

for future generations. I urge my Democrat colleagues to listen to their own colleagues and join us in saving Medicare, not the status quo.

MEDICARE PROGRAM IN DISTRESS

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, help.

I've fallen and can't get up!

This is the cry of a program—the Medicare program—in deep distress.

This is the cry of America's elderly as they tremble at the prospect of losing access to doctors, hospitals and medicines as the Medicare program is held hostage to the Republican steamroller of deficit reduction. By the year 2002, the average senior citizen will pay \$1,200 a year more in Medicare premiums.

This is the cry of health care providers across the country as they struggle to meet the needs of their patients in the face of ever-restrictive government reimbursement policies. Under the proposed \$270 billion cut to Medicare, hospitals will crumple—one hospital in my district will have to reduce its health care services by \$5.6 million. That's just one hospital. Multiply that by the number of hospitals in your district.

And what for? So rich people can wallow poolside in their second and third homes.

What do we get?

Tax breaks for the rich.

Tough breaks for the little guy.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a trust fund. People pay their money in and trust that it will be there for them when they need it. But the Democrats broke that trust and squandered our Medicare away. And not only have Democrats left their footprints on our seniors' backs, their fingerprints are all over our seniors' wallets.

But, Mr. Speaker, seniors can finally rest assured, because responsible Republicans have the courage and common sense to protect and preserve the Medicare system for our seniors in the future, while providing affordable increases so that they receive the care they deserve.

It is a good thing the Republicans are in control to get our fiscal house back in order.

MOVE FORWARD ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND LOBBY REFORM

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member, I came to this House commit-

ted to enacting reform and restoring the trust of the American people in Congress.

I am proud that on my first day in the House, we voted to make the Congress abide by the same laws other Americans do. We cut committee staff by one-third. We opened committee meetings to the public.

But the job is incomplete, and we risk undermining all that we have already done if we don't move forward with campaign finance reform and lobby reform. You cannot have one without the other. It is time to stop the money chase which perverts the electoral process.

It's been a month since the President and the Speaker shook hands over a commission to move these issues forward. The President is ready to act. Why isn't the Speaker? Let's vote on H.R. 1100, which I and others introduced before that meeting in New Hampshire, to form such a commission. The American people want an end to the talk of reform. They want action.

The American people are concerned as we act on legislation to cut Medicare, roll back environmental protection, and cut taxes. For the wealthiest they deserve to know we are doing their work and not that of special interests. Let's end the talk and bring campaign and lobby reform to the floor.

HARRY WU

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, Harry Wu, an American citizen, a tireless crusader for human rights, and my friend, is being unjustly detained in the People's Republic of China.

Harry Wu survived nineteen years of torture, starvation, and solitary confinement after he was imprisoned for merely criticizing the government. Since then has devoted himself to exposing the horrors of the Chinese gulag.

China, immediately release American citizen Harry Wu and allow his return to the United States. He has committed no crimes and is being detained illegally. This is a gross abuse of his rights and seriously damages U.S.-China relations. Free this innocent man.

To Chinese officials I say this in Chinese:

"Mr. Wu is an American. Mr. Wu is my friend. If you hurt him we will not forget. If you do not free him we will not forget. Be careful."

TIME TO SEND A MESSAGE TO SERBIAN AGGRESSORS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we shoot at one another across this aisle. We do

it verbally. There is a holocaust abroad in the world, and it is on the front page of the Washington Post, the Washington Times, the New York Times, and on every major network: Thirty thousand new refugees yesterday.

And what do we see on the front page of the Washington Post? a Dutch general, our general, the United Nations' general, having a drink with Ratko Mladic, an international terrorist, an international war criminal, an international thug.

Shame on the United Nations. Shame on the international Western community. Shame on America. We have imposed an arms embargo on the Bosnian people so they cannot defend themselves adequately. Shame on us.

Mr. Speaker, a holocaust goes on. Let us stand up, speak up, and vote to let the Serbian aggressors know that the West will not stand for international thuggery.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 187

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f), 306, or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. The amendments printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. Points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House

with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendments considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole are as follows:

Page 57, line 21, strike “: *Provided further*” and all that follows through “Act” on page 58, line 2.

Page 72, line 19, insert “, subject to passage by the House of Representatives of a bill authorizing such appropriation,” after the dollar figure.

Page 73, line 4, insert “, subject to passage by the House of Representatives of a bill authorizing such appropriation,” after the dollar figure.

Page 75, line 24, strike “equivalent to” and insert “not to exceed”.

SEC. 3. The amendment against which all points of order are waived is one offered by Representative Schaefer of Colorado or Representative Tauzin of Louisiana as follows:

Page 57, line 9, strike “and” and all that follows through “Reserve” on line 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, my friend, Mr. BEILENSON, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Ms. PRYCE asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, in the immortal words of baseball great Yogi Berra, “It’s *deja vu* all over again.”

Less than 12 hours ago, the Rules Committee met to craft this second fair and responsible rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Having been a part of the discussions which led to this new and improved rule, I can say quite honestly that House Resolution 187 more than adequately addresses concerns which have been raised about certain unauthorized provisions which have been included in the bill, namely those sections dealing with funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

In response to these concerns, the rule provides for the automatic adoption of an amendment which makes the availability of NEA appropriations subject to passage of an authorization bill in the House.

By including this language, we can ensure that these funds will not be appropriated unless properly authorized, while also giving the full House an opportunity to debate this important and controversial issue.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, this rule contains essentially the same provisions as House Resolution 185, which we discussed on the floor of the House late last night.

Specifically, this is another open rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, after which time the bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill shall be considered by title, rather than by paragraph, and each title shall be considered as read.

As in the previous resolution, this rule waives clause 2, related to unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions, and clause 6 of rule XXI (21), related to reappropriation in an appropriations bill, against provisions of this bill.

Again, this is done as a precaution since the House, due to time constraints, has not yet approved authorizing legislation for all of the programs and activities contained in the bill.

The rule also waives provisions of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill relating to new entitlement authority and to matters within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee. Language to correct these Budget Act violations is also included in the self-executing set of amendments.

In addition, the rule waives points of order against the amendment printed in the rule relating to the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, if offered by Representative SCHAEFER of Colorado or Representative TAUZIN of Louisiana.

Under the rule, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may give priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration, and such amendments shall be considered as read.

As before, the rule waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI(21), relating to non-emergency amendments offered to a bill which contains an emergency designation. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

As I mentioned last evening, H.R. 1977 is a fiscally responsible bill which responds to the American people’s clear mandate to reduce the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government.

The bill is more than \$1.5 billion below last year’s level—a full 11 percent cut from the 1995 spending level—and is consistent with the balanced budget resolution already adopted by the House.

My good friend from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the Interior Ap-

propriations Subcommittee, has done yeoman work on this legislation, and I congratulate him on working to reach a compromise which will enable the House to debate, and then pass, this essential funding bill in a timely manner.

Those on both sides of the NEA funding issue owe Chairman REGULA a great debt of gratitude for his strong leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues, especially those who voted against the rule yesterday, to realize that this is a wide open, responsible, and reasonable rule. It will create the kind of healthy deliberation which should be the hallmark of this legislative body, and I urge its adoption without any further delay.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PRYCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentlewoman. I know that she stayed up until the wee hours this morning trying to work out this compromise on the rule. I just want to reemphasize what she said. This is still a totally open rule. Yes, we are self-executing into the base text of the legislation simply the words that say “subject to passage by the House of Representatives of a bill authorizing such appropriation.”

But, having done that, and having done it right up front in the beginning of the bill, the bill is still open to amendment at any point so that every single Member, 435 Members of this House, will have the opportunity to come to this floor and work their will in any way that they see fit. We have stuck to our guns in keeping these rules open so that Members on both sides of the aisle, regardless of political or philosophical persuasion, will have their opportunity to legislate on this floor.

I commend the gentlewoman for a great job on this rule. I urge every Member, on both sides of the aisle, to unanimously pass this rule, and let’s get on with the people’s business.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say the House needs to move ahead with the appropriations process. We are fast approaching the August district work period, and less than half of our 13 regular appropriations bills have cleared the Committee on Rules. This resolution will get us back on track. I believe it is an immensely fair deal for both sides of the aisle. I urge its adoption without further delay.

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

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 12, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	34	72
Modified Closed ³	49	47	12	26

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 12, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Closed ⁴	9	9	1	2
Totals:	104	100	47	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.
² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.
³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.
⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	O	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Appropriations	PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations FY 1996 #2	
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PO-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] for yielding me the customary 30 minutes of debate, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this rule, and we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio has explained, House Resolution 187 is identical to the rule for consideration of the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 that the House defeated last night, except for one change related to the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts.

This new rule provides that the appropriation of \$99 million contained in the bill for the NEA would be contingent upon House passage of an authorization bill for the NEA.

Although those of us who strongly support the NEA believe that the organization should be given the same treatment that the bill gives other agencies whose authorizations have expired—that is, we believe that its funding should be fully protected by waiving the prohibition against unauthorized appropriations, without being contingent upon passage of another piece of legislation—we appreciate the fact that the NEA funding will not be able to be struck on a point of order when the House considers H.R. 1977.

Because we discussed the other provisions of the rule in detail last night, I shall only briefly summarize them at this time:

House Resolution 187 is an open rule, as rules for Interior appropriations bills have always been, to the best of our knowledge. Members may offer any amendment that is otherwise eligible

to be offered under the standing rules of the House. The rule permits the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule waives several House rules for provisions in H.R. 1977, as well as several sections of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule also contains a self-executing amendment, and it waives points of order against an amendment to be offered by Representative SHAEFER or TAUZIN relating to the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The waivers of clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill are necessary because the bill contains funding for numerous programs whose authorizations have

expired, and because of legislative language contained in the bill. Despite their past criticism of waiving rule XXI, it is clear that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have found that it is necessary to provide such waivers in order to move appropriations bills through the House in a timely manner.

However, I want to point out that the senior Democratic member of the Resources Committee, Mr. MILLER of California, strongly objects to waiving the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill for provisions in H.R. 1977 that directly or indirectly amend laws under the jurisdiction of the Resources Committee.

□ 1040

He noted in a letter to the Committee on Rules that the Committee on Resources has not considered the impact of changes that H.R. 1977 would make on a number of major environmental laws. We hope that these changes in laws will be fully explained and debated as the House considers H.R. 1977 so that Members will be fully aware of the consequences to our environmental laws that would result from approving this bill.

The rule also waives three sections of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. Two of the waivers are needed to cover the minor amount of spending required for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission. The third waiver covers the change in budget scorekeeping related to the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

As a matter of principle, we are normally reluctant, all of us, to waive the Budget Act. However, because none of the provisions which require these waivers would have any real or serious or substantial impact on our efforts to control spending, we do not consider the waivers here to be significant violations of the Budget Act, and we support them.

Beyond our concerns about the rule itself, many of us do have strong objections to the bill that this rule makes in order, primarily because of its deep cuts in funding for many important and useful programs, programs that cost very little compared to the immense amount of value that they add to the quality of the lives of tens of millions of Americans.

We realize that the Subcommittee on Interior had an extremely difficult task determining how to cut 12 percent of the funding for programs under its jurisdiction, especially since many of these programs have already been squeezed for funding in recent years. But the subcommittee was in that position only because the Republican majority has imposed budget priorities that in our opinion do not serve the best interests of our Nation.

Those priorities are forcing us to cut next year's funding for the relatively modest programs in this bill by \$1½ billion, \$1½ billion so that hundreds of

billions of dollars can be spent over the next several years on unnecessary additional increases in military spending and on tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest Americans among us.

These program cuts will cost our Nation dearly in countless ways, Mr. Speaker. The bill is a 27-percent cut in energy conservation programs and will mean a slowdown in the progress we have been making toward reducing our Nation's dependence on imported oil as well as the cost of energy. The elimination of all but a nominal amount of funding for land acquisition for national parks and for other public lands will mean that there will be far fewer opportunities in the future for Americans to enjoy the experiences our national parks and other public lands have to offer.

The 40-percent cut in funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, the first step of the elimination of both organizations, will mean that fewer Americans will be able to enjoy the very many cultural benefits that these organizations have made possible across this wide and great country of ours. And the elimination of funding for prelisting and listing activities for endangered species will greatly impair our ability to save animal and plant species before they reach critical level. The result is likely to be the decline and the possible extinction of many additional species.

In this and many other ways, the natural and cultural resources of our national resources that help make the United States the greatest nation on Earth will be severely harmed by this bill. This misguided attempt to save a very modest amount of taxpayers' dollars will be robbing our Nation of some of its greatest strengths and assets.

Mr. Speaker, we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

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

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Rules and all those who worked so late into the night last night to reach agreement on this rule. The amount of money that is going to go to the NEA, should this rule pass and the bill pass, will be the same as was originally planned and probably a little bit more.

The only difference is, instead of having it in 3-year tranches, it is going to be in 2 years. That will definitely let the people who support the NEA know that after the 2-year period, the money is going to be there, but after the 2-year period they go to private sources to get funding for NEA projects.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the gentleman's position is

based on what he conceives to be the position of the authorizing committee. That is what we use as the basis for our appropriation. The Senate bill is entirely different. They may come up with another form of the bill and, as a result, the result of what the gentleman predicts may not come to pass.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying. I thank him for his contribution. But I have great confidence in our conferees that they are going to hold firm. When you have confidence in Members like the gentleman from Ohio, your confidence is well founded.

I think we will have an agreement that was reached last night, one that was acceptable to all factions of our party. I hope to the Democratic Party as well as those of all political persuasions.

I would just like to say to my colleagues who are members of various organizations in the Republican Conference that we worked long and hard last night to hammer out our differences. I cannot think of anybody, liberal, moderate, or conservative, that cannot support this rule. I would like to urge all of my colleagues, when they come to the floor, if they have any doubts about the rule, to look up their friends of the various philosophical persuasions and ask them what happened last night so that they will be fully informed and will vote correctly on the rule.

We should have unanimous consent on the rule, unanimous passage. I doubt if my Democrat colleagues agree with that. But at least on the Republican side, we should have 232 hard votes.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House would again reject this rule since this rule is contrary to the rules of the House in that it provides for substantial legislation on an appropriation and protects those items of legislation on an appropriation against a point of order that would ordinarily lie against those provisions under the rules of the House. So we are not quite complying with the rules of the House as the majority has suggested that we are.

But it is also because the changes that they seek to make are devastating to the programs. This legislation that historically has been about the stewardship of this Government of the public's lands, the lands that are owned by the taxpayers and the citizens of the United States of America, public lands that are used by some 300 million visitors this year, public lands that have attracted millions of tourists from other countries to the United States to visit our parks, to visit our wilderness

areas, to visit our historical sites, it has been the charge of this committee to provide the resources to take care of those lands. What we see now is for the first time in 40 years, this committee has failed to discharge its duty to the public in the kind of funding that it provides.

This committee has gone far beyond just the issue of the budgetary issues. This committee has gone off in a fit against activities that they do not like. They do not like the Endangered Species Act. So they decided what they would do is they would not let any moneys be used for prelisting activities. That is an interesting notion because that also means that you cannot use money for prelisting activities that might prevent a species from being endangered.

They also tell you that they are not going to let you use volunteers to go around and collect the data that might help us map out how we avoid the endangered species crisis that we have experienced in the past. They also tell you that they will not let you use the National Biological Survey on private lands, even if requested by private landowners.

And the fact of the matter is, we have forest products companies in this country that have requested this help so they can map out how to harvest their timber in an environmentally safe manner, how they can harvest their timber so they do not run into an endangered species problem, how they can harvest it on a sustainable basis so they can go to their shareholders and they can say: This is on your plan to operate this company in the future. We would not allow them to have the benefit of the knowledge and the scientific expertise of the biological survey even if requested by them.

These Republicans are sticking their head in the sand, and what do they hope happens? They hope that we get into an endangered species crises, one after another, one after another so there will be a growing groundswell to repeal the act. If it is in fact repealed, it will be repealed because they have denied the ability of the agencies to work to protect the endangered species.

Last night we were treated on ABC News to the success of the Endangered Species Act, to the bald eagle being returned from the endangered list to now 4,000 pairs, bald eagles also that are viewed now in many States where they were basically extinct because of DDT and because of other activities, and the delisting of the gray whale and others. So where are we on this?

They have decided they want to fight over the past, and they want to destroy the ability of this agency to do its work. Not only have they weighed in on behalf of the special interests that want to see the repeal of the Endangered Species Act, but they have also weighed in on behalf of the special interests that simply want to continue to use the public's lands without paying

for them. In my town hall meetings very often people say to me when they are talking about the deficit, they say, why do not you run the Government like a business?

One of the reasons we do not run the Government like a business is because of the Republicans. No business would give away billions of dollars of gold and platinum and silver and trona and coal and gas and oil and not make those individuals pay a fair royalty. But that is what the Federal Government does.

Last year we witnessed the Federal Government giving away land for a few thousand dollars, of which it was expected to be mined a billion dollars or \$10 billion in gold. And the American taxpayer got zip.

You want to know why there is a deficit? You keep pandering to the big energy companies, to the big mining companies, and you will end up with a deficit. The public is entitled to a fair return.

But what does this bill do? This bill says, we will remove the moratorium. It got so outrageous that the Congress decided last year to put a moratorium on this activity until we get a mining reform bill. They have lifted the moratorium, so once again we are back into the business of giving long-term leases, ownership in fact, of Federal lands to the mining companies without their paying their fair share for that effort.

I think that you have got to understand that this legislation is among the worst pieces of environmental legislation to come through the House so far. It falls on the heels of the lobbyists and special interests writing the clean water bill that we witnessed. It falls on the legislation to devastate the environment in terms of regulatory reform that is now being held up in the Senate.

We ought to disavow this legislation. We ought to disavow this rule because of its allowing for legislation on the appropriation. And we also ought to understand that this is a systematic effort to undermine the Endangered Species Act so that Members will hear from their districts that they have to repeal the act because the act does not work.

The reason the act does not work is because the Republicans in the House are falling into the same method that George Bush and Ronald Reagan used, and that was, they would not let the act work because they were hoping that they could build up such anger over the act that it would, in fact, be repealed. It is not going to be repealed because the overwhelming majority of American people do not want it repealed. They want it to work. They want the species saved. They want us to make smart decisions.

Finally, let me just say this, they banned the use of volunteers. They banned the use of volunteers. Four thousand Americans go out and help this Government by surveying the number of birds, breeding birds, and others in this country, and help State agencies to collect that data.

In Yosemite National Park and in Sequoia National Park, they collect biological data. We are trying to restore the Grand Sequoias of the Sierra Mountains. And yet what we find out is, if you want to do that on private land with volunteers, you are not allowed to do that.

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to advise the gentleman that I will be offering an amendment, in conformance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], to allow the volunteers to do the migratory bird counts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Are we going to allow the National Biological Survey on private property?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am just talking about the bird count.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] was coming my way. Here I have been speaking for 7 minutes.

Let me tell you about the National Biological Survey on private lands. This is an outrage.

The issue about the National Biological Survey on private land is this, a lot of local communities and a lot of companies, private enterprise, want to avoid the problems of the Endangered Species Act and getting into where you have a threatened endangered species.

In southern California, in northern California that I am familiar with, they are trying to go out and determine the areas that are inhabited by the kit fox, by the salamanders, so that the developers, the home builders, industry and others will know what they can do or not do with their land and how they can develop it. They want the help of the government. They want the help. Forest products companies in the Southeast have asked for help from the National Biological Survey.

What this Congress would say or what this House would say in this bill is, even if requested, they cannot help you, if it is about private land. What you have done is you have diminished the rights of those landowners to get the help of the Government that they pay taxes for that have the expertise to help them get out of a problem that can cost them millions of dollars, if not their companies.

They are asking for help and you are telling them no, we will not allow you to be of help on private land.

Last year we had a problem because people were concerned about the National Biological Survey coming onto their land without permission. And we required that they obey the laws of the State and gain permission. No problem with that. But now you are saying to people who are involved, have hundreds of millions of dollars at risk, have loans at the banks, that they cannot get the help from their Federal Government or Orange County cannot get the

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

Interestingly enough, when I opened my mail this morning, I had a letter from a constituent where she said, "In spite of the openly expressed hostilities to the arts by this Congress, I still urge

you to consider reauthorizing the NEA, at least to give it and the arts world a chance to reorganize their means of funding and setting of artistic priorities."

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to move on to the matter before us. This rule is really, in many ways, worse than the rule before

us last night. It still violates normal House rules in order to allow a continued onslaught on environmental protection and reversal of environmental progress made by previous Congresses.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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