

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my good friend from California that God loves a repentant sinner, and I remember in the Bible when Paul is on the road to Damascus, then called Saul, and Christ appeared to him, and he had a miraculous conversion and became, instead of a zealot against Christ, he became a supporter and became one of the greatest apostles of all, and the gentleman from California has been, at least to my recollection, one of the bigger spenders in the body, and apparently he has some new found fiscal conservatism, and I just like to say, I really appreciate that conversion, and I hope that conversion continues when we get to the appropriations bills later in the year, because later in the year we'll have the opportunity to make some major cuts in spending, and since this new found conservatism has risen in this gentleman's psyche, I hope it continues, and I would congratulate him on becoming a fiscal conservative.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but they are somewhat off target. The fact of the matter is that in these issues before the committee, which I have now sat on for 20 years, my position has always been that the Federal Treasury and the Federal taxpayer, whether it is in my district in California, in the Western United States or anywhere else, is entitled to fair market value for the resources. Most of these pieces of legislation that have made it to the floor the gentleman from the well has voted against for, I am sure, other reasons than those reasons, but the fact is we have voted, whether it is in water subsidies, mining subsidies, timber subsidies, and tried to regain for the people some control over those, that has been my historical record, and it has happened no matter without question where the project existed or elsewhere, and so the gentleman's arrow is somewhat misplaced at this point, but I appreciate his support for the concept that I am expressing here and expect his vote on this amendment because that road to Damascus was started with one small step, and the gentleman can take it here today. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] will have some other literary reference at some point—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reclaiming my time, let me just say that I am happy to see that the gentleman is moving in the right direction, and I hope, when we get to the appropriations bills later this year, that he will continue to be fiscally conservative.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that we try to maintain a certain level of consistency, and I would point out to the gentleman from California that in November of 1993 he did vote for legis-

lation that included the nonreimbursed advance of the hatchery in Senecaville, OH, and I am curious that now he has seen that this is no longer a good policy, he would like to depart from that.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody a minute ago from the other side of the aisle mention the National Taxpayers Union, and I think it is appropriate to point out the lack of credibility that that organization has with most Members of this House and certainly with most Members of the other body. Some may wonder why that is. Let me remind Members that when the Senate was controlled by the Republican Party, and the House was controlled by the Democratic Party, the National Taxpayers Union used double standards in order to rank and rate Members' votes about whether they were conservative enough or liberal enough. Whatever it was, they were going to make the report. So, when you pass an appropriations on this side of the House and voted for it, it was a bad vote for the National Taxpayers Union. That same bill passing the Senate, however, was not counted as a bad vote against a Senator.

So, I think it is appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that any time somebody gets up and touts that particular organization, that those of us who understand that they use a double standard ought to stand up and say so.

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

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 584) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mrs. Sara Emery, one of his secretaries.

NEW LONDON NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 146 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 614.

□ 1502

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 614) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I suspect this debate will be somewhat shorter than the last one. I cannot think of anything that can be said that has not already been said, including references to outside organizations and other such debate. But this bill, which is brought to us by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] with reference to the New London National Fish Hatchery in Minnesota, is substantively the same as the previous two bills. It is of the same level of importance as the previous two bills. I would hope that, once again, this bill would proceed to be passed without amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, ditto. I really join the gentleman from New Jersey in being utterly unable to conjure anything that has not been said at least three times before.

I take that back, I can think of one thing. I understand the desire of the new majority to tote up on the scoreboard the number of open rules that they have successfully adopted, but I would enter just one personal plea to go back to the old system of suspensions.

The gentleman from New Jersey and I and the gentleman from Alaska and I and others in the old days would have been finished these three bills approximately 1½ hours ago. We could be well on our way toward dinner. There are matters that require the time of the House, but with all due respect, these three bills, which are very good and should be passed, do not require that much time. We should proceed.