. 648 on the

motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LIGHTFOOT, WOLF, ISTOOK, KINGSTON, FORBES, LIVINGSTON, HOYER, VISCLOSKEY, COLEMAN, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359. When I first signed on as a cosponsor, I thought it might be a good way to address some patent department deficiencies, but since then I have changed my opinion and I respectfully ask to be withdrawn as a sponsor of H.R. 359.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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 Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right, I will not object, but I did want to take the opportunity to address the distinguished chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. As the chairman knows, the Committee on Resources has approved H.R. 1332, which would eliminate the Office of Territorial and International Affairs [OTIA] and terminate its programs. This action will save taxpayers \$16 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$117 million over the next 7 years. This authorization bill, which I intro-

duced, received widespread bipartisan support and is currently awaiting floor consideration.

Mr. Speaker, when the floor considered H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill, I offered an amendment to delete the funding for the OTIA and its programs in accordance with our committee's work. The chairman graciously accepted my amendment. Unfortunately, the other body has gone in just the opposite direction in their appropriations bill by preserving in some ways and enhancing this unnecessary office in other ways. It is my hope that the Chair and other House conferees will stick firm to the House position in trying to eliminate this piece of bureaucracy.

At the very least I would ask that, since both authorization committees have such opposite views of the future need of the OTIA, that the chairman not accept any legislative language from the Senate involving the OTIA or its programs and that they subject any appropriation for the OTIA, its programs or former territories, to an authorization.

Mr. Speaker, this issue should be resolved by the authorization committees, and I would appreciate the chairman's consideration.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and we certainly will.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. 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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1977, be instructed to disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

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

This is a straightforward motion instructing the House conferees to retain the moratorium on the hard rock mining claims. During House consideration of the bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] offered an amendment to insert the existing moratorium language that has operated this year. The amendment was adopted by a bipartisan vote of 271 to 153.

My motion tells the conferees to stay with the current moratorium language. It requires them to abide by the rule of

the significant majority of the House to stop the corporate welfare that has resulted in companies receiving mineral rights worth hundreds of millions of dollars for as little as \$2.50 an acre.

The latest example of that, Mr. Speaker, was a few days ago when Secretary Babbitt was required to sign an application for a patent by a foreign company which is estimated to be able to mine 1 billion dollars' worth of minerals in return for a payment of \$275. It is time to stop this raid on the Federal Treasury that has gone on for more than 100 years. It is time for the legislative committees to make substantive changes to the 1872 Mining Act.

Mr. Speaker, my motion is a vote for fiscal responsibility, and I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct House conferees to accept the mining patent moratorium, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The House adopted a 1-year moratorium on issuing mining patents. The Senate, however, took another tack. Senate provisions would require fair market value of the surface value of patented lands. The Senate also adopted a reverter clause so that, if land patented for mining is ever used for any other purposes, it reverts back to Federal control.

The Senate provisions raise revenue while the house provisions do nothing but preserve the status quo. Comprehensive mining law reform proposals are pending in both the House and the Senate. These proposals include royalties, which will lead to additional increases in revenue to the Treasury. However, past experience has shown that a patent moratorium will stifle any progress toward comprehensive mining law reform and preserving the status quo which both sides of this issue agree is not acceptable. The only responsible position is to oppose the motion to instruct, thus bringing in revenue and clearing the way for comprehensive mining law reform.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to instruct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I had neglected in my opening remarks to point out that the most important and significant leader in support of the patent moratorium in this House has been the chairman of this appropriations subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. His speeches on this subject have been illuminating and have been very persuasive, and I know that he will be very, very persuasive in support of the House position at such time as we meet on the conference.