to kill Medicare. The American people know exactly what the Republicans are doing.

The Republican plan is to cut $270 billion out of Medicare to pay for a tax cut for the rich. Because of this, seniors' premiums will be increased, seniors will be put out of nursing homes, medical services will decrease, drug costs will increase. Finally, Madam Speaker, under the Republican plan, the elderly will die prematurely.

America must reject this cold, this cruel, and this heartless Republican plan to kill Medicare.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON S. 440, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on the Senate bill (S. 440) to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

As additional conferees for the consideration of sections 105 and 141 of the Senate bill, and section 320 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, BARTON of Texas, GREENWOOD, DINGELL, WAXMAN, and BROWN of Ohio.

As additional conferees for the consideration of section 157 of the Senate bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, HANSEN, and MILLER of California.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

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

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 21, 1995, at page H9431.)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with somewhat mixed emotions. I had hoped to bring my first Interior appropriations conference agreement, as chairman, to the floor with unqualified support. Unfortunately, there are some divisions among conferees as you will note from the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the essence of democracy is compromise. In my 9 months as chairman I have learned that our form of government is truly a democracy, and I would not change that. Despite that fact, I, like many of our conferees, am not happy with every provision in the bill. However, the conference agreement before you today is an excellent example of how we on the Committee on Appropriations have taken our pledge to balance the budget very seriously.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before you today charts a new course, a fiscally responsible course, but a course which also provides for the protection and enhancement of our public lands, preserves the critical science and research capabilities, and maintains health and education programs for native Americans and, I would add, very important, respects private property rights.

While I believe this bill is fiscally very responsible and represents common sense, the action of the conferees with respect to mining is in direct opposition to the views of a bipartisan majority of this body, as was evident by the vote on the Klug amendment, I understand there will probably be a motion to recommit and each Member will have to make his or her own decision on the mining policy issue.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is 10 percent, or $1.4 billion below 1995 spending levels. This represents real savings, both now and in the future. By not starting new programs or construction, we save costs in future years. The bill terminates agencies and programs and puts others on notice that Federal funding will terminate in the near future. This bill is not business as usual.

We are not cutting at the margins with the hopes that we can keep programs on life support until more money becomes available in the future. Instead, we have terminated lower priority initiatives to provide scarce resources to meet the many critical needs of our public lands, to ensure quality health and education for native Americans and to promote quality science and research in energy and public land management.

Specifically, four agencies are eliminated: the National Biological Service; Bureau of Mines; DOE's Office of Emergency Preparedness; and Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation. In addition, more than 35 individual programs have been eliminated.

With respect to the National Biological Service, an issue of some interest to many in this body, let me reiterate that the NBS has been eliminated. However, as many agreed, the core natural resource research activities, critical to responsible stewardship of our public lands, has been preserved and will be carried out by what is widely recognized as the premier unbiased, credible, specific agency, the U.S. Geological Survey.

This will ensure that critical research, critical scientific information will continue, and that it will be conducted independent of regulatory influence or agendas and will ensure scientific excellence.

In keeping with our commitment to reduce spending, we have also cut funding for this activity by 15 percent.

□ 1045

As to the endangered species program, we are waiting on the authorizing committee inasmuch as the authorization for the Endangered Species Act has expired and we hope that the Committee on Resources will bring out a bill. The appropriation recognizes that we are waiting for that action.

The National Endowment for the Arts is funded at the House-passed level of $99.5 million. The statement of the managers also makes it clear that it is the intent of the House to terminate Federal support for the NEA after fiscal year 1997. Again, this is consistent with the authorizing bill that has come out of the committee of jurisdiction.

Funding for land acquisition, as in the House-passed bill, is not earmarked and is funded at 40 percent below last year's funding levels. This ensures that the limited funding will be directed only to high priority projects for the four land management agencies. If there is a critical piece of land, there will be funding available, but we do no earmarking.

Contrary to what Members may have read in their local press, passage of this bill will not force the closure of one single national park or recreation area. No park will be forced to close under this agreement, as funding for park operations is over 1995 levels by $5 million. I would point out that this is in the face of a 10-percent reduction overall. We have kept the funding for those agencies, those facilities where the public interfaces at pretty much 1995 levels in terms of operations. In the case of the parks, it is $5 million over 1995. There certainly is not reason whatsoever to close any park.

To achieve that, increased savings were made in lower priority park programs such as land acquisition and construction. Those things are nice to do, but we did not have the funding to achieve that. Initially, I tried to divide the responsibilities into three categories, must-do's need-to-do's and nice-to-do's. Some of these are nice to do, but we had to take care of the must-do's.

Construction has been reduced by more than 14 percent, and land acquisition is down nearly 44 percent. Overall—and that is including every dimension of the park activity—funding is

down less than 5 percent. With respect to construction, we have funded critical maintenance, health and safety, and repair and rehabilitation rather than starting new projects.

In effect, let us take care of what we have. This is very important. All of you who are homeowners recognize that you have to take care of the repairs and rehabilitation of a structure or the result of much more expensive problems late on. We have taken that approach in dealing with our responsibility in terms of construction.

Funding for critical scientific research is also maintained, including important health and safety research and mineral assessments of the former Bureau of Mines, which will now be carried out by the USGS and the Department of Energy for significant savings. This disposition upholds the House position that much of the work of the Bureau in health and safety research and minerals information is critical and these functions will be preserved.

I might also add that in terms of the energy funding, we respect the contractual obligations of the U.S. Government. We have many projects that are underway and research through contracts with universities, almost all of them matching funds. Nevertheless we ensure that these contracts can be carried out and that the word of the U.S. Government will be maintained.

Core programs that are critical to providing for the needs of native Americans have also been maintained. Funding for the Indian Health Service is down less than 1 percent from last year's level. I might add that many native Americans came to see me in the past 3 weeks, and without exception they said the most important thing to them is the tribal priority allocations [TPA]. We recognize their concerns, and for that reason we directed the $87 million increase over the Senate to TPA.

Energy programs have also been reduced 10 percent from 1995 levels with commitments for continued downward trends. Numerous energy projects were terminated and the limited funding focused on projects and programs which leveraged significant non-Federal investment. While new construction was significantly curtailed, it was our goal to take care of necessary maintenance and rehabilitation of Federal facilities, and a good example is the Smithsonian, where the conference report provides nearly $34 million, which is the President's budget request, for critical repair and restoration of aging Smithsonian facilities.

As Members may recall, when the Interior bill was on the House floor in July, the House voted 271 to 153 to support maintaining the existing moratorium on the issuance of mineral patents on public lands. However, the Senate prevailed in the conference, and that moratorium is not presently in the conference report.

I reiterate, in terms of the budget, this is a good bill and with respect to the stewardship of our public lands and resources, I also believe it is a good bill. In the long term we cannot truly be good stewards of our public lands and our cultural and natural resources, we cannot foster scientific excellence, we cannot ensure a better future for native Americans, we cannot improve our energy security, if we cannot first get our fiscal house in order.

I think it is imperative for future generations, if they are to have the same rich heritage that we have, that we have control of our fiscal house, that we not spend their future.

Page 53 in the statement of the managers which accompanies the conference report—House Report 104–259—contains a typographical error under amendment No. 110 which deals with the fossil energy research and development appropriation for the Department of Energy. The general reduction to processing research and downstream operations in the oil technology program is $1,100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD at this point a table on the various amounts in the bill as agreed to by the conference managers.

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	563,936,000	568,062,000	-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	12,068,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,615,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
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)	8,883,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,158,682,000	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	53,768,000	34,095,000	26,355,000	38,775,000	37,655,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	6,687,000	6,700,000	6,019,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	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	8,983,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahonton 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	996,000	1,000,000	996,000	800,000	800,000	-196,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	568,936,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000	.....	145,965,000	.....	-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,088,249,000	1,092,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,094,000	37,649,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	179,883,000	114,868,000	116,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund	6,000	2,300,000	.....	.....	.....	-6,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission 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)	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,462,000	586,369,000	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	186,556,000	182,169,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	.....
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	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	176,327,000	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	1,609,842,000	1,509,828,000	1,261,234,000	1,359,434,000	-159,578,000
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	80,645,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund	1,996,000					-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises	1,966,000	1,966,000		900,000	500,000	-1,466,000
Indian direct loan program account	779,000					-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,671,000	9,984,000		7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,671,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,660,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,546,412,000	-184,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,885,000	40,468,000	37,468,000	-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	52,405,000	68,188,000	65,188,000	-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	14,618,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal	23,574,000	24,938,000	29,518,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	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	-4,683,000
Office of the Solicitor	34,608,000	35,361,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	
Office of Inspector General	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	
Construction Management	1,996,000	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	5,998,205,000	-509,692,000
Appropriations	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,028,205,000)	(-509,692,000)
Rescission	(-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)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,660,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	193,748,000	203,796,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry	154,268,000	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	1,326,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,266,888,000	1,247,543,000	1,256,253,000	-72,640,000
Forest Service fire protection	159,285,000	164,265,000				-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	199,215,000	192,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	163,500,000	-35,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-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)	
Land acquisition	63,862,000	65,311,000	14,600,000	41,167,000	41,200,000	-22,662,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	-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	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-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	417,169,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer)	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-3,900,000	-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	149,028,000	-38,020,000
Energy conservation	755,751,000	923,561,000	558,371,000	576,976,000	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	6,297,000	8,036,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness	8,233,000	8,219,000	.....	.....	.....	-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	135,954,000	25,689,000	.....	.....	.....	-135,954,000
(By transfer)	(90,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+96,236,000)
Energy information Administration	84,566,000	84,689,000	79,766,000	64,766,000	72,266,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,566,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,653,000	-86,234,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,725,792,000	1,815,373,000	1,722,842,000	+13,062,000
Indian health facilities	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,975,000	151,227,000	238,958,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,961,800,000	-1,262,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	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						
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	307,988,000	308,188,000	-5,665,000
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	38,700,000	12,950,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	52,902,000	54,566,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	4,016,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
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	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,259,000	88,765,000	82,259,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants	28,512,000	28,725,000	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	156,087,000	82,469,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-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	3,063,000	3,063,000	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		1,368,000				
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	28,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,116,873,000	-894,460,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-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	12,114,878,000	-1,404,352,000
Appropriations	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,083,099,000)	(12,144,878,000)	(-1,404,352,000)
Rescission	(-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)	(-44,769,000)	(-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)	(107,764,000)	(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	1,156,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	588,938,000	603,850,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
National Biological Service	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,965,000		-162,041,000
National Park Service	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,078,000	1,300,336,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey	571,462,000	586,369,000	698,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	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	128,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	268,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,546,412,000	-184,558,000
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	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	5,998,205,000	-509,692,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,566,000	1,143,569,000	1,179,653,000	-86,234,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,996,600,000	1,961,800,000	-1,262,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
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	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	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	56,615,000	59,229,000	58,298,000	+1,380,000
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	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	28,715,000	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	3,063,000	3,063,000	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	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,116,873,000	-894,460,000
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	12,114,878,000	-1,404,352,000

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

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, my young friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], did not have an easy job in crafting this bill. When we start off with a billion dollars plus, less than we had the previous year, and have to allocate the balance among some of the most important programs for the people of this country, it becomes a critical job. Much as I respect what my good friend has done, I think it is a terrible bill.

I have been here in this House a fairly long time, much of it spent working on the Interior appropriations bill. This is the first year, first time in all these years that I refused to sign the conference report on the Interior appropriations bill. Why? It is such a bad bill. It is a terrible bill.

It is so bad that only one of the Democratic conferees signed the conference report. We do not have time this morning to go into all the defects of the bill. It is a giveaway bill. It opens up the people's natural resources for the taking.

Mr. Speaker, over the years that I have been on this committee, we have tried to protect and foster the people's public resources. This bill does just the opposite. It opens the people's resources for exploitation. It turns over the Nation's wealth for the exploitation by special interests. It would cut down our ancient forests. It would enter our oil reserves much more, and it would open up the capture of our valuable minerals.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we were able for the first time, for the first time, to check the giveaways that the Mining Act of 1872 had laid the foundation for. We were able to stop the giveaways of our gold and our silver, of all of our precious metals and our precious minerals, by approving a moratorium on patents transferring lands to a mining company for, what price, $2.50, $5. That stopped the giveaway to an extent. We finally, in that moratorium that we prepared, we grandfathered in existing claims and some of them have matured. I will talk about them a little later. But the Members of this House recognized the moratorium as a great idea and that it should be continued. On a vote to instruct conferees, which I offered, to uphold the moratorium, the vote was 271 to 151. Ninety-five Members of the Republican Party voted to instruct the conferees to continue the patent moratorium, 95 Members of the Republican Party.

What happened in the conference, Mr. Speaker? The first motion that was made in the conference was made by a Republican conferee of the House to kill the patent moratorium. And it carried, with the votes of six Republican conferees. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who had so eloquently supported the moratorium when it passed the House in the first instance, was the only Republican to vote the other way. If carried with the votes of the majority of the Republican conferees and by the vote of one Democrat. And with that vote, down went the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, I propose today to reinstate that moratorium. I propose to make a motion to recommit this bill to the conference in order to, by instructing the conferees, to insist upon maintaining the patent moratorium. It is still a good idea. It is still a good idea. The Members of the House who voted for that moratorium ought to vote for it. Why? Well, let me tell my colleagues what the moratorium that we had in existence for one year did. How important was it?

The moratorium held up, and this information is from the Interior Department, the moratorium held up 235 current applications involving 138,879 acres of public land containing over 15.5 billion dollars' worth of gold, silver, and other minerals. If the moratorium goes down, as it will unless my motion carries, if the moratorium goes down, these lands will be sold to the large mining corporations for next to nothing. And additionally, a new crop of patent applications for more public land and minerals will be filed at bargain-basement prices.

Waiting in the wings, Mr. Speaker, are 332,771 outstanding mining claims covering more than 6.6 million acres of public land, about the size of the State of Maryland. If the moratorium is lifted, all of these claims will be eligible for application and the loss to the American taxpayer could reach into the tens of billions of dollars.

As an example of what approval of one of these applications may be, let me cite what happened as reported in the newspapers on September 7, 1995. Interior Secretary Babbitt made headlines. He said he reluctantly had to do what he had to do. He had to sign away 110 acres of Federal land in Idaho containing minerals worth $1 billion to a Danish company. And how much did the Danish company pay for all that property? Just $275. And again, on September 26, 1995, Secretary Babbitt was forced to sign away title to 118 acres of public lands in Nevada worth over $68 million in gold. For how much? For $540.

These were patents that we could not stop. These were patents that had been grandfathered under the provisions we adopted, and there was nothing we could do to prevent them. But others can be, others can be by the patents moratorium that was approved in last year's appropriations bill. We want to put it into this bill as well. We want to get a fair deal for our valuable minerals. Nothing excessive, just a fair deal. Some compensation, some compensation for the people's wealth that is being exploited. Now we get none.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, when the time comes I propose to offer my amendment, and I urge Members of the House to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, my old friend, Chairman REGULA, did not have an easy job in crafting this bill. And while I disagree with some of the decisions he made, the major flaws in this conference report are not of his doing. The allocation for the Interior Subcommittee was far too small—$1.1 billion less than the fiscal year 1995 amount. And while some may cheer this fact, those of us who know the Interior bill realize it has no fat; every cut we make has a direct impact on someone's life. Every dollar we cut from the Bureau of Indian Affairs means the quality of life for native American declines; every dollar we cut from low-income weatherization assistance means an elderly couple will go cold this winter; and every dollar we cut from the National Endowment for the Arts means another public school student will be deprived of art education.

The cuts to vital programs in this bill are reason enough to oppose it, but when all of the extraneous legislative riders are added, it heaps insult on top of injury.

The administration has said the President will veto this conference report unless major changes are made. I agree with the President. The Interior bill needs a higher allocation and it needs to be free of legislative riders. Then and only then will it be worthy of a Presidential signature.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The most troubling aspect of this conference report is that it devastates programs for native Americans. It does so by cutting funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs by $388 million from the budget estimate. This crippling cut is directly targeted at programs that help Indian tribes run their reservations. If we ratify these cuts by passing this conference report, we will not only be harming one of the most impoverished and vulnerable segments of our society, but we will be breaking yet another treaty with the Indian people.

Under this conference report, the tribal priority allocation at the Bureau of Indian Affairs is $122 million less than it was in the House-passed version of the bill. This catastrophic reduction will decimate programs operated by tribal governments, including: child welfare services, higher education scholarships, adult vocational training, social services, and housing repairs. In addition, health and education programs for native Americans are inadequately funded. All totaled, these cuts will result in massive increases in unemployment, crime, hunger, illness, and a general deterioration of tribal communities.

One cannot help but think of the words from Dee Brown's classic novel, ''Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee.''

> They made us many promises, more than I can remember, and they only kept one; they promised to take our land, and they did.

Through treaties and other agreements, the American Indians turned over their land, cultural traditions, and general way of life to the U.S. Government in exchange for secure lands, housing, medical care, and education. But once again our Government is undermining supposedly iron-clad agreements. Yet again the Great Father is devastating American Indians, just as we did at Wounded Knee in 1890.

There is also a little-noticed provision in this bill that singles out a small Indian tribe in Washington State and punishes them even further for simply wanting to defend the water rights they were given by our Government. The Lummi Indians are a proud and honorable people and they simply want the Government to live up to their promises. Instead, this bill hammers them into giving up their water rights or have their Federal funds cut in half. This cruel provision has no place in an Interior Appropriations bill.

MINING MORATORIUM

I would like to address the lifting of the mining patent moratorium in the conference report. This is a very disturbing development and may be one of the most egregious acts committed on the American public by the Republican leadership since the so-called revolution of the 104th Congress.

As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle work to slash and cut assistance to those who need it most, welfare for the mining industry has been given new life. As you all know, the mining patent moratorium expires on September 30, 2 days from now, if it is not explicitly continued in the Interior appropriations bill. Once this happens the give away of public lands will once again start in earnest.

I find it ironic that the Republican majority litters the airwaves with rhetoric about reducing the deficit. They say one thing, but talk is cheap, about $2.50 to $5 an acre. This reminds me of the Teapot Dome scandal which occurred during the twenties, when then Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, went to jail as a result of having given, really as a gift, the oil belonging to the people of the United States. It seems the Teapot Dome scandal is happening all over again, but maybe we should call it the Land Plot scandal. If my Republican colleagues really want to cut the deficit why are they willing to give away our precious minerals and ores. I would like to share with you what the Federal Government receives for development of resources on public lands.

Resources on Public Lands	Compensation
Oil	12.5 percent of gross.
Natural gas	12.5 percent of gross.
Coal, surface mined	12.5 percent of gross.
Coal, underground	8 percent of gross.
Gravel	Full fair market value.
Building stone	Full fair market value.
Calcium	Full fair market value.
Clay	Full fair market value.
Sulphur	5 percent of gross value.
Phosphate	5 percent or more of gross.
Sodium	2 percent or more of gross.
Potash	2 percent or more of gross.
Gold	Free of charge.
Copper	Free of charge.
Silver	Free of charge.
Uranium	Free of charge.
Molybdenum	Free of charge.

This is very upsetting to me, as I am sure it is to my colleagues who voted overwhelming 271 to 153 in support of the Klug amendment retaining this moratorium. Yet, by the slimiest of margins the House conferees subverted the will of this body and receded to the Senate position, even after being instructed to do otherwise.

If my colleagues would indulge me I would like to take this opportunity to read the comments of one of our most learned colleagues on this subject.

. . . We are literally giving our rich mineral resources—our gold, our silver, our platinum—away to foreign interests for bargain basement prices.

It is possibly the biggest travesty in Government and yet it has been happening under an antiquated 1872 law. The Mining Policy Center reported estimates that since 1872 the Federal Government has given away more than $231 billion of mineral resources belonging to the public, either by patent or by royalty-free mining on public lands. . . . these figures are a clear indication that the Government is not receiving a reasonable return for the taxpayers under the current law. I find it incomprehensible that we are willing to give away the public lands with virtually no compensation.

Chairman REGULA spoke these eloquent words on behalf of the American people September 13, 1994, ensuring the fiscal year 1995 Interior appropriations conference report prohibited the Interior Department from processing new mining claims on Federal land. In the short time the moratorium has been in place, it has saved American taxpayers millions of dollars by blocking the Federal Government from giving away precious minerals and ores to foreign mining companies who take advantage of an ancient law that allows them to mine on our public lands for almost nothing.

This very troubling feature of the conference report has caused the administration to threaten a veto of this bill. In a statement by Vice President AL GORE the lifting of the moratorium was singled out as one of the primary reasons the President will not sign this legislation and is why I cannot lend my support to my good friend and colleague RALPH REGULA in his maiden voyage as chairman.

I certainly hope all of the Members who voted for the Klug amendment will not give in to the pressure of the mining industry, but instead reaffirm their support for ending this corporate welfare by voting for a motion to recommit.

NATIONAL FORESTS

This bill does more than just betray our trust with the Indian people and expand subsidies for mining companies, it also devastates our national forests.

The conference report to be ratified here today will dramatically increase logging on our already overtaxed forests. While funding for forest research, recreation and state and private forestry is slashed, this bill actually increases the appropriation for timber sales management and timber road construction.

This conference report also contains a legislative rider that would force the Forest Service to adopt Alternative P in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. Alternative P is a radical forest management plan that has been rejected by the Forest Service and the Governor of Alaska because it would wreak ecological havoc on the Tongass.

What's more, this conference report also contains sufficiency language—a rider which prevents all environmental law from being enforce in the Tongass. The Endangered Species Act is dismissed, the National Environmental Policy Act is waived, the Clean Water Act is ignored and all other applicable laws are considered irrelevant. In addition, this sufficiency language prevents all citizens, environmentalists and private land owners alike, from exercising their rights to sue the Federal Government.

If we adopt this conference report we will be rejecting the judgment of the Forest Service, we will be putting a great forest at risk and we will be setting a dangerous legal precedent.

NEA AND NEH

And this bill doesn't just stop at ravaging our environmental heritage, it also cripples our cultural heritage. This conference report will cut the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities by nearly 40 percent. These cuts are far out of proportion to the total reduction in this bill.

I wonder if we all fully understand the impact these cuts will have on our society. Performances will be cancelled, museums will close, and art education opportunities in our schools will be cut back sharply. And while every segment of our country will suffer from these deplorable cuts, none will be hurt more than the children.

The conferees also adopted legislative language which dictates what types of art the NEA is allowed to fund. This rider, the so-called Helms language, is blatantly unconstitutional and has the heavy handed overtones of former communist countries which decided what art and literature were acceptable for the people. I sincerely hope this House does not want to get in the business of deciding what books are appropriate and what paintings are offensive.

All of these cuts and legislative riders are indicative of the warped priorities in this conference report. Do we really want to cut weatherization funding for poor families by $100 million, as this bill does, at the same time we increase spending on low-priority research and development projects? Do we really want to gut funding for endangered species programs? Do we really want to cut funding for the National Park Service by $68 million? Do we really want to harm the Indian people? Do we really want to give away precious minerals on Federal land for next to nothing? Do we really want to subvert the will of Congress and the desires of the people of California by eliminating our newest National Park, the Mojave National Preserve? Do we really want to censor art? I know I don't want to and I don't think the American people do either.

There are a few bright spots in this conference report and I want thank our chairman for his enormous assistance with the Holocaust Museum; thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to salute the staff. They did an excellent job under very difficult circumstances.

But sadly, the fact remains, this bill hurts Americans, all Americans, in a profound way. And this is why Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 44 years, I must vote against an Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time and rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, all members of the Committee on Appropriations realize the difficulty this year we have all had in putting a bill together and still honoring our commitment to balance the budget, at least by the year 2002. If I had had my druthers, we would have not terminated the Bureau of Mines, but I understand that was a compromise, so we accept this.

Mr. Speaker, I will pose a question to the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman REGULA.

As I understand it, the conference report to H.R. 1977 contains $13.7 million for the Department of Energy's industrial advanced turbine system program. The mission of the program is to

develop more efficient gas turbine systems for industrial power generation. Implementation of the turbine program will help keep U.S. manufacturers on the cutting edge of turbine technology for power generation applications and enhance our Nation's economic competitiveness.

Is it your intent that the $13.7 million provided by your subcommittee for 1996 be used to fund each of the two projects selected for the industrial advanced turbine systems program so that they have the opportunity to participate in the full-scale prototype demonstration phase?

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of the conference agreement.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for including this.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking and congratulating the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], our chairman, for the way he has handled this bill. I greatly appreciate his courtesy and cooperation, and I want the gentleman to know that I genuinely regret that I cannot support the end product of his work.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this conference report deserves to be defeated. Congress should not pass it. If it is passed, it should be vetoed, and that veto should be sustained.

It is true that there are some good things in this report. For example, in terms of funding, the report is better than the bill when it left the House.

Overall funding levels, however, fall far short of meeting our responsibilities, whether with regard to programs for Native Americans, or proper stewardship of this country's natural and cultural resources, for energy-related research, and for fostering the arts and humanities that enrich our national life.

These shortfalls are not really surprising. They reflect the serious imbalance in the overall Republican budget plan, which overemphasizes new weapons and cutting taxes for well-off Americans at the expense of needed domestic programs.

Even worse, this conference report is loaded with riders, some of them merely unwise and shortsighted restrictions on spending, others far-reaching legislative provisions of exactly the kind that the normal rules prohibit.

Why is this happening? Well, the pattern could not be clearer. Some of the riders continue and expand the Republican leadership's sneak attack on our environment and natural resources, while others are old-fashioned sweetheart deals with friends and supporters. I will not take the time to go through the full list of these bad items, but I do want to mention a few.

For starters, there is the language about the gold and other so-called hard rock minerals found on Federal lands. For too long the American people, the property owners, have been shortchanged. Under the obsolete mining law of 1872, the Secretary of the Interior has no choice but to sell these lands for a pittance.

Our appropriations bill for last year included a moratorium on these bargain basement sales. We tried to extend that in a strong bipartisan vote when this bill left the House and later insisted on it in instruction to conferees.

So what did the conference produce? Well, not only does it not include the moratorium, it actually would require the Secretary to speed up the processing of these patent applications.

Other bad provisions here deal with the national forests. The House bill was not all it should have been, but the Senate bill was really bad, with provisions, for example, to force the Forest Service to sell off more timber in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska.

So what happened in conference? Well, it was to make the bad Senate bill even worse, adding language intended to block any challenge to expanded cutting in areas where the Forest Service wants to protect fish and wildlife and other important values. That is wrong, and we should not support it.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I could talk about the provisions in the conference report that would also block grazing reform, and many, many others, but I think the point has been made. This conference report deserves to be defeated.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. Due to the funding allocation we had to work with, it has been very difficult to put together responsible legislation. But we have done it.

The conference report to H.R. 1977 puts us squarely on the side of reducing the deficit. The bill spends $1.4 billion less than last year, for a 12-percent savings.

As I said, drafting this legislation has been difficult. We had to eliminate 4 different agencies and eliminate over 35 individual programs to meet our budget cuts. For each of us on the conference committee, that meant accepting some very difficult cuts.

This conference report is proof that we are serious about reducing spending. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and to oppose any attempts to change it. We have crafted a carefully balanced bill that spreads the pain of deficit reduction as evenly as possible.

I would like to say something about provisions in the conference report relating to mining. The conference report moves significantly toward mining law reform. Instead of a moratorium on mining on Federal land, it includes a requirement that mining companies pay fair market value for the land. It also includes provisions that return the land back to the Federal Government if ever used for non-mining purposes.

These mining provisions in the conference report are a huge step forward in reforming the mining law to ensure a fair return to the Treasury and to protect the environment.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report and to reject attempts to recommit the measure. A moratorium would yield nothing—no increased revenue, no protection from abuses of the mining law. A moratorium on issuing new mining patents would do nothing but ensure the status quo.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report without any changes, and oppose the anticipated motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of this debate, a motion will be made to recommit this conference report with instructions.

This motion, to be offered by Mr. YATES, only concerns the mining claim patent issue, and I would urge the Members to support it.

My friends, a cruel hoax is being perpetrated on the American public. It is cruel indeed.

For contained in this conference report is a provision which will allow billions of dollars worth of valuable minerals underlying Federal lands to be transferred to private interests for free under the mining law of 1872.

This provision exists despite a national outcry against this 19th century practice that continues to this day.

It exists despite a bipartisan amendment which passed in this body by an overwhelming vote last July aimed at halting this practice.

A vote of 271 to 153, on an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin, SCOTT KLUG, and myself.

It exists despite a motion to instruct House conferees to insist on retaining the language of this amendment in its dealings with the other body.

And it exists despite the alleged preoccupation of some Members of this body that the Government should be run more like a business.

Well, my friends, what business, what individual, would allow minerals underlying land that they owned to be given away for free?

Who, in their right mind, would say, hey, what a great deal, pay me the value of the surface of my land and you can have the underlying gold, or silver, for no charge?

Yet, this is what is contained in the conference agreement before us today.

The House, last July, took a strong stand in seeking to extend a moratorium on the issuance of mining claim patents.

This was done on a bipartisan basis. Liberal or converstaive, Republican or Democrat, we agreed that it is time to put a halt to allowing public lands containing billions of dollars' worth of minerals to be patented for a mere $2.50 an acre.

Yet, the purveyors of the special interests had a different idea.

Scarificing the public interest on the alter of corporate welfare, they sought, and succeeded, in getting the conference committee to include in this legislation what amounts to sham reform of the mining law of 1872.

I urge every Member to vote in support of the recommittal motion, so that the public, at least in this instance, can receive some assurance that the Congress is not in the business of squandering their natural resource heritage for a pittance of its fair market value.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to recommit, because it is not the concept of special interests per se; it is taking a special interest in the hard-working men and women who are risking their lives daily and making a decent and honorable living by mining this Nation's resources so that this Nation can continue to prosper.

My friend from West Virginia came forward and offered some points that I think need to be addressed. No. 1, it is important to remember that in the western United States, for example, in Gila County, AZ, 97 percent of the land is under Federal control.

Have there been problems in the past? Certainly. But the conference report provides rational, reasonable reform. Gone are the days when someone can file a patent and then take that land for nonmining purposes. We are getting rid of that.

Mr. Speaker, do not be deceived. It is time to stand up for American jobs. It is time to recognize the reality that this Nation as a whole prospers when the mining industry and those working in that industry are allowed to continue to earn an honest day's wage.

So that is the special interest I rise to defend, the hundreds, indeed, thousands, of hard-working men and women in the Sixth District of Arizona who will lose jobs if we file this moratorium and in essence hang up a sign on the western United States saying ''Closed for business.'' Because, rest assured, Mr. Speaker, if we do that, then we will sound the death knell for the mining industry in the western United States and we will send jobs out of this Nation to foreign shores. And instead of the dreaded corporate welfare, well, friends, we will have genuine welfare, as we make honest, law-abiding citizens wards of the State.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. This committee had a significant problem in terms of 1 billion dollars' worth of cuts that they had to make in terms of the overall budget. But the fact of the matter is instead of going after the waste that is in the departments and the agencies that they have had, within their review instead of going after the programs in terms of corporate welfare, in terms of the timber roads, in terms of the mineral extraction laws, of grazing permits, instead of many other exploitive policies, they chose to take those dollars out of the Bureau of Indian Health. They chose to cut down the Indian Education Program. They chose to shortchange the land management agencies and the jobs they are trying to do, to abandon the Columbia River study project. They chose to turn their back on the natural resources and the protection of those resources, and yielded instead to the robber barons of the 19th century operating in 1995.

These individuals for many years have received and exploited the lands of this Nation, have harvested the timber; and not just harvested it for a profit, but at the expense of the taxpayer. When you add in the timber roads, the rehabilitation, the other things that have to go on, the taxpayers actually lose tens of millions of dollars. Most egregious, of course, is the rejection of the moratorium on the patenting of mineral claims.

The fact of the matter is the moratorium is no victory. It is a stalemate, and that keeps the pressure on for real mining reform. But what they do in this legislation is they say that the 600 claims must be accelerated claims in terms of acting on the claims and granting patents therefore giving this land away at so-called fair market value in the West and in other places in this country where the land value is very, very low, to give away those billions of dollars worth of minerals, which is the legacy and the property of future generations and of this generation.

□ 1115

If we want to deal with the deficit, we cannot go back and then serve the special interests in this particular legislation. That is what happens in this legislation, cut and slash again and again, programs, that are important to people, programs that provide for the protection of our natural resource legacy. To squander money by opening up the Tongass Forest, demanding we will cut and harvest more timber there, where it costs us taxpayer dollars to do that, and it costs us millions of dollars to do it, this bill is an outrage; not just wasting taxpayer dollars but destroying our natural resource legacy.

It is a shame and it is a sham, the type of mining reform that is in this legislation. It should be soundly defeated, and we should be voting for the Yates motion, as we did initially for at least a mining patent moratoria. We should be voting for that motion to send this back to conference, at least so we can get the mineral patent moratorium in place.

The President needs to and has pledged to veto this bill, and it richly deserves our no vote and it deserves a veto by the President so that we can get some sound policy and sound deficit reduction in the process of public policy setting in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Department of Interior appropriations bill. This legislation, which is based on pseudoscience, fails in terms of priorities, process, policy, and the pragmatic. I strongly urge defeat of the conference report for H.R. 1977.

Under this bill, the Federal Government stewards are prevented from carrying out the basic responsibilities with which they have been charged, protecting the land and water resources of our Nation. The Members of Congress and the professional land managers have a sworn duty to protect wildlife and biological diversity, to preserve the environmental value of our national parks, and to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation. The conference report essentially abdicates such commonsense responsibilities and constructs a new set of priorities in which the rights of the American people to use and enjoy the public lands of our Nation finish dead last behind a wide variety of special interests, in essence the users who exploit public resources.

During the course of consideration, the majority simply circumvented the normal legislative process. This measure is not just a spending bill, this encompasses wholesale policy. In Congress, the House strictly separates policymaking authority changes from the appropriations spending and this is done for good reason. There has been no indepth open debate and hearings on the policy changes which are being directly sent to the President. The public has not had an adequate opportunity to examine the policy path that is being advanced, much less the Members of Congress. We have completely rewritten the Endangered Species Act, forestry laws, and land management laws behind doors closed to all but a select few. This is not in keeping with the American tradition of representative government: the American people have a right to know that significant policy changes are being made and they have a right to know the direction of the new policy path.

Mr. Speaker, there is a simple reason these crucial policy decisions were tacked on to the Interior appropriations bill instead of being considered independently: these policies were added as riders because on their own, they do not stand up to scrutiny. This is bad policy based on distorted science and values. The American people do not support it. Such change would not be sustained in the heat of open debate.

Many successful programs are seriously underfunded or even eliminated in this bill. The majority has made these cuts in the name of deficit reduction but the cuts are not fair or balanced rather money is wasted on timber

sales, roads and construction that is being forced on the land management agencies while Indian education is eliminated and Indian health programs short changed. I support deficit reduction, but this is not the way to achieve the goal of controlling spending. Problems we face in managing our natural resources will not go away just because we ignore them, and disregarding these issues will only cost the American taxpayer more in the long run.

The moratorium on new listing under the Endangered Species Act of animals and plants as endangered or threatened will only increase the cost of recovery down the road. There is ample scientific evidence that we need to be proactive in species management if we are to succeed in recovering species with reasonable cost and regulation. Eliminating the National Biological Survey [NBS], which has undertaken crucial research on species, will only exacerbate the difficulty and increase the cost of preserving endangered species. Moreover, it is hypocritical for this Congress to call for better science and then deny funding for the NBS, an agency specifically set up to conduct unbiased scientific research.

Eliminating the Bureau of Mines, which has been very successful in improving mine safety, is also shortsighted. Not only will there be economic repercussions to the elimination of this agency, there will be a significant human cost as workers in the mining industry face more dangerous conditions in their place of work.

The catalog of questionable policy decisions included in this bill stretches on well beyond those policies I have just mentioned. The mining patent moratoria to prevent the public land giveaways under the 1872 mining law are eliminated, energy conservation and weatherization programs are severely reduced or eliminated, historic preservation efforts are crippled, new guidelines to set minimum national standards for the management of Federal lands used by Western ranchers to graze livestock are postponed, and the Forest Service will be forced to implement an unsound management plan for the Tongass National Forest. Furthermore initiatives to provide recordation of existing rights of ways on public lands is set aside. These actions simply personify the mismanagement and political interference regards professional stewardship and the law.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report severely undermines our national legacy of conservation, it fails in terms of process, and it fails in terms of policy. We must remember that the policies and programs already in place to carry out the mission of the Interior Department are not the work of Democrats or Republicans alone. Instead, they are derived from years of deliberation, of listening and responding to the core conservation and preservation values and ethic of the American people. This conference report reflects a failure to uphold the deliberative process that underlies the American tradition of conservation. We can and must do better than this. I urge defeat of the bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us here have been elected to represent the 600,000 people in each of our respective districts, but each of us also knows that we need to put always the interests of our great country ahead, No. 1. We are all Americans and we are proud of our heritage and this body.

Today, we have a terrible deficit and debt, $5 trillion. Each of us has to look under every rock and stone to try to get that deficit down. Somehow, though, certain interests have been able to keep mining royalties tied to 1872 law. That is ridiculous, and what a bargain for them.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that if this bill goes forward there are interests that have a lock on about 1,200 acres of land that they are going to be able to put a claim on for about $8,000 or $9,000, and they are going to make a windfall profit of $10 billion on that money that they invest. That is not right. That is not right at all.

In fact, that is why the Citizens Against Government Waste say this, and I will include the letter for the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, the letter reads, in part, as follows: ''Dear Representative. In July, the House voted 271 to 153 against corporate special interests. This sounds like reform, but it is not; it is pure corporate welfare. As much as $15.5 billion in taxpayer-owned minerals will be sold beginning September 30 if the moratorium is not renewed.'' That is tomorrow.

''Instead of taxpayers receiving billions in return from these sales, CBO estimates that the Senate reforms will provide a mere $150 million over 7 years. Simply put, a moratorium period must be adopted to allow for more comprehensive reform.''

''The Interior Department estimates this single action could result in the issuance of 600 patents covering 230,000 acres of taxpayer land in the next 2 years. The Citizens Against Government Waste urge you to support the motion to recommit and pass mining claim patent moratorium language.''

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Interior appropriation bill unless we also pass and adopt the motion to recommit. The rape and pillage of taxpayers across this country has got to stop and we can do it with this motion, and I hope that we are successful.

CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The 600,000 members of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW) urge you to support the motion to recommit the FY 1996 Interior Appropriations conference report and instruct the conferees to renew the moratorium on patent applications for public lands.

In July, the House of Representatives boldly voted 271–153 against corporate special interests and extended the moratorium for another year. However, during the conference, a Senate provision was adopted which lifts the patent moratorium and allows mining claim patents for the price of the land surface. This sounds like reform, but it's not: it's pure corporate welfare. As much as $15.5 billion in taxpayer-owned minerals will be sold beginning September 30 if the moratorium is not renewed. Instead of taxpayers receiving billions in return from these sales, CBO estimates the Senate reforms will provide a mere $150 million over seven years. Simply put, a moratorium period must be adopted to allow for more comprehensive reform.

The Interior Department estimates this single action could result in the issuance of more than 600 patents covering 230,000 acres of taxpayer land in the next two years. CCAGW urges you to support the motion to recommit and pass mining claim patent moratorium language.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. SCHATZ,
President.
JOE WINKELMANN,
Chief Lobbyist.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep opposition to this bill. Amongst many other things, it prematurely terminates three vital initiatives that protect fishery habitat in the Northwest, amongst many other bad cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my unmitigated opposition to this bill. From funding decreases in land acquisition and energy conservation to the termination of the National Biological Survey and the Office of Indian Education, this bill is so packed with ill-advised cuts that it would take me an hour just to list them all. At the top of the list, however, is this bill's treatment of our Nation's sports and commercial fisheries.

First, this bill prematurely restricts and terminates three vital initiatives to protect fisheries habitat in the Northwest—PACFISH, INFISH, and the Upper Columbia Basin assessment. These measures are designed to ensure that activities in the region's national forests don't harm important spawning and rearing habitat for trout and salmon.

Second, this bill drastically slashes funding for land acquisition. If we are serious about protecting private property rights, we must purchase the lands necessary to provide the habitat for fish and wildlife.

And third, this bill terminates all funding for new species listings under the Endangered Species Act. We are simply putting our heads in the sand if we think that stopping agencies from listing species will somehow magically make endangered species problems go away.

On the west coast, we are struggling to reverse the decline of our world famous salmon runs. As recently as 1988, these salmon contributed more than $1 billion and 60,000 jobs annually to our regional economy. Since then, however, salmon fishing revenues have dropped by 90 percent because of declining populations.

To those of you who think that gutting funding for the ESA or habitat protection or land acquisition will help the economy, I say go talk to the unemployed fisher men and women in my district, go talk to the bankrupt tackle shop owners in Idaho, go talk to the thousands of recreational fisher men and women in this country who may never be able to catch a salmon in the Pacific Northwest again, go talk to the native Americans whose culture and religion rely on salmon that will soon no longer exist.

Yes, we need to reduce the deficit. But the priorities in this bill are all wrong. We can do better than this. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking chair, for yielding time to me.

I want to respond to my good friend from Arizona who took the well and very legitimately and forcefully defended the mining jobs in his district. Mr. Speaker, what is important to note here in this moratorium is we are not talking about a moratorium on mining. Plenty of mining goes on and will still be able to go on, on unpatented claims. What we are talking about is a moratorium on the issuance of patents on Federal claims, which is the transfer from Federal ownership to private ownership.

Mr. Speaker, plenty of mining goes on, on unpatented claims. We are not going after the jobs in the district of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] or the district of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. In addition to that fact, there are plenty of royalties, State taxes paid by mining companies today, yet mining continues, jobs are provided. The only problem with the regime today is that the Federal taxpayers get nothing for the disposition of their resources.

State governments do, yes; other companies do, yes; but not the true owners of the land, the Federal taxpayer. That is the issue here. It is not a moratorium on mining.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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 strong opposition to this conference report. This bill represents nothing less than an assault on the environment.

You know, one reason that I'm proud to be a Republican is that I think our party looks to the future—we expect people to make sacrifices today to protect the Nation's well-being tomorrow. That's the idea behind many of our welfare reform proposals. That's why we believe in balancing the budget; we don't want to saddle future generations with our mistakes.

But in the bill before us now, we throw that principle to the winds. We squander precious resources, robbing them from future generations. We tell wealthy mining operations that they don't have to wait, we'll give away national resources to them right now for a song. This bill violates basic Republican principles, and for what? Not to cut the deficit; this bill denies the Federal Government—the taxpayers—money that is their due, by giving away our resources.

Now, I voted for the Interior bill when it passed the House. I had some qualms about a number of items in it, but overall I thought it was an important vote for deficit reduction. But the bill that has come back from the Senate—with its Tongass National Forest and Columbia River Basin and mining provisions—this conference report is intolerable.

I urge all my colleagues who care about the environment to vote against this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill. Even though there is an outstanding chairman, this is not a good bill. I think on a bipartisan basis a lot of people are expressing concerns across the board about many provisions. I am going to cite the one that is most important to me and many of us that represent native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this bill cuts native American programs in education, health, housing by 11 percent. However, of all the programs within the Department of the Interior, here is the real pain: Forty five percent of these cuts are absorbed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that thousands of native American people across the country are going to face cuts on many issues affecting reservations, law enforcement, services to the elderly, road repair, housing repairs, and social services.

Here is the most devastating cut, Mr. Speaker. The elimination of the Office of Indian Education, which basically destroys our promise to native Americans that they will receive the same educational opportunities as the rest of our citizens. Four-hundred thousand Indian children are not going to get these educational opportunities.

On the environmental side, the elimination of the biological service basically says that sound science and information about biological diversity and mining safety is not as important as it should be. At a time when 50 percent of our oil comes from foreign sources, the bill slashes energy conservation by 27 percent.

The bill basically also continues the 1872 mining law, Mr. Speaker. I am a westerner, I am pro mining. I have probably as many mines as anybody here, but there is no reason for any foreign corporation, as it exists at the Yellowstone, to be able to purchase for $2.50 a Federal acre. That is simply not right. Without this moratorium, Mr. Speaker, this is going to continue occurring.

With the endangered species, we are basically saying we are not going to do any more listings, we are not going to pay attention to endangered species, plants, animals. That is not good sound policy. The Tongass, I have been there. What are we going to do, are we going to continue the decimation of our forests?

What are we going to do about the arts, the humanities, 39 percent cut to the National Endowment of the Arts, the Endowment of the Humanities. These are not elitist programs. These are grass roots programs that help artists, that train people, that create jobs. This is short-sighted.

Mr. Speaker, the best we can do is vote for the motion to recommit. We need to kill this bill. It will be vetoed and it will come back. The two chairmen, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. YATES, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. REGULA, are good people. They have produced far better products in the past and we expect that to happen again after the veto. But a strong vote is needed to send a message, to send a strong message that the bill as it comes out on a bipartisan basis is not a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations conference report. This conference report sets a new low even for this House: It singlehandedly abandons our commitments to native American people, devastates many important environmental statutes, and destroys our arts community.

Let me be clear that if this legislation is sent to the President's desk in its current form, it will be vetoed.

This is more than a simple appropriations bill, it is a recipe for disaster comprised of a narrow political agenda and a heavy dose of partisan politics.

I thought the message the American people sent the Congress in 1994 was that they wanted an end to business as usual. This bill does not pass the test: It sends the wrong signal at the wrong time and it should be defeated.

Continuing the Government's miserable track record of keeping our word on Indian treaties, this bill further reduces vitally important funding for a wide array of Indian health, education, and housing services provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA] by 11 percent. However, of all the programs within the Department of the Interior, the BIA is absorbing 45 percent of all the cuts.

These harsh cuts will mean that thousands of native American people across the country will face cuts in law enforcement on reservations, services to the elderly, road repair, housing repairs, and social services. These cuts literally hit Indians where they live. This will be felt from the hogans on the Navajo reservation to the tarpaper shacks of Pine Ridge. It will be a cold, harsh winter for all.

The elimination of the Office of Indian Education will demolish our promises to ensure that the first Americans receive the same educational opportunities as the rest of our citizens. By eliminating the Office of Indian Education this bill eliminates educational opportunities for half-a-million Indian children and adults.

Indian children are about 3 times as likely as their peers to drop out of high school. Today, 36.2 percent of all native American children live in poverty. Native American students on average score 15 percent lower than their peers on standardized tests. Only 9 percent of native Americans have a 4-year degree compared with 20 percent of other Americans. Yet, this bill eliminates programs for dropout prevention and special education for gifted and talented students.

This bill eliminates the Native American Fellowship Program, which makes awards to native American graduate students to study in the fields of medicine, education, psychology, law, business administration, and engineering. Once students complete their education, they must return to native American communities to practice their professions.

And let me set the record straight about something else—native American tribes are not seeking handouts. They are seeking to have promises that were made in treaties and statutes fulfilled. The Federal Government has a solemn duty to live up to its promises to sovereign Indian nations. This bill turns its back on this obligation and leaves the first Americans with less support, few resources, and yet another broken promise.

As if that were not bad enough, this bill devastates environmental programs. At a time when sound science and information about biological diversity and mining safety is more critical than ever, this bill eliminates the National Biological Service and the Bureau of Mines. At a time when nearly 50 percent of our oil comes from foreign sources, this bill slashes energy conservation program funding by 27 percent meaning that our dependence on foreign oil will only increase.

This bill would eliminate the moratorium on mining claim patents, thereby continuing the yard sale policies of the 1872 mining law which Congress refuses to update and reform. Without this moratorium, foreign-owned mining companies will be able to buy up our land for as little as $2.50 an acre, remove any and all of our precious natural resources and abandon the land without cleaning up the mess they have made. The American West is already littered with many of these mining disasters. This bill will create thousands more.

This bill bars the listing of any new endangered species until the end of fiscal year 1996 or until legislation reauthorizing the act is enacted. It also bars the use of funds to designate critical habitat for species which have already been listed, risking our chance to save endangered populations of plants and animals.

This bill delays the implementation of new grazing regulations, despite the fact that the Resource Advisory Councils [RAC's] established by these regulations are already in place in many States and are moving forward with bipartisan recommendations for rangeland management.

In my State of New Mexico, our Lieutenant Governor, a Republican, has said that ''ranching interests are well-represented on the council.'' And Fran Gallegos, appointed by the Lieutenant Governor to serve as chair of the State's council, has said that ''I will not allow political agendas to mar the work we are beginning now.'' And while this kind of bipartisan consensus-building is occurring in New Mexico and in other States, Congress is preparing to stop the RAC's and delay implementation of any changes in rangeland management while we wait for new legislation to be enacted. I fail to understand why yet another bureaucratic process is necessary while thousands of hard-working men and women who make their living from the land wait for a conclusion to this issue. It is time to put it behind us. Unfortunately, this bill would make us begin all over again and reinvent the wheel.

And in yet another giveaway to corporate interests, this bill would increase logging in Alaska's Tongass National Forest, denuding yet another section of our precious national forests for a quick buck. And the bill goes even further to prohibit the Forest Service from setting aside additional acreage in the Tongass as areas where logging would be barred in order to protect wildlife.

Even though the contribution of every American to our arts and humanities amounts to less than the cost of two postage stamps, this bill reduces funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by 39 percent. Even though every industrial nation in the world has some kind of government program to support the arts, this bill calls for the elimination of the National Endowment for the Arts in 3 years. Furthermore, the National Endowment for the Humanities is cut by 36 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting it down. The American people did not send us to Washington to pollute their air and water, destroy our arts community and abandon our commitments to those who lived here first. I urge a ''no'' vote on this bad bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct something. The gentleman mentioned that the Office of Indian Education had been terminated. That is not accurate because in the House we added back $52.5 million for that office, and we maintained that in the conference committee. So there is now $52.5 million for the Office of Indian Education.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just to reintroduce exactly what the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] said, because one of the most troubling aspects of this conference report is that it devastates programs for the native Americans. I just cannot understand the attitude of this House. How can we overlook the history of our irresponsible crushing of the Indian people over the centuries?

Mr. Speaker, this conference report compounds that irresponsibility. It does so by cutting funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs by $288 million from the budget estimate. This crippling cut is directly targeted at programs that help Indian tribes operate their reservations. If we ratify these cuts by passing this conference report, we will not only be harming one of the most impoverished and vulnerable segments of our society, but we will still be breaking another treaty with the Indian people.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Speaker, on the matter of the native Americans, the conference came up from the Senate $86.5 million. The House had a substantially higher number, the Senate was much lower, and we did restore a good portion of that and we allocated most of the increase to the tribal priority allocations.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

□ 1130

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a case where a very good Member is bringing us a very bad bill, and I am sorry about it. but I just cannot bring myself to support it.

Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at what this bill does to the Tongass; if we take I look at what it does to the Bureau of Indian Affairs; if we take a look at what it does to the California Desert Act; if we take a look at what it does on mining, as has been discussed often this morning, my only question would be where is Bill Proxmire when we really need him? If Bill was here, he would absolutely give this bill the Golden Fleece Award for this Congress, because this bill, which is above all supposed to be a bill that protects the public's interest, instead caves in to the private interests.

Mr. Speaker, the worst of all offenses is what has been done or what has not been done to reform the mining law. As I pointed out on the floor yesterday, under existing law, Interior was forced last year to sign away land under which was located an estimated $10 billion in gold, and they had to sell it for 10,000 bucks. Under the so-called reforms working their way through this place, that price tag would rise to 100,000 bucks. Big deal.

Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me that the only logical thing for this House to do, if we care about defending the public's interest, is to support the recommittal motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], repair this bill, at least in one way. That still does not mean that the bill would be worth passing, in my view, because of all of the other problems. But at least it would fix up a notorious rip-off of the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report as it is written and to oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, there were, some would argue, good and valid reasons to have a moratorium on mining in America. There were three arguments. One was land was being sold at giveaway prices, $2.50 to $5 an acre.

The second was land that was being patented or mining was not being used for mining, it was being used for some other purpose.

The third was the fact that there was no royalty being paid. This process is designed to address problems like that, and this bill has done that.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report, which I urge my colleagues to read and to pay attention to, makes these issues clear. In legislation which we have adopted, in fact, there now is a provision that the full market value of the land has to be paid. There is no

giveaway. So the first argument has been dealt with.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the effort to recommit this bill is an effort to stall the mining reform that we are moving forward on and we must reject this motion to recommit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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