

giveaway. So the first argument has been dealt with.

Second, there is a reverter provision. If on any occasion the land is not used for the mining purposes, it reverts automatically. The second issue is dealt with. Both of those are dealt with in the conference committee report itself.

But third and finally, the issue of a royalty is also dealt with in both the House and Senate reconciliation legislation. A royalty will be paid. There may, indeed, have been good reasons for those who were interested in them to impose a mining moratorium, but they were resolved in this report. I urge my colleagues to recognize we have fixed those problems.

The miner moratorium hurts jobs and hurts people. For the other side, for those who oppose it to say we do not need minerals in America, we are anxious to protect jobs, but we do not care about miners jobs, so we do not need minerals produced in America and we can buy those minerals from overseas, they miss so much of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, we need those jobs here in America and in the western United States. I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and to support this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, merely to point out to the gentleman that we are not getting the full value of the land. We are getting the value of the surface of the land. We are not getting the value of the minerals that lie below the land. The value of that land, with its dust and its scrub and its rocks and consisting of land that nothing can grow on, is bound to be practically nil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the President: Mr. President, this bill is probably going to get to your desk. On behalf of the West, sir, veto it and send it back. This bill is bad for the West.

This bill is bad for the public's land, because it has in it a terrible bias toward extractive industry, an unconscionable bias.

This bill does break our word to the first Americans. America's Indian people are the least well-housed, have the highest infant mortality rate, they suffer the highest unemployment rates, they have the least length of time in which they live. This bill is going to make it worse for them. Mr. Speaker, I again say: Please, Mr. President, veto it.

This bill gives away our natural resources, particularly in the West, at bargain basement prices. It mandates timber volumes in sensitive forests. The boys in the board room are getting their greed satisfied with this bill. Mr. Speaker, I say: Mr. President, veto it.

Jim Watt must be smiling. He could have written this bill. Mr. President, veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I again say: Mr. President, out our way, we like the National

Endowment for the Arts. This bill cuts that agency almost 40 percent in the next year. And what is worse, it applies Government censorship to the grants. In the West, we do not like censorship. Mr. Speaker, I say: Mr. President, veto this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). The Chair must remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others, such as the President.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on Interior appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with jurisdiction over mineral resources on the public lands. I believe the conference report language on mining claims solves a problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to fix an outdated law, not since 1866, whereby miners pay a fixed price of \$5 an acre for resource-rich land. None of us believe that the existing price of \$5 an acre is valid today, but there is every reason to support his conference report.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that patent applicants will pay fair market value for the land, upon enactment of this conference report. The Committee on Resources has within its budget reconciliation title legislation a measure to levy a royalty on hardrock minerals produced from public lands for the first time in 150 years.

Mr. Speaker, why would any of us not support his opportunity to charge fair market value for mineral patents and receive royalty?

Mr. Speaker, I urge acceptance of this conference report.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit the Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report language does answer one of the critical issues that we are dealing with with regard to mining reform, and that is it does require a fair market value to be paid for the land in a mining claim.

The other issue that is talked about so much is whether a royalty will be paid for the right to mine the minerals under the land that will be patented. That issue is also going to be resolved. Members all know that in the reconciliation bill that is coming, an imposition of a royalty is included. The two key issues that we must address here in mining reform, plus additional mining reform issues that are going to be addressed, are under consideration and will be resolved by this House.

Mr. Speaker, the effort to recommit this bill is an effort to stall the mining

reform that we are moving forward on and we must reject this motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all read in the last month or two where the Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, had to sell valuable mineral rights to a foreign-owned company at basement prices. And I will not even call them basement prices. The prices were so low, it was criminal that we had to give away those mineral resources.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress who are environmentalists and fiscal conservatives recognize how wrong it is to give away our natural resources, especially to foreign-owned companies.

Mr. Speaker, what we should do is recommit this bill, fix this problem, and make sure that this travesty does not continue. It is wrong from an environmental standpoint, it is wrong from a fiscal standpoint, and it is wrong from an American standpoint.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the new majority came here with a call they were going to run this place like a business. Well, I do not know of any business or any family who would run their business as we are running the natural resources of this country.

Mr. Speaker, think about the term "below-cost timber sales." We sell timber at a price that is inadequate to recoup the Government's cost. We sell minerals at a price that no family, that no business would give them away for.

If we were a wealthy institution, and with all our fiscal problems this is a wealthy country, if we were impoverished, we would not sell things below cost. We certainly would not take our children's and grandchildren's assets and dispose of them in some fire sale that would destroy the land in many instances, but certainly not bring any profit.

Mr. Speaker, this is bad business; it is bad government; it is bad stewardship. Support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in opposition to this conference report and urge support for the motion to recommit this to conference.

Mr. Speaker, if this goes through as it is, it will, in most likelihood, mandate and accelerate the issuance of 600 patents of lands; a giveaway of land at fair market value for the surface, but does not take into consideration what the value of the minerals are—nearly a quarter-million acres of public land.

Mr. Speaker, years ago we changed that process with regard to coal and

oil. Why does this 19th century robber-baron attitude persist with regard to hardrock minerals, where somebody can explore and prospect for the gold, look for the value, and then come back and expect a handout from the Federal Government? The land for peanuts and the minerals for free while the taxpayer ends up holding the bag.

We cannot do that. This will result in a quarter-million acres of Federal land punctuating the entire landscape of this country, critical areas, which will be given away on this basis with no assurance as to the use and return for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep the pressure on to get a good mining reform law to change that 1872 law. We can only do that by sending this back to conference or the President vetoing the bill. There are many other things wrong with the legislation that need to be remedied, but the mining moratorium is the debate today. Vote to send this back to conference.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we respond to what has just been said, because we must again make it clear that the legislation we are considering does require payment of fair market value for the land.

The argument has been made, "Yes, but it does not require payment for the minerals." But I say again, the reconciliation legislation that is coming does contain the royalty provision for payment of the minerals as they are extracted.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two pieces of the reform that have consistently been thrown out as the components that we must address: The value of the land and the value of the minerals. Those are both being addressed and those who would have Members support the effort to recommit this conference report simply want to stop the progress on making these needed mining reforms.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report language on mining claims solves a problem, rather than simply deferring action. When enacted, miners seeking title to their claims will pay fair market value, not \$5 an acre, which never occurred to begin with.

□ 1145

Some mining claimants have complied with present law and now qualify under present law. This is America. They have filled all the obligations required under law. If a new law is retroactively applied without grandfathering these claims, then the Federal Government will be exposed to billions of dollars in takings liabilities.

You say fine. That is the taxpayers' dollars you are talking about. That is what you are talking about here, is controlled by the Government.

These people followed the law, and we passed that law. And now you are going to make it retroactive. That is taking and the Government is susceptible to a lawsuit. Maybe you ought to be reliable yourselves. Maybe you ought to pay the bill instead of the taxpayer. If we are talking about future laws, that is different, but this applies to the present law that in fact is in effect today and those people followed that law.

A "no" vote is the right vote for this motion to recommit. If in fact a "yes" vote is the overwhelming majority or the minority, then we have taken and implemented a taking of property from a private individual, a citizen of the United States.

I have watched this from the floor before. Where this Congress thinks nothing about retroactive taxes, breaking people, taking their homes in the guise of good for all. This time if you do so, you are going to be sued. We are going to be sued. But none of us are held responsible. That is what is wrong.

I hope that the people listening to this program, all 26 million of you, understand what this Congress may do today. That is, implement a lawsuit against you, not us individually, but against the taxpayers of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of things I want to emphasize. We respect private property rights in this bill, perhaps more than has been historically true. We have tried to protect those. We have tried to ensure that we protect America's natural heritage.

I would have to point out, obviously we have \$1.4 billion less, and I think those who have spoken in opposition to the bill have made that case that we should have spent more. But if we are going to get a balanced budget in 7 years, it has to start somewhere. We have tried to do the things that are important.

Again, I emphasize, the parks will be open. The forests, the Smithsonian, the fish and wildlife facilities, the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery of Art, their operating budgets have been held pretty much intact, because we want the public to continue to have access to the facilities that they treasure.

We had to make it up on land acquisition and many other activities that had not as high a priority. Even on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where it was something that affected the tribal activities, we have maintained the level of funding. On the issue of the moratorium, I think it is a policy question. Members have heard debate on both sides. Each Member will have to make his or her own decision.

We were instructed to maintain the moratorium by a voice vote and the original amendment carried 271 to 153. But there was a difference among conferees as reflected in the report.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, said that in this bill we respect private property rights. And we do. We protect private property rights. The problem is, though, we do not respect public property rights. And we give away the public property on too many occasions in giving away the opportunity to exploit the people's resources.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill and in support of the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit the Interior appropriations bill to conference and to restore the House language regarding the mining law patent moratorium.

If the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Interior Appropriations bill were a car, it would be recalled.

What it purports to do in the name of budget cutting is obscene. Not only is this appropriations bill packed with authorizing legislation as in a spending bill—in clear violation of House rules—but, it also shamelessly and against the public interest runs rampant in overturning sound environmental policy.

There are simply too many flaws in this conference report to describe each one of them, but, one of the most offensive is the elimination of the mining patent moratorium.

Despite the fact that the House has repeatedly voted for a moratorium on giving away public lands to mining companies, the conference committee adopted language that replaces the patent moratorium with a new Senate provision that is even worse than that which currently exists under the old 1872 law.

This is not an insignificant concern. It is one—if not the primary—reason the President has said he will veto this bill.

Unless the patent moratorium is restored, over 600 patent applications worth more than \$15 billion in mineral resources, currently blocked by last year's moratorium, will be given away for less than \$700,000 for whose benefit and under the banner of what kind of conservatism.

Unless the conference report is changed and the moratorium imposed—mining companies—many of them foreign-owned—will get title to an additional 230,000 acres of the public's land for a pittance of their real value. Who does this benefit?—the struggling middle class?—is this an element of the contract for America?—what kind of conservatism is this?

Ending the moratorium also means that all 330,000 mining claims—or another one million acres of public land—will be eligible for patenting or disposal to the mining industry.

People often ask us Why can't you run government more like a business?

Our inability to reform the 1872 mining law is a perfect example of both why they ask us this question and why we can't run government more like a business.

I can think of no business that gives away its assets—for free—without taking any kind of a payment. But, the Federal Government is

forced, through actions such as this legislation to virtually give-away public lands that are rich in gold and silver to mining companies. We don't even reserve a royalty or any other sort of economic payment to the public—it's just *finders keepers* under the 1872 mining law.

We have been trying for years and years to get this archaic law changed—but the mining industry and its friends in Congress have been successful in blocking those attempts.

So, we have been forced to impose a simple moratorium to stem the flow of valuable mineral properties from the public troth while we try to get meaningful reform enacted.

Just this year, because Congress has failed to reform the 1872 Mining Law, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt has been forced to sign away land worth more than \$1 billion for a pittance of its true value.

For example, the Secretary was recently compelled to sign away ownership to 109 acres of public land in Idaho containing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of a mineral called travertine to a Dutch owned corporation for the paltry sum of \$275. This looks like letting business run government for business's purpose—these are public lands, these are public assets. This legal piracy of public resources must stop. If the Republicans are serious about reforming Government, and not just interested in consolidating and moving more and more of the Nation's capital resources—upstream—to the already rich and wealthy, then they should not stand in the way of reforming the 1872 Mining law.

We should not give away permanent ownership of the public lands. We don't do that in oil, gas or coal leasing.

But, the hard rock mining industry claims to be different than all the other mineral resource and extractive industries. They claim that patenting is critical to their ability to function. But, this is a bogus argument. You do not need a patent to mine. It is absolutely irrelevant to the question of mining—unless you are trying to avoid paying a royalty if and when Congress gets around to changing the 1872 mining law.

No State gives private companies title to its resources, and yet the companies mine on State land. I know of no private citizens who give mining companies title to their land for mineral exploration and production, and yet they mine on private lands.

So why don't we change the law? It's simple—money talks, nobody walks—The mining industry spent a small fortune last year and again this year to prevent reform of the 123-year-old Mining law of 1872. It is cheaper for them to pay the lobbyists and make the campaign contributions than to see real reform enacted to safeguard the taxpayers who own this gold. As a result, we can look forward to many more giveaways like the ones Secretary Babbitt signed earlier this year—trading a fortune in public gold for a pauper's ransom.

If we do not stop patenting, through mining reform or through a patenting moratorium pending achievement of mining reform—we will see more and more public land given away in the years to come.

Unless we keep the patent moratorium in place, these lands will be given away to mining corporations that want to avoid paying a royalty.

We cannot be party to the continued looting of the Treasury by foreign gold companies and others. So we should include a patent moratorium because as a practical matter, we should

not leave the 1872 law, and particularly the patenting process, on the books should no action be taken on comprehensive reform. If we must again defer until next year—or the year after—comprehensive reform, we should hold the program in abeyance. For while we may not have agreed on the precise design of reform at the point, virtually everyone agrees drastic reform of the mining program is necessary.

So, I urge the House to recommit the conference report and insist on adoption of the House language. If we cannot achieve real reform, we will at a minimum stop the giveaway of 15 billion dollars' worth of public resources until such time as we do achieve reform.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Interior appropriations bill before us today. It is a bill rife with Federal giveaways—an interesting juxtaposition given the Republican interest in balancing the budget and reforming welfare and other programs for the poor.

The real message is: It's OK to attack welfare for the poor, but do not question Federal welfare to those who can make billions off our Federal lands with a minuscule return to the Government. Why are we offering this giveaway to those who benefit from the largesse of our natural resources, and at the expense of our public lands and our Federal Treasury?

The biggest giveaway in the bill is the fire sale of our Federal lands and their mineral deposits to a single beneficiary—the mining industry. And this is done in the name of mining reform. This isn't reform; this is a retreat.

The House is already on record opposing what the Senate has included in H.R. 1977. We voted 271 to 153 in opposition to lifting the moratorium on mining claim patents—only 2 months ago. Now, we are retreating from this vote and our position against this giveaway.

Mining companies stand to gain millions, or billions, in mining these underground resources with literally no return to the Federal Government. If this is Republican reform, then I can only imagine what is in store for the American people.

Let's look at real reform and let's stand by the vote we took in July and let's not rip off the American people.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 1977 and vote to recommit the bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, on September 29, 1965, President Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act into law. This historic act created the the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and ushered in a new era in the cultural life of America.

At this time I would like to submit for the RECORD a newspaper article from September 30, 1965 on President Johnson signing the act.

For most of our Nation's history, one would have to travel to the largest cities in order to see and experience great art. But today, thanks in large part to the 100,000 grants made by the National Endowment for the Arts, culture and art are thriving in every corner of America. The statistics speak for themselves: in 1965 there were only 58 orchestras in the country; today there are over 1,000. Prior to the NEA there were 37 professional dance companies in America; now there are 300. In 1965, there were five State arts agencies; today, every State has a public arts agency

and there are community arts agencies in over 3,800 cities, counties and towns. Perhaps most impressive of all has been the increase in the number of people attending the theater; before 1965 only 1 million people attended the theater each year, today over 55 million attend annually.

From the great performances on public television, to touring arts exhibitions and performances, art is now available to all Americans.

By any measure, the National Endowment for the Arts has been a success. The Arts Endowment has made a difference in the lives of millions. In Chicago for instance, grants to organizations like Urban Gateways have helped tens of thousands of school children become better students through the arts. All across America, millions of children and their families have had the chance to see the masterpieces of the visual arts, hear the masterworks of American composers, and read the novels, stories and poems of America's best writers. Traditional folk arts have been resurrected. Historic buildings which add beauty and character to neighborhoods and cities have been saved and restored. In short, American culture and the American people have been profoundly changed by our small investment in the arts.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on the 30th anniversary of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, I urge my colleagues, and the nation as a whole, to reflect on the role that arts and humanities play in our lives; how we are enriched by them and how bleak our lives would be without them.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD.

[From the Morning News, Wilmington, DE, Sept. 30, 1965]

\$21-MILLION-A-YEAR BOOST—LBJ SIGNS AID-TO-ARTS BILL

(By Norman Rynn)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson turned the White House Rose Garden into a cultural center yesterday to sign a bill that makes the federal government a multimillion dollar patron of the arts.

Taking over a role played by the aristocracy in medieval times—and now carried on by governments in many European countries and the Soviet Union—the Administration will be able to pour up to \$21 million a year into support of the creative and performing arts and humanities.

Poets, painters, actors and a huge crowd of congressmen gathered in the rose garden to watch Johnson sign the bill which created a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

Now that the bill is law, Johnson said, "Let me tell you what we are going to do with it. Working together with the state and the local governments, and with many private organizations in the arts, we will:

"Create a national theater to bring ancient and modern classics of the theater to audiences all over America.

"We will support a national opera company and a national ballet company. (He did not spell out whether this would be similar to Russia's world-famous Bolshoi Ballet Co.)

"We will create an American film institute, bringing together leading artists of the film industry, outstanding educators, and young men and women who wish to pursue the 20th Century art form as their life's work.

"We will commission new works of music by American composers.

"We will support our symphony orchestras.

"We will bring more great artists to our schools and universities by creating grants for their time in residence."

The President declared further that "in the long history of man, countless empires and nations have come and gone. Those which created no lasting works of art are reduced today to short footnotes in history's catalogue."

"We in America have not always been kind to the artists and scholars who are the creators and the keepers of our vision. Somehow, the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and the humanities get the basement."

It was a remark that went over well with his audience, which included such notables as composers Meredith Willson and Richard Adler; actor Gregory Peck and Hollywood director George Stevens; photographic great Edward Steichen; Impresario Sol Hurok, writers Paddy Chayefsky and Marianne Moore.

Notably absent was playwright Arthur Miller, who informed Johnson that he would not be present because he disagreed with the Administration's Vietnamese policy. It was the second such snub this year. For the same reason, poet Robert Lowell turned down an invitation in June to the White House Festival of the American Arts.

The legislation signed by the President creates a national foundation to develop policy and coordinate the work of two endowments. One would be for the humanities which would include such things as art criticism and the study of modern and classical language, and the other for the arts, including music, folk art, industrial design and the like.

There will be a basic \$5-million fund for each endowment, with additional money authorized to match nonfederal contributions for support of the arts and humanities. Each state with an arts council will get \$50,000 a year for its support, while states without the councils will get \$25,000 to help create them.

Furthermore, the U.S. Office of Education will get \$1 million to support state and local educational agency efforts to teach the arts and humanities and to train elementary and high school teachers in these fields.

The national theater and ballet and opera companies that Johnson mentioned will one day be able to perform in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which will be the nation's No. 1 cultural showpiece.

The President later in the day requested \$17,910,000 in supplemental appropriations to initiate the grant-in-aid programs under the act signed yesterday. The request was included in a \$132,993,000 supplemental appropriation request sent to Congress.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the amendment to restore funding to the Mojave preserve which failed on the House floor, I am deeply disappointed that the Senate saw fit to accept the House language on this issue.

While there are a number of other things wrong with this measure, not the least of which is the mining issue, this back door effort to gut the California Desert Protection Act is of particular concern to me.

Congress expressed its will loudly and clearly when it passed the California Desert Protection Act in the last session. Overwhelmingly and with significant Republican support, Congress directed the National Park Service and not the Bureau of Land Management to manage the Mojave preserve.

If the new majority in this House seeks to repeal this or any other part of the Desert Act, they should introduce legislation to do that. It should be open and undisguised legislation.

We should not let the appropriations process be abused in this way.

Supporters of the Desert Act were not afraid to have open and honest debate during the years it took to get this measure enacted. Opponents should allow for the same kind of exhaustive review if they believe they have the support to repeal it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

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 the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. Totally, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1977 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on Senate amendment numbered 158.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. YATES. 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 notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 147, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 696]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner

Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Evans

Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink

Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinar
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—147

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert

Camp
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett

Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoke
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kim
Knollenberg

Kolbe	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
LaHood	Orton	Spence
Largent	Packard	Stearns
Laughlin	Parker	Stockman
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Stump
Lewis (KY)	Paxon	Talent
Lightfoot	Petri	Tate
Livingston	Pombo	Tauzin
Lucas	Quillen	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Radanovich	Thomas
McInnis	Riggs	Thornberry
McIntosh	Roberts	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rogers	Vucanovich
Metcalf	Roth	Waldholtz
Mica	Salmon	Walsh
Mollohan	Saxton	Wamp
Moorhead	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
Myers	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Seastrand	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Shadegg	Wicker
Neumann	Shuster	Wilson
Norwood	Skeen	Young (AK)
Nussle	Smith (TX)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—10

Buyer	McHugh	Tucker
Collins (IL)	Porter	Walker
Fields (LA)	Reynolds	
Frost	Tejeda	

□ 1210

Mr. PETRI, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GRAHAM, WELLER, CUNNINGHAM, KINGSTON, MANZULLO, MCCOLLUM, and JONES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak for one moment for the purpose of advising Members about their travel schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a minute to advise Members that we, of course, have passed the continuing resolution through our body. It is now under consideration in the other body. We recognize the possibility of extended consideration of the continuing resolution in the other body, and, in light of that, we cannot make any hard and fast declarations about our potential departure time today. We still remain somewhat optimistic, but I thought it was only fair to alert the Members.

Of course, we must await the other body's final consideration for our final action at this point. We will try to stay in touch with them about what is going on, and I will try to keep the body informed. I remain hopeful that perhaps they can expedite their consideration and we can move on with our day's schedule.

In the meantime, as we contemplate that, we will be considering the possibility of other legislation to be brought before the body today. But we will make every effort we can, in light of

the considerations we must give the other body, to complete our work as early as we can today, so that Members can get home for their district work period.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a consultative meeting on Bosina at the White House today with a number of Members at 12:30. Is it possible we could accommodate those Members who need to be at that very important meeting without having votes interrupting?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. I, too, will be in that meeting. We are looking at all options on the schedule. We will do our best to accommodate all Members, perhaps even by delaying votes or whatever, and we will try to accommodate them.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I know a number of Members want to have the vote, if possible, so they could go to that meeting without having to leave. Is it possible that votes could be held before that time?

Mr. ARMEY. As the gentleman knows, the other body works at its own pace, and we will, of course, as we always do, wait their result.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Is there any change in the anticipated order of schedule today? Everything remains as is?

Mr. ARMEY. Not at this time. We intend to proceed as we scheduled for today.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that meeting. I am also aware that we have the defense conference report for the 1996 appropriations scheduled on the floor in the next few minutes, and that that vote may come up at some point this afternoon. I would suggest to those who are conducting the meeting, that it might be wise to either hold it on Capitol Hill or reschedule it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we did receive extremely late notice from the White House, and we are trying to accommodate everyone concerned with respect to the White House request. We will make a determination and proceed with due consideration of all our Members in light of the two considerations two matters we have at the White House and the other body.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2405, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-270) on the resolution (H. Res. 234) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2405) to authorize

appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1976, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-271) on the resolution (H. Res. 235) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1215

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1289

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1289.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There is no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2399. An act to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the intent of such Act and to reduce burdensome regulatory requirements on creditors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2099. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2099) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of