

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have just one additional observation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

[Roll No. 648]
YEAS—387

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armedy
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer

Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood

Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey

Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)

Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traffant
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—31

Berman
Boehler
Brewster
Clay
Clayton
Collins (MI)
Conyers
DeLay
Engel
Fattah
Flake

Gonzalez
Hastings (FL)
Houghton
Hoyer
King
Lewis (CA)
Martinez
McDermott
Mfume
Moran
Murtha

Nadler
Rangel
Serrano
Stark
Thomas
Towns
Velazquez
Walt (NC)
Waxman

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra
Dingell
Moakley
Hayes
Jefferson
Maloney
McDade

McKinney
Tucker
Morella
Paxon
Reynolds
Sisisky

□ 1215

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

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

So the motion was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

□ 1215

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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