

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, across the county, Americans are looking for some signs. Signs of progress. Signs of leadership. Signs of decency. Unfortunately, this is still the only sign they see. "Closed." Why? Simple. Because of the close-minded radical right—Members who refuse to see any side to this issue other than their own.

But it is not just their minds that are closed. The Gingrich Republicans have closed their eyes, too. They close their eyes to the pain that their gutless gamesmanship has caused.

Seniors and children are denied nutrition programs, unemployed workers can not get benefits, and all the GOP does is talk about "holding the President's feet to the fire." Meanwhile, innocent Americans huddle around a fire to keep warm.

Yes—this GOP majority has opened its backrooms to big business lobbyists to help them write new laws. But it closes the door on hardworking Government employees who implement and enforce those laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and your side of the aisle, to open up our minds, and say "Yes, we are open." Open the Government, now.

A CLEAR MISSION

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

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today I walked into this great House as a brandnew Member of Congress representing Long Island, NY. When I did that, I had one mission 1 year ago, and that was to do things differently, to get away from the rhetoric and the empty words that really are not truthful.

The simple fact is, we have done our job. The President does not like it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle certainly do not like it.

Here is the result of our work product. We promised a balanced budget; we delivered it. Here it is. Mr. Speaker, anyone in this country who would like to get a copy of this real budget, call my office, 202-225-5516; I will send you one.

If you would like to see the President's alternative balanced budget, you do not have to call. You can see it right here. You cannot really see it, because it does not exist.

The President of the United States has not done his job. Though he has done a lot of yakking, and he has done a lot of blabbing; he has not rolled up his sleeves and done the real work and put numbers on the table.

UTAH CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF STATEHOOD

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my fellow Utahns in celebrating

Utah's Statehood Centennial. One hundred years ago, on January 4, 1896, my home State of Utah became the 45th State in the Union.

Utah had spent nearly 50 years attempting to become a State, and had been turned down six times by 1896. But the patriotic and pioneering spirit of those who settled in the Utah territory prevailed, and the news of the long sought after statehood was received with great rejoicing and enthusiasm as thousands of citizens participated in parades and celebrations on that cold January morning, celebrations being reenacted in Utah today.

Over the past 100 years, citizens of Utah have served our great Nation with distinction through military, government, civic, and religious activities.

Today, Utah enjoys the strongest economy and is among the most rapidly growing States in the Nation. It is without prejudice that we declare Utah to be the greatest place on Earth.

It is my honor to serve the people of Utah in this, the people's House of Representatives. Today, we in the Congress honor the contributions which Utahns have made to our Nation over the past century and look forward with great anticipation to the opportunities of service to one another in the next century.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 393

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 393.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LA HOOD) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REGULA moves to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto message on 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

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 motion to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto message of the Presi-

dent to the bill H.R. 1977 and on the veto message itself, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, today we have an opportunity to correct a serious problem, and that is the lack of access to the Nation's treasures that result from the veto by the President of the Interior appropriations bill.

It is a good bill. We worked hard on it on both sides of the aisle. It was re-committed twice to the conference to take care of the problems of the Tongass to satisfy the environmental concerns and also to take care of the need for a mining moratorium. Those issues were addressed, and I think out of the give and take of the conference and the recommitments, we arrived at a good bill, a bill that is fair and a bill that is nonpartisan.

There are many projects that need to be finished that were in Members' districts, both Republican and Democrat. The parks, of course, serve all of the people of the United States, as well as do the cultural institutions downtown.

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that on December 20, 89 Members of the minority voted to override the President on securities litigation reform. That is a pretty esoteric bill, and I am going to borrow a phrase from my good friends on the other side of the aisle and say that was an override for the rich, because people involved in securities are pretty much well-to-do people; they certainly are not the average American.

They found it in their hearts to override the President's veto on a bill with a very narrow constituency, a bill that will be beneficial to a limited number of people.

Today we are asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in voting to override a bill that affects 260 million Americans. This is an override for the people, and I would hope that the 89 Members of the other party that voted to override the President on a very sophisticated piece of legislation, affecting only a handful of Americans relatively, certainly would want to do the same for the 260 million Americans that want access to the treasures of this Nation.

Today we have an opportunity to open the facilities that Americans care about, to give them an opportunity if they come to the Nation's Capital to visit the Vermeer exhibit, one of the world's great treasures, at the National Gallery, which is scheduled to leave, I think, February 11, a very limited opportunity of time; an opportunity to see the marvelous exhibits at the Smithsonian; an opportunity for sportsmen that like to hunt ducks that are coming down the flyways and are stopping at the various facilities, one

in Arkansas that I am aware of, the season I think opens or should have opened January 1; an opportunity for people that want to go to Philadelphia and see the Liberty Bell; an opportunity to visit the Holocaust Museum.

All we need is for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or for the 89 that wanted to override the securities legislation to say, let us open up these facilities to the American public, let us open our parks, let us open our forests.

□ 1045

What does a vote "yes" mean? A vote "yes" means that we can keep Indian schools open, it will provide welfare assistance to needy Indian children. A vote "yes" will ensure that essential services on Indian reservations, including health services, law enforcement, education, continue to be provided.

What will a "no" vote mean? A "no" jeopardized the health, the education, and the safety of over 1 million native Americans. Let me say here that we added, at the request of the administration, in the bill that they vetoed, we added prior to the veto, an extra \$50 million for Indian programs. This was something I know that the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations was interested in.

A vote to override the President's veto will ensure the collection of Federal revenues. Most people do not realize that from mining, oil and gas leas-

ing, and timber harvesting, we collect \$8 billion, not million, \$8 billion in Federal revenues. But those collections agencies, such as MMS, are paralyzed because of the fact that they do not have people on the job. We could very well lose a substantial amount of money.

A "no" vote will jeopardize the collection of the \$8 billion that are generated by the activities in this bill.

A "yes" vote will put 130,000 Federal employees back to work. It will ensure that they can provide for their families.

All we need today is for the 89 that voted to override on securities legislation to vote to override the President today, and we will put those 130,000 employees on the job as early as tomorrow.

What does a vote "no" mean? It means they still live in an era of uncertainty. They have difficulty meeting their monthly payments.

What will a "yes" vote do for our national parks? Some 369 national parks will open their doors. I call on 89 of you to help us open the doors. It will open 500 national wildlife refuges, our 150 national forests, the National Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian, our natural and cultural treasures will be opened to the public.

A "no" vote will lock the doors, will deny 260 million Americans access to those things that they treasure, the

parks, the forests, the fish and wildlife facilities, the National Gallery, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum. A "no" vote is to keep them out. It is very important that the American public understand that a "no" vote today is to deny access to these marvelous facilities.

What will a "yes" vote do for the American people? It means that they will have the things that they treasure. It means that they can appreciate their great out-of-doors, the public lands, the forests, the hiking and the camping areas, and these are a part of what we talk about in family values. A "yes" vote means that that family that wants to camp out in a national forest or a national park will have an opportunity to do so. A vote "yes" is a vote for the American people. A vote "no" is to say you are locked out, no access to the things that you treasure so much and that belong to all the Americans.

So I say to my colleagues, the right vote today is a vote "yes." If you can vote "yes" to take care of a handful of lawyers that deal in securities litigation, you certainly can vote "yes" to let 260 million Americans have access to the things they treasure, to the things that they own, to the things that are part of their heritage of this great Nation.

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	583,936,000	588,082,000	-29,174,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000				-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,482,000				-121,176,000
Wildland fire management			235,924,000	240,159,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazmat account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,088,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,815,000	3,115,000	-9,963,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,500,000	+91,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	8,500,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,957,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,367,000	95,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,159,882,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction	53,788,000	34,085,000	28,355,000	38,775,000	37,858,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	8,687,000	8,700,000	8,019,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	87,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,963,000	38,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,169,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,963,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund		152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund		400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	598,938,000	603,850,000	603,864,000	-87,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,985,000		-182,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,068,248,000	1,082,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	36,094,000	37,849,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	36,312,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	178,983,000	114,888,000	116,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund	8,000	2,300,000				-8,000
Land and water conservation fund (recession of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Land acquisition and state assistance	87,373,000	82,696,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund		15,200,000				
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,367,329,000	1,480,122,000	1,281,076,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-87,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,482,000	566,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	188,181,000	193,348,000	198,558,000	182,189,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,992,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,998,000	188,609,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	93,251,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	178,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,519,012,000	1,608,842,000	1,509,626,000	1,261,234,000	1,384,434,000	-134,578,000
Construction.....	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,145,000	82,745,000	80,845,000	+3,549,000
Nevado rehabilitation trust fund.....	1,996,000					-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises.....	1,986,000	1,986,000		900,000	500,000	-1,486,000
Indian direct loan program account.....	779,000					-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	9,871,000	9,884,000		7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,871,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,800,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,966,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories.....	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,885,000	40,468,000	37,486,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant.....	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	
Subtotal.....	78,201,000	69,232,000	52,605,000	68,188,000	65,186,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	19,800,000					-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association.....	13,574,000	10,038,000	14,818,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments.....	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,800,000	14,900,000	14,800,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal.....	23,574,000	24,938,000	29,518,000	24,938,000	24,838,000	+1,384,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs.....	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,823,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management.....	62,479,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,883,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	34,808,000	35,361,000	34,808,000	34,808,000	34,808,000	
Office of Inspector General.....	23,939,000	25,486,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	
Construction Management.....	1,896,000	2,000,000		500,000	500,000	-1,496,000
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....				16,338,000	16,338,000	+16,338,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,892,000
Appropriations.....	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,978,037,000)	(6,053,205,000)	(-484,892,000)
Recession.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....		(15,200,000)				
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,800,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,966,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research.....	193,748,000	203,798,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry.....	154,288,000	187,459,000	129,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund.....	17,000,000					-17,000,000
International forestry.....	4,987,000	10,000,000				-4,987,000
National forest system.....	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,286,988,000	1,247,543,000	1,268,253,000	-72,640,000
Forest Service fire protection.....	159,285,000	164,285,000				-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund.....	226,200,000	239,000,000				-226,200,000
Emergency appropriations.....	450,000,000					-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management.....			385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction.....	189,215,000	192,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	183,500,000	-36,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite).....	(-44,789,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits.....	(50,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Land acquisition.....	83,882,000	65,311,000	14,800,000	41,187,000	41,200,000	-22,882,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Total, Forest Service.....	2,803,802,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,871,000	2,176,224,000	2,186,579,000	-637,023,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology.....	-337,879,000	-155,019,000				+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	423,701,000	436,508,000	379,524,000	376,181,000	417,189,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer).....	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-3,800,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	187,048,000	101,028,000	151,028,000	136,028,000	146,788,000	-36,262,000
Energy conservation.....	755,751,000	923,561,000	556,371,000	578,978,000	553,293,000	-202,458,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer).....		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation.....	12,413,000	10,500,000	8,297,000	8,038,000	8,297,000	-8,118,000
Emergency preparedness.....	8,233,000	8,219,000	-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....	135,954,000	25,889,000	-135,954,000
(By transfer).....	(90,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+ 96,236,000)
Energy Information Administration.....	84,586,000	84,689,000	79,786,000	84,786,000	72,286,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy.....	1,265,887,000	1,418,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-88,478,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services.....	1,709,780,000	1,818,350,000	1,725,792,000	1,815,373,000	1,747,842,000	+38,062,000
Indian health facilities.....	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,875,000	151,227,000	238,966,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service.....	1,963,062,000	2,060,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education.....	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,980,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,886,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute.....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses.....	313,853,000	329,800,000	309,471,000	307,966,000	308,188,000	-5,865,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings.....	23,954,000	34,000,000	24,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction.....	21,857,000	36,700,000	12,950,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	382,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,862,000	373,082,000	+10,388,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses.....	52,902,000	54,586,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	4,018,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	56,918,000	64,481,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,366,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance.....	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,800,000	10,323,000	10,323,000
Construction.....	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,576,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,036,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration.....	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,258,000	86,785,000	82,258,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants.....	28,512,000	26,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts.....	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration.....	146,131,000	156,067,000	82,486,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-82,131,000
Matching grants.....	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities.....	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration.....	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities..	363,117,000	384,200,000	219,988,000	241,000,000	230,494,000	-132,623,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses.....	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants.....	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,947,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000			-2,738,000
Public development	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund		1,388,000				
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,789,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,184,636,000	-1,354,594,000
Appropriations	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,083,099,000)	(12,194,636,000)	(-1,354,594,000)
Reconciliation	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,200,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,789,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer)	(107,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,158,862,000	1,055,483,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	871,038,000	702,817,000	568,836,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-87,174,000
National Biological Service	182,041,000	172,866,000		145,965,000		-182,041,000
National Park Service	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,336,000	1,318,337,000	-67,962,000
United States Geological Survey	571,462,000	588,369,000	688,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service	194,821,000	201,240,000	192,998,000	188,809,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	126,007,000	64,000,000	-86,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	299,578,000	299,411,000	299,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,882,806,000	1,456,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,556,000
Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,507,697,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,662,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,802,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,871,000	2,176,224,000	2,186,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy	1,285,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,599,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,966,600,000	+23,738,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,765,000	52,500,000	54,680,000	52,500,000	-26,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	11,213,000	19,848,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,708,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,388,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,308,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,308,000	19,308,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services	26,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,947,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,184,636,000	-1,354,594,000

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Ohio is trying to continue a coverup. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, why he does not come in with a good bill, a bill of which we on the committee can be proud, instead of trying to revive a dead, discredited bill.

We should approve not only a clean continuing resolution, and then we can pass an Interior bill the President can sign, not this bill, which the President rightfully vetoed. The gentleman did not indicate the defects in this bill, and we know why the President vetoed the Interior conference bill, because it is a bad bill and it would have been wrong on the part of the President to sign this bill.

My good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, at the last time this bill was on the floor, got up before the House and said that we all know why the Government is shut down, it is because the President vetoed this bill. Well, of course the President vetoed this bill because it was the right thing to do. He vetoed the bill because it slashes funding for the Native Americans by \$325 million.

My friend from Ohio talks about the additional \$50 million they have put in. That is a sop, a pittance, when one realize that the original cut to the funds for the Native Americans was over \$400 million by the Senate, almost a half billion dollars.

The President vetoed the bill because the low income weatherization program is gutted by lack of appropriations. He vetoed the bill because the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities are cut in half. He vetoed the bill because America's greatest forest, the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, will be increased in its cut of timber by one-third. If its harvests in the past are any indication, the cut will be a clear-cut, as well. It treats the Native Americans like second-class citizens. It suspends the environmental laws that give the public a right to protest the breaches to the environmental laws that the increases in the cuts are liable to make.

My good friends in the majority do not believe this veto override will be successful. My friend from Ohio points out all the things that an override of this veto will bring. Well, the evils in this bill are such that the President could not possibly have signed the bill. Those wrongs will continue, because I am sure that the President continues the same frame of mind.

There has been no effort on the part of the majority to rework this bill. The conference took care of the moratorium for mining and little else.

As I indicated, the chairman of the committee, and it is indicated, also, by my friend from Ohio that the veto of the President was responsible for the

closing of the Government. The fact is that the wrongs in this bill were emphasized by the House's veto on two separate occasions of this bill. Motions to recommit the bill to committee were approved by the House. So they believed, along with the President, that this was not a good bill. If it is not a good bill, why, then, does the gentleman from Ohio ask for an override?

All of these wrongs could be satisfied by passing a clean continuing resolution, as has been pointed out so frequently. Because that continuing resolution is not passed, because this is such a bad bill, our national parks are closed, the National Gallery of Art is closed, and the Vermeer exhibition is barred from showing to the public through the expenditure of public funds, although the Mellon Foundation, as it has done so frequently in the past, has come to the rescue of the Vermeer exhibition, and the public will be allowed to see it until its scheduled time for closing takes place.

The Smithsonian is shut down. Millions of Americans whose livelihood depends upon the Interior Department, the Forest Service, and upon other agencies are left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, let me give some examples of what is happening as a result of what the closedown of the Government is doing to this bill.

Welfare assistance to 53,000 Indian families has been ended. Child welfare assistance to 3,000 Indian children in foster homes and orphanages is cut off. Indian tribes that rely on funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs are having to furlough employees, close schools, and close tribal jails. Over 383,000 visitors have been turned away from the national parks, having a devastating effect on towns and businesses that rely on that tourism.

Local communities are losing over \$14 million every day because of the park closures. Thousands of service industry workers have lost their jobs as a result.

The Park Service has been forced to evict people who are camping in the Everglades National Park in Florida. The Minerals Management Service is prevented from issuing permits to begin exploration or development of authorized offshore oil and gas deposits. A Federal criminal trial against an international wildlife smuggling ring in Chicago has been delayed because the Fish and Wildlife Service cannot provide crucial assistance to the Justice Department. The National Biologic Service has been prevented from investigating an alarming increase in the death of bald eagles and sea otters.

The list of hardships and tragedies, Mr. Speaker, goes on and on. The Nation burns and the House of Representatives fiddles. We should have had meetings of the full committee, not just of the chairman of the House subcommittee and the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, to decide what will go into the bill. Other members of the committee have contributions to make, as well.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we must defeat this motion to override the President's veto, and only then can we have a serious discussion of how to fix up the Interior bill which the President was so correct in vetoing.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we respond to the gentleman from Illinois.

Number one, he made a great case for overriding the President's veto. He pointed out all of the things that are happening, how people are being penalized in so many different ways, how the health is in jeopardy for Indians and so on. There is a very simple way to cure that, I would say to the gentleman, my friend from Illinois, and that is, vote to override the President's veto.

This bill, as we well know, has a lot of good things in it. Let me just mention a couple.

We are talking about the Native Americans being second class. One-fourth, 25 percent of the money in this bill is for Native Americans, \$3 billion. They are hardly second class when we are appropriating 3 billion taxpayer dollars to support the many and varied programs. As I would point out, we did respond, actually we put more in the conference and in the bill that finally went to the White House than was requested by the President during earlier negotiations.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that the amount requested by the President was \$1.9 billion. The amount that the conference approved and which is in this bill is \$325 million less than the amount requested by the President.

Mr. REGULA. As the gentleman would recognize, though, that in the negotiations, and I want to address that, the gentleman said that we made no attempt to work with the White House. We did and I have a whole list of things here that we changed in response to the White House. They said initially, and I would add they keep moving the goal posts, that is part of the problem; we no sooner respond to the White House's request than the goalposts move.

□ 1100

They asked for \$110 million, this is not the original request, this is after we were in conference, they asked for \$110 million over the Senate-passed level. We ended up with \$111.5 million over the Senate, plus \$25 million additional for the Indian Health Service. And I could go through the whole list of things that the White House requested during the conference to which we responded, perhaps not totally, but as much as possible.

Part of what is at issue here is how much we are going to spend. I have to

agree, we are not spending as much as the minority party would like. But the American people have said, we are not willing to borrow money from our grandchildren to fund today's programs. So the allocation to us was 10 percent under 1995's appropriation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman think the American people want the Indian children to be deprived of their food and of their necessities of life? This bill and the failure to provide a clean continuing resolution are doing that. The gentleman knows it as well.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would only point out that with \$3 billion, they are not actually being deprived. That is a lot of money. It goes to these many programs. The person that is depriving the Indians of access to these funds is the President of the United States. I hope that 89 of my colleagues will recognize that today, as they did on the securities litigation legislation, and will support the fact that we want this \$3 billion to go to the Indian programs.

The gentleman mentioned increasing cuts. Certainly we had to reduce spending to meet the 10 percent reduction goal. But I have to say that I think we have done a responsible job, given the fiscal constraints.

The gentleman and I have served on this committee for many years together and in the past years we were always able to spend more each year. That made life easy. We just added another 5 percent to everybody's program or 3 or whatever the number was, and everybody was happy. Because the American people, in November of 1994, said, wait a minute, we do not want to put our grandchildren in debt. They already owe \$20,000 apiece. We do not want to add to that for Government programs. So as a result the Committee on the Budget gave us 10 percent less than 1995. So instead of having an increase, as we have had in the past, we had a reduction. So we did it and we worked together in many respects.

We did the must-dos. We flat funded the parks, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery so they can stay open for the public, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service. We did the need-to-does, things that needed to be fixed, repairs and so on. The nice-to-dos took a hit. There is no question about it. We abolished the Bureau of Mines. We did a number of other things. But frankly, unless we are willing to continue borrowing money from future generations, we are simply going to have to restrain our spending. That is what we did here. We tried to do it in a fair manner. I do not think the gentleman would disagree that given the fiscal constraints we had that we were at least bipartisan in allocating the money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, will the gentleman tell me why the majority, the Republican majority agreed to increase the cut for the Tongass forest by at least a third?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the original was, I think, something like 450. We got it back to 418. But the money we put in the bill, which is the real world, limits the cut to exactly or a little less than has been cut in the past during the time that the gentleman was chairman of this committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be surprised in the event that the cut went beyond the amount that he says will be authorized by, paid for by the 320?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised because history tells us that the money we put in will probably result in a smaller cut, and I would also point out to the gentleman that it is the President's chief of the Forest Service, appointed by the President, that is managing the Tongass as part of the Forest Service. Therefore, decisions that are made along the lines the gentleman is discussing will be made by the employees or certainly the executive branch appointees that have responsible positions. There is no way that they can, by magic, create money out of the air so that with the money that is in the bill, the cut really is restricted to what we have had in the past.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us why the Republican majority agreed to nullify the environmental laws by depriving the public of the right to protest the increases in the cuts?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman No. 1, in the recommendation we took out the sufficiency language with the exception of one sale. This is a parallel to what happened when the gentleman was chairman on the Oregon situation at the request of Senator HATFIELD. Any further sales other than the one that is just changing the location are subject to sufficiency language, which means it has to go through the courts, through the EPA and all the requirements.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, has the sufficiency language been taken out of the cut in the Northwest States of the United States?

Mr. REGULA. The language that was placed in the bill that the gentleman was chairing?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I chaired that had sufficiency language goes back something like 8 or 9 years. There was no sufficiency language after that. It was done for one time only. Yet there is sufficiency language for the amendment that was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. The people of the State of Arizona, the environmental community is deprived of the opportunity of protesting because of sufficiency language.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I notice that the President never even mentioned that in his override message.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know why?

Mr. REGULA. Because they were a party to it.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it was put in because the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona was put in after the President's statement had been drafted.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, how could he write the statement until he had the bill? He vetoed the bill at 11 a.m. We did not get the veto message until 5 p.m. explaining his decision. So he had 6 hours, if he wanted to get it in there.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the fact remains that the gentleman has not replied to my point about the sufficiency language being in the bill as being applicable to the cut that takes place in the forests of the Northwest.

Mr. REGULA. Well, we are having a good discussion. I do not want to use too much of my time here.

Mr. YATES. But the gentleman has not really answered my question.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the gentleman is referring to. We had one instance, just as he had one instance when he was chairman, of sufficiency language being included and that was on a sale in the Tongass that has already gone through all the environmental steps. It is just that the people that were going to purchase it are out of business so it is a moving of that sale to another purchaser. But the environmental requirements had all been met. That is the reason we put sufficiency on that one item. I agree we had it in originally on the Tongass generally, but we took that out. That was one of the things that was negotiated on the recommittals.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, what about the marbled murrelet provision? The marbled murrelet provision, is that not still subject to sufficiency language?

Mr. REGULA. The marbled murrelet is in the bill that went to the White House.

Mr. YATES. It is subject to sufficiency language, is it not?

Mr. REGULA. No, that is not. That is a different issue, and we only had the one sufficiency, similar to what the gentleman had in the bill for Oregon some years ago.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply stuck here, forced to repeat much of what I said yesterday on two previous veto overrides. Nothing real is happening here today. There is no real legislation which is being pursued here today.

Everybody knew the President was going to veto this bill. He made it quite clear. He indicated he was not going to sign a bill which has a huge increase in logging in the Tongass, one of the few temperate rain forests left in the world. He made it quite clear that he was not going to accept the reversal of

the California Desert Protection Act, which passed last year. He made it quite clear he was not going to support other provisions, including major reductions in weatherization programs for low-income people trying to stay warm in a cold winter.

But this is not about the veto. Everybody knows this veto is not going to be overridden. The only reason we are having this silly debate on the floor here today is because the majority party is trying to keep off the floor any effort to open up the entire Government. So this is a time filler. We are going to waste 2 hours on something which is going nowhere.

Now, I would simply point out, in contrast to what my good friend from Ohio has said, the President did not shut down the Government. Presidents have for time immemorial vetoed legislation which they thought was out of whack. Those vetoes did not shut down the Government because previous Congresses were responsible enough to pass continuing resolutions so that the Government remained open.

This Congress has refused to do that because there is a strategic decision which has been made by Mr. GINGRICH and his clones. That decision has been that unless the President is going to accept their reductions in Medicare, their reductions in Medicaid, their reductions in education, and their other demands in the 7-year budget negotiations going on in another room on other subjects—unless the President is going to cave on that collection of issues, that in order to put the squeeze on the President—they are going to keep the Government closed. That is the decision that my colleagues on that side of the aisle have decided that they are going to make. They are apparently willing to take all the heat from the public that is going to be generated in order to get their way.

Collectively, they are holding their breath and turning blue until the President caves. That is what is going on.

Now, it seems to me that that is not what the public sent us here to do. I want to congratulate the action taken by the Senate majority leader, Senator DOLE. I think that action has defined the difference between fighting for principles within a rational construct and simply behaving like nihilists, pretending that you are principled. I really believe that the only way we are going to get out of this impasse is for our moderate friends on the Republican side of the aisle to recognize that sooner or later they are going to have to make a choice between following the rational leadership of someone like BOB DOLE or following the irrational leadership, in my view, of someone like Mr. GINGRICH.

Until my colleagues make that choice, the taxpayers are going to be stuck with the incredible spectacle of first seeing Government workers prevented from doing the work that they are being paid for and then later on

seeing the spectacle of workers being required to work for which they are not getting paid. It is really an Alice-in-Wonderland world.

What ought to happen is very simple. My colleagues ought to stop this 2-hour charade. They ought to bring to the floor legislation which opens up the Government and allows everyone to go back to work. But that is not going to happen. The chairman of this committee summarized several weeks ago why it is not going to happen. He held a press conference after the President signed the defense appropriations bill and then said the following:

If the Government shuts down on December 15 and 300,000 people are again out of work, most of the people going out will be his people; I think he is going to care more than we do.

That was said by the distinguished chairman and my good friend, the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the truth of this statement has been demonstrated. It is apparent that there is very little concern on that side of the aisle for the 300,000 Government workers who are being forced into these silly circumstances, and there is very little concern for the taxpayers who have a right to get the services for which they have already paid taxes. They have a right.

The Congress ought to quit this silly game. My colleagues ought to follow the lead of Senator DOLE. They ought to bring up that clean continuing resolution to open the Government so that we can continue to discuss our other differences like adults, without shooting innocent people in the process. Until they face up to their responsibilities and open up the Government, that is exactly what is happening.

□ 1115

All my colleagues are doing is shooting the innocent because of incredible arrogance that some people in this House have, the incredible arrogance to think that their political ideology is more important than the service we are supposed to provide our constituents. That is outrageous.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to first thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for giving me 4 minutes, and I have to agree with everything that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has just said, and I would like to maintain that thought just a little longer because to me, what I am seeing happen in this House, and I have seen it since December 15, is something that I, who have served here now starting my 20th year, have never seen before, and I say that in the history of this country no one has ever seen before, no Member of this House in all those 207 years has seen the cynicism of what I call the radical right wing Republicans led by our Speaker in

the approach to how we run the Government, and that approach is, Mr. Speaker, they use blackmail. If they cannot get their way on a balanced budget provision or reconciliation bill which they call a Balanced Budget Act, then they are going to shut down the Government until the President agrees to what they want in a balanced budget.

Now that is as simple as that, my colleagues. It is pure blackmail. I never thought that I would ever see a Member of Congress elected by his constituents elect to use a shutdown of the Government in order to get their views on something. We are seeing it right here today on this bill.

It is very apparent to me that the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from Alaska, those on that side, are going to say, "Well, we let you have a vote to override the President." Purse cynicism. Then they are not going to do anything more. They know the vote is not going to be in their favor, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has rightly proven. We are not going to override the President because there are things in this bill that many of us cannot accept.

Mr. Speaker, we are willing to compromise, like the President is, to work it out, but, no, not them. They have got to have their way, and their way only, and, if they do not get their way, then there is not going to be a CR.

We had the opportunity yesterday. Every one of us had that opportunity yesterday to keep the Government running, to let everybody go back to work. The people; like in my district I had a lady call me yesterday, my colleagues. She got a \$50 paycheck yesterday. I asked, "How would you like to—how would this staff, how would your staff, like to get a \$50 paycheck?" No, my colleagues are smart.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, who heads up the Legislative Subcommittee, yes, he was smart. The President was not quite seeing exactly what my colleagues were going to do.

I wish the President had never signed that legislative appropriation bill. He should never have done it. He should never do it next year. He should not sign the Defense appropriation bill next year. He should not sign his own next year until all the rest of these have been done because my colleagues are not just doing it now, they are going to propose—it is very clear to me that under the operation of GINGRICH, under their operation under Speaker GINGRICH, they plan to do this every time, not just this year, not just for this bill for this fiscal year, but for next year also. They are willing to put people in hardship, to let kids starve, just so that they can say we have to have our balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want a balanced budget, too. I voted for one, I voted for one. But I do not want one with a big tax cut in it like my colleagues have got, I will not vote for one with a big tax cut

like my colleagues have, and the President will not ever sign one with a big tax cut like my colleagues have got. I will not vote for one that cuts Medicare for my elderly citizens like my colleagues have got, the President will not sign one like that. And my colleagues say, "Okay, we'll shut down the Government," and that is just what they have done.

I ask, "Why don't you do like your Presidential candidate, Senator DOLE? Why don't some of you, just 20 of you, come with us? We'll open up the Government."

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to sit here and listen to the rhetoric that comes out from that side of the aisle, the outright mistruths very nearly close to the mistruths have been spoken by the President of the United States.

When I hear people talk about the Tongass, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and, no, I will not yield. I listened to that tirade a while ago, and I will not yield. The Tongass does in fact—the provision of this bill froze the amount of timber that could be harvested. It froze it to 1.7 million acres. . . .

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there are no truths in—

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The gentleman has to prove that he is telling the truth, and he is not.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VOLKMER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. My parliamentary inquiry is how far back will the stenographer, the reporter, go because it is our—at least my—when I asked for the words to be taken down, that the gentleman had used the word "mistruth" way back and continuously in reference to Members and to the President, and I would like for all of those words to be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words most immediately complained of.

□ 1130

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how do I make certain that the words which are

going to be read back are the words to which I was objecting? Because the words to which I was objecting were the words that indicated that the gentleman from Illinois had uttered mistruths and had known that. Those are the words that I am specifically addressing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will direct the Clerk to report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

The gentleman keeps talking about the Tongass. It will be 90 percent in wilderness, and he knows it, and you told a mistruth every time on this issue, and you know that it is a mistruth. There is absolutely no truth, there is no truth. . . .

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. OBEY. No, I did not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. VOLKMER. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object because, in my view, when a Member accuses another Member of purposely misleading the House, he owes it to the House to apologize. I will be happy to withdraw my objection if the gentleman apologizes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I apologize when I know I am speaking from my heart. It is rare that I ask this House to listen to a gentleman's understanding as he sees the issue. It is rare that I have to apologize when other gentlemen do not take the opportunity to read the facts on an issue.

The gentleman and I have discussed this for many, many years, and he and I know we differ. He knows my emotionalism on this. He knows I have lost over 42 percent of my working people in this area. He knows that I am a gentleman that would never impugn another gentleman. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. YATES. I do not know that.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Well, then, I apologize to you personally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I withdraw my objection, in light of the apology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alaska may proceed in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, may I again go back to what I said happened in the Tongass.

We froze the amount of timber to cut. We know, in fact, that it is 90 percent a wilderness. These are facts, my friends, facts, not fiction.

In fact, we know that only 10 percent, and only 10 percent, over 100 years would be cut. We know that there are 42 percent of my people out of work in southeast Alaska today because of action of this body, and we heard a lot about it is a shame that the President vetoed this. Then we talked about the people's hardships and the people that are out of work.

What about the people that are blue collar workers? Have I heard anybody on this floor defend them, other than myself and a few of my colleagues? I heard a gentleman a while ago say, we are going to hold our faces blue until we get our way. I would rather be blue than red.

I am going to suggest respectfully that this veto is wrong. The President shut down these parks; the President shut down the monuments. There is a letter today in the Washington Post about the police were on hand at the parks. Where were they before? They are issuing tickets to people, taxpayers. Where were they before?

This administration and this Secretary of Interior are using this for a political gambit. This is what this is all about. We did our job. We sent a bill to the President that the President could have signed and should have signed.

By the way, we heard a lot about the American natives. The American natives want to stand on their own, they want to manage their own affairs, they want to be able to decide their own destiny. They do not want to continue with handouts as the minority has been doing over these years to make them subservient. They want to be their own people. The best way, they have said to me, is we will take our cuts as long as everybody else does too. But this President has kept those monies away from those people.

It is time that this Congress overrides this President, and you have that responsibility too.

Make no mistake about it. Mr. Speaker, the Interior appropriations veto was politics, pure poll-driven politics.

If you read the President's veto message and compare it to the White House press release, they are identical. Was the President trying to seriously communicate with the Congress or was this just a public relations exercise? I have never seen anything like it.

The President vetoed this bill with a press release, threw thousands of workers out of work right before the holiday, and then blamed the Congress. Shame on you, Mr. President.

This is a slap in the face of Chairman REGULA and Chairman LIVINGSTON. They sent a balanced bill to the White House that was sensitive to every concern raised by the President's staff.

This veto message also insults my constituents who live and work in the Tongass National Forest. It singled out a carefully drafted provision that would bring stability to my constituents who live and work in the Tongass.

The Tongass provision did 2 things: First, froze the amount of timber that could be harvested over 100 years at 1.7 million acres and, second, allowed the Forest Service to

convert timber sales from one purchaser to another. It did nothing more and nothing less.

The fact is, every issue raised by the Clinton administration was addressed in the bill.

The administration said it wanted the ability to use good science, so we allowed them to use sound scientific data under Chairman REGULA's bill.

The administration said it did not want a permanent ban on habitat conservation areas, so Chairman REGULA's bill removed the ban at their request.

After the bill passed the Congress, the President's staff had to find an excuse for him to veto it. The Environmental Mecca, the Tongass National Forest, served as excuse No. 1.

The veto message/press release makes it sound like the whole 17-million-acre forest would be clear-cut tomorrow if the bill became law. The fact is only 10 percent of the forest will ever be harvested during a 100-year period. The other 90 percent is off limits in wilderness status or not available for harvest.

It seems to me that your advisors told you about the wrong Tongass provision, Mr. President.

The reality for my constituents is that 42 percent of the timber employees in the Tongass are out of work. Timber is part of a well-rounded Alaskan economy. We have enough preservation in the Tongass to protect the resources and environment. We need some stability, Mr. President.

I urge my colleagues to override this poll-driven veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes 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 and Members, this committee, the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, does a lot of great work; and in this legislation there are a lot of very good provisions. Unfortunately, this bill, which does so much for native Americans, which does so much for the natural resources of our country, is being held hostage by the Senator from Alaska and by those who seek to have special privilege in the Tongass National Forest, the only temperate rain forest in North America, the only one that belongs to the American people.

What they are seeking to do is to go back in time. In 1990 we passed a Tongass reform bill. They seek now to nullify that even though the Alaska delegation at that time said that they would agree to it if they could have 10 years of peace under the requirements of that bill.

What they seek to do now is to go back to a plan which received thousands and thousands of comments about its inadequacy for sustainability, about its inadequacy for Native rights, about its inadequacy for the environment; and they seek to legislate that plan in this bill. Why? Because the Pacific Timber Co. wants it that way; there are no ifs, ands, or buts about it.

The reason the Washington Monument is closed and the reason the Lib-

erty Bell is seeking private donations, and the reason you cannot go snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park is because of the Louisiana Pacific and this legislation.

This is the worst of special-interest legislation. You cannot do what they want to do under this bill unless you waive the environmental laws of this Nation. You cannot do what they want to do under this bill unless you put in sufficient language to protect this corporation from a lawsuit that they have already lost in court.

We are here doing that in this legislation, and we are holding Indian children hostage. We are holding the health of Indian natives of this country hostage. We are holding the tourism economies of Yosemite National Park, Mariposa County, hostage, because Louisiana Pacific wants to do legislatively what they are afraid to do and come before our committee, the Committee on Natural Resources, and debate this openly about the Tongass.

The gentleman from Alaska previously said the Tongass is 90 percent wilderness. No, it is not. And when he says he only wants to cut 10 percent, he has to recognize this. The vast majority of Tongass is ice, rocks, lakes, and other things. The timber base is a very small business.

When you want to clear-cut 10 percent of that timber base and you want to do it without regard to the environmental laws of this country and without regard to the public planning process, you do great devastation to the remaining land base and the timber base in that area. That is why the Governor of Alaska is opposed to this process. That is why the Anchorage Daily News is opposed to this process. That is why the Alaska Outdoor Council, some 10,000 members, hunters, and fishermen, are opposed to this process. That is why the Alaska Wilderness Recreation and Tourism Association is opposed to this process, because you are legislating on them a single use for a great natural resource that is in fact increasing the economy of Alaska. It is diversifying the economy of Alaska.

The reason the logging economy went down in Alaska is because of a Japanese-owned mill that cannot get more Federal dollars and subsidies, for the taxpayers quit. They went out of business because they just could not get enough subsidies. Well, excuse me. Try the marketplace.

Now what we have is a struggle to try to get those lands that they have locked up under an old 50-year contract without environmental reviews, they are trying to bring that into the land base for this. So what? So they can get pulp and send it to Japan; so they can get logs and cant them and send them to Japan. There is no value added here for the American economy. But there is \$102 million in the last 3 years lost in preparing these sales and cutting these roads.

So without \$102 million of subsidies, these logs would never leave. These

logs would continue to be trees. They would be vertical instead of horizontal. That is why. That is why.

That is why we must sustain the veto. We cannot have the special interests come into the Halls of Congress and dictate and say that we must set aside the laws so that they can have the special privilege of not having to put up with public input and public debate and a public planning process, so they do not have to suffer the indignities of losing a court case, so they do not have to suffer the scrutiny of the public subsidies to their private corporations.

That is what is holding hostage the National Park System, the Indian health system, the endangered species system in this country, the special interests of Louisiana Pacific and their associates.

The people of Alaska oppose this legislation; their newspapers oppose this, their tourism association and the Governor of the State oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to override the President's veto. President Clinton stood up for the environment and the taxpayers. We should support him.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know what's going on here. There's a hidden agenda in this bill that the Republicans do not like to highlight.

Why are our national parks closed and thousands of loyal employees out of work? It is because the Republican leadership allowed this spending bill to become a grab bag of legislative gifts for special interests who want to exploit our natural resources at taxpayer expense.

The Republicans apparently believe that it is more important to dictate a forest plan that will increase Federal spending to cut down 400-year-old trees in the Alaska rainforest than it is to reopen the national parks and put people back to work. But the Republicans just can't say no to Louisiana Pacific. That's what this fight is about—more taxpayer dollars to subsidize Louisiana Pacific and increase logging in the Tongass National Forest by over 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no valid reason to hold Federal workers, private sector contractors, and the rest of the public hostage to the Alaskan pulp mill barons. This Tongass rider doesn't belong on any appropriations bill. It hasn't been the subject of a single day of public hearings in the Resources Committee. The only thing the chairman from Alaska has pending in committee is his bill to give away the entire 17-million acre Tongass National Forest, abolishing the wilderness areas and national monuments in the process. It's no wonder that the Governor of Alaska is joined by so many other Alaskans in opposing this Tongass rider.

This bill is full of other antienvironmental legislative riders that wouldn't see the light of day if considered in the normal process. It guts the California Desert Protection Act. It stops progress in improving land management in the Columbia River Basin. It undercuts the Endangered Species Act. The list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that we learned a lesson from the timber salvage rider

that passed on the rescissions bill earlier this Congress. There were no hearings on that legislative rider either. We were assured by proponents that it applied only to dead trees and burned trees. But what we later found out is that language was included to cut healthy forests in the Pacific Northwest. We found out that exempting the timber industry from the environmental laws of this country leads only to disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made clear from the outset that the Tongass and the other legislative riders on this bill were unacceptable. Yet Republicans made only cosmetic changes in response. They alone share the blame by producing an Interior appropriations bill that tries to legislate bad policy rather than allocate public funds. They just can't say no to the special interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the veto override. Let the Republican majority instead get to work on producing a clean bill that is in the public interest. Let's get on with the business of governing and reopen the parks, monuments, refuges, and forests that are so important to the American people.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and point out that 90 percent of the Tongass Forest is not wilderness.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course it is not.

Mr. VENTO. Also, the 10 percent that we are talking about here may make up 50, 60 percent of the whole timber base in that forest.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, we oversee the national parks, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service. On December 18, 1995, President Bill Clinton vetoed the Interior appropriations bill which would have provided funding to keep parks, forests, BLM recreation areas open to the public. In a staged press conference, President Clinton surrounded himself with children and said that for the sake of maintaining clean air and clean water for the children, he would have to veto the bill.

What the President failed to realize or point out was that the Interior appropriations bill funds the Department of the Interior agency and has nothing to do with the Environmental Protection Agency, which is charged with regulating the Nation's air and water. Rather than working with the Congress on resolving issues of substance, President Clinton has simply chosen to play politics. The bottom line is that the Clinton administration is using our national parks, forests, and BLM recreational areas as part of their strategy to thwart efforts to balance the Federal budget.

The national parks, forests, and all other Department of the Interior facilities would be open if President Clinton had just signed the Interior appropriations bill. His public excuses for not signing the bill simply do not wash.

In addition to killing the funding for the parks, the administration got enough Democratic support to kill a bipartisan bill in the House of Representatives which has facilitated States providing the support necessary to keep parks and wildlife refuges open during periods of budget impasse. It is clear that the administration is simply keeping facilities closed for political reasons alone.

In fact, it does not even require any legislation to keep parks open. Secretary Babbitt has full authority to accept donations to fund park operations, but the terms demanded by the Secretary are so onerous that only the State of Arizona has agreed to them in order to keep the Grand Canyon open.

Actually, this is a hot-button issue, Mr. Speaker. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior are going around talking about closing the park. There is no park closing bill, and I would urge this body to override the veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the override of the President's veto message on this important Interior appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, this bill, under the mantra of repeating over and over again a balanced budget amendment, something we would all like to do, but the question is how you do it, when you look into the bowels of what is in this particular bill and what is in the 7-year plan that our Republican colleagues are trying to foist upon us, they are extreme positions. They are positions that do not agree with the last three decades of work that has been done in this Congress, that is the product of the American people, the product I wish I could claim of only Democrats, but I know that there are many Republicans that have worked on that. But fundamentally it is in disagreement with the people of this country.

In this spending bill, I think we see in clear view the fact that this extreme agenda that is being delivered to this Congress by the leadership in this House and the Republican Senate is inherent. They are trying to put in here in a covert way, the chairman of the policy committee rises and gives a speech, but the fact is the policy committees have not done their work.

This is a spending bill, but yet within this spending bill, it is laced with provisions that overturn fundamental policies of environmental law, of land use law, of the endangered species, very well worked out agreements such as the Tongass Forest agreement which now they disagree with. This fact is they are trying to put it through in a covert way.

If these proposals are so meritorious, why are they not put up on the floor to be voted on and considered as they were passed into law initially, in other words, to defund something that has been designated a park? That is what is done in this particular legislation, in other words, to renege on the establishment of the Mojave National Preserve in California, to open up again the question of the Tongass which has an agreement to cut 300 million board-feet a year, but to specify and to suggest to override all environmental types of challenges that exist in law for good reason; for good reason, to renege on the Columbia Basin and prevent the establishment of an environmental impact statement so that we can move forward with the Pacific Northwest problem.

This bill deserves to be defeated, and I hope we will uphold the President's veto.

□ 1145

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, let us stop the rhetoric, misstatements, and half-truths. The current budget crisis this Nation is facing is not because Congress failed to do its job. We passed a bill. It is because the President chose to veto the Interior appropriations bill, the VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill, and the Commerce, Justice, State bill, and because Democratic Senators are filibustering the Labor, HHS bill.

Again, let me reiterate why certain Federal employees have been furloughed and why others are performing their duties without pay; it is because the President has decided that it is more important for him to engage in partisan politics than to allow Federal employees to go back to work.

Today, we are going to have the opportunity to override the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. If we are successful, this \$12.1 billion appropriations measure will reopen our museums, the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, put back to work those dedicated employees at the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as get the needed money to our Nation's Indian communities.

The President's shutdown of the Federal Government does not have to continue. In fact, if you want to find out what kind of impact his shutdown is having, I would encourage all of my colleagues to visit one of the 23 tribal communities in Arizona. They have been devastated by the President's veto of this important bill. Recently, the proud and noble Chairman of the Hopi Tribe announced that he may have to release the inmates in the tribe's jail

because they do not have the money to heat the facility. I might add that these funds are included in this Interior appropriations bill. Again, we do not have to allow this type of suffering to continue.

The President's veto message was based solely upon polls conducted by his political advisers. The President realized that most Americans are concerned about the environment, and justifiably so. But he has taken this posturing to an extreme and in the process hundreds of thousands of hard working Americans are suffering the consequences.

I will speak more about this later. Let us do what all Americans want us to do: Let us allow them to go back to work. Overriding the President's veto of this bill will accomplish this and a lot more.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than sufficient reasons for both the President's veto and for our sustaining it.

But I think it is especially important to explain why this is not about reopening the part of Government funded in this bill. The illogic of the arguments that have been offered on this point is profound, if not comic. Here is how it goes.

First, let us dillydally for months on even getting this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, having wasted months and months on extraneous business at the first part of the first session of this Congress. That is what happened on this bill.

Second, then let us yield control of much of the substance of the bill in conference to some of the most extreme anti-environmental forces and have it rejected, not once but twice, taking additional weeks, not because of the President of the United States but because moderate Members of the majority party could not swallow the fiscal and environmental outrages in this bill. That is what happened.

Third, then let us waste several more weeks before finally getting a bill to the House that could pass. That is what happened on this bill.

And, fourth, we then end up 2½ months into the fiscal year, 2½ months late, 2½ months of irresponsible failure by the majority party to manage the most basic business of the Congress. That is what happened on this bill.

Fifth, we then wait another month after that, 3½ months into the fiscal year, 3½ months late, 3½ months of failure by the majority to manage the business of the House, and then we bring up a veto override and have the temerity to suggest that it is the President's fault for the circumstances that we are in? Give me a break.

An absolutely astounding, stunning act of political chutzpah, to suggest that having failed in our responsibilities for 3½ months to take care of the

people of America, funding critical natural resource management responsibility, then to suggest that it is the President's fault, that he is somehow responsible for these unfortunate circumstances. It makes no sense. Truly an amazing act of political illogic.

This partial closure is in fact the intended effect of the Speaker's deliberate decision cynically to use the majority's failure to get its work done on appropriations bills to leverage concessions on other budget matters on which the American public and their President simply disagree with the extreme views of many in the majority party.

We are in this fix because of the Speaker's refusal and no other reason.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. For 20 days now, his veto shut the American people out of the Smithsonian Museums, the national parks such as the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, and in my district the Cleveland National Forest. These parks and museums provide a quality of outdoor life and experience for millions of Americans.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman, and certainly there is no other chairman that I know of that would write a more fair and equitable bill than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman. I commend him for his hard work in crafting this spending bill for our Nation's national parks, national forests, public lands, and national wildlife refuges during these times of budget constraints. The Interior appropriations bill provides similar operating funds as in 1995, as we did previously, for national parks and monuments.

We will later today take up legislation to allow State employees to voluntarily operate our national parks. I also support this legislation. But this bill, overriding the President's veto, is the much better long-range solution to the problem.

One hundred thirty thousand Federal employees are furloughed because of the President's veto of this bill. These people deserve to be back to work, allowing our national parks and forests and cultural institutions to be open.

I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto and support this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has offered a motion to discharge from committee the Interior ap-

propriations bill that has been vetoed by the President. Normally the committee would go to work, take into consideration the reasons the President gave for his veto, reasonable policymakers would make the necessary adjustments, and pass the appropriation.

Now the Republicans are trying to find a way to look better. They have simply created a mess, not only on this bill but on the budget in general. The Republican caucus has been led by the freshman class, that group which has the least experience in the management of government.

The Republicans have gone too far. The Republicans have stepped way over the line. They have jeopardized not only the National Park Service in this bill, they have jeopardized Federal employees and veterans' services, prison security, passport services, and Social Security services.

Time and time again we heard that they were willing to shut this Government down, that they would do this, and this is what they are doing. Just yesterday they voted in the Committee on Rules to allow the Speaker to recess in 3-day intervals. They are planning to go home. In that Committee on Rules, GERALD SOLOMON, JAMES QUILLLEN, DAVID DREIER, PORTER GOSS, JOHN LINDER, DEBORAH PRYCE, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, SCOTT MCINNIS, and ENID WALDHOLTZ all voted to give the Speaker the power to call a recess.

I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto. This is not about good policymaking. This is about the continued efforts to force all of us to do what that freshman class wants done. We cannot allow that to happen. I think we are more responsible than that.

And if they decide to recess, let them go home. But the people on this side of the aisle, my colleagues in the Democratic Party, I believe, will stay here. We will stay here and do the work of the people rather than use those kinds of tactics.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to override the President's veto. In doing so, I must acknowledge that I agree with the President on one thing: This bill is not perfect. But guess what? The legislative process is not about producing legislation that one side or another views as perfect. The legislative process is about getting the most reasonable compromise possible among competing viewpoints.

We need to remember the old adage, "The perfect is the enemy of the good." This bill represents a reasonable compromise.

Take the issue of the Tongass National Forest on which I worked. This bill would allow the planning process

to continue unimpeded. This bill would allow science to determine the acreage and the allowable sale quantity that will eventually be permitted in the forest. This bill allows for the set-aside of additional environmentally sensitive habitat conservation areas. And this bill would allow lawsuits to challenge the controversial alternative P forest management plan.

Did we make some compromises to achieve these goals? Of course we did. We made reasonable compromises with legislators with opposing views to protect the long-run health of the forests and the integrity of the planning process.

Let me repeat that. We made reasonable compromises with legislators with opposing views to protect the long-range health of the forests and the integrity of the planning process.

I urge an override.

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

I just want to say, in response to the gentlewoman from California, that we have been negotiating with the administration on a continuous basis. Some of the changes were in response to their requests. The only problem is they kept moving the goal posts.

I thought it was interesting that it took them 6 hours after they vetoed the bill to decide what the veto message would say, because I think they had some problems. They recognized it was a good bill, and yet they felt that they had a commitment to close the parks and close the forests and close the Smithsonian and close the Holocaust and close the National Gallery of Art. And so, after finally pondering as to why they did veto the bill, we got a veto message late in the day.

I say to my colleagues that are wondering procedurally, we are not going to call for a vote on this motion to discharge the bill from the appropriations process, and we will go into the next hour of debate on the override itself. But I hope at that time the 89 Members of the minority party that voted to override the President for the securities lawyers will vote to override the President for the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Bulgaria, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment,

the Dole proposal to open the Government, and that a motion to reconsider be considered as laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers and recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

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.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-147)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1200

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate on this subject. I have a number of Members that would like to speak on it, so I will reserve my remarks for the closing.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge my colleagues to support the motion to override. For the sake of the American people we need to reopen our national treasures. There is no good reason why the parks are closed. There is no good reason why the monuments are closed. There is no reason why our constituents here in Washington cannot go to some of the great places around this District.

This bill is fair, balanced. It protects our natural resources while ensuring a fair return to the American taxpayers. I urge all my colleagues to support the motion to override.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

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

I also thank the chair of the committee who does outstanding work and is an outstanding chair, but I must rise to urge that we not override the veto.

The veto is there because the President found that there were things in this bill that were broken, that need fixing, and we in Congress can fix those things. The President rejected the clear-cutting of the Tongass National Forest. The President rejected the jeopardizing of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management plan. The President recognized that this bill kills the California Desert Protection Act that Congress enacted last year.

This bill prohibits the protection of the habitat for endangered species and further prohibits any further listing of endangered species. This bill walks away from the commitment of the Indian Health Service and Indian education. It walks away from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities. In particular let us talk about that for a moment.

I think the shutdown of the Federal Government has drawn national attention to the importance that the arts play particularly here in Washington, DC. Indeed our country has said that these things are important. This bill cuts funding for those important programs. This bill was vetoed because Congress failed to hear the recommendations of the White House conference on tourism which met here just a few months ago, the private sector, at the invitation of the President, to recommend to Congress and to the executive department of how we should best support tourism in the United States. This bill undermines those recommendations.

So my colleagues, this committee has worked hard. It has an outstanding chair and outstanding members because it has recognized the interest of special interests in this and is certainly a bill that ought to be vetoed, as it was by the President. I ask my colleagues to sustain that veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a staunch environmentalist. I opposed this bill in some earlier versions. In fact, Members may recall that this is the third try which finally managed to get past the House. I voted against it the first two times because I was concerned about environmental issues. But I am satisfied that this bill in its present form is the best bill we are going to get out of the House. I believe that the environmentalist concerns are largely satisfied.

In regard to the National Endowment for the Humanities, I was also one of those who worked to maintain funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities. In fact, we managed to get