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

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

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

I urge an override.

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Bulgaria, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment, the Dole proposal to open the Government, and that a motion to reconsider be considered as laid on the table.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

it increased considerably over some of the earlier proposals.

Once again, I believe this is the best bill that we can get from this House as it relates to funding for that organization. I read the veto message from the President, and to me it seems like a rather thin veto message. I suspect if this bill had hit his desk by itself and not in the company of the other two bills he vetoed the same day, this bill would have been signed and passed into law because the objections are not that strong.

I believe it is very important that we vote to override the President's veto on this bill. It is important that we open our national parks, our wildlife refuges, our national forests, put 130,000 Federal employees back to work, open our museums and the Smithsonian in particular do a good service to the American public by once again allowing them to use and visit these national treasures which we have.

I urge my colleagues, particularly those on the other side of the aisle, who are concerned about these issues to recognize that this bill in its present form is a good bill, certainly the best we are likely to get through this Congress, and I urge them to override the President's veto and put this into effect.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sustain President Clinton's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. The legislative riders in H.R. 1977 mandate extreme changes in national environmental policy that cannot stand public scrutiny on their own. Otherwise, they would not be hidden in this funding bill.

One of the riders in H.R. 1977 would end a hugely successful energy-efficiency program that was enacted 8 years ago during the Reagan administration. At that time, a broad industry coalition that included all major appliance manufacturers agreed to efficiency standards to make refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners, dishwashers, and gas furnaces more efficient. On average, these Federal efficiency standards have brought savings of $1,300 per U.S. household—a total of $130 billion in economic savings.

Why would Congress terminate a program that has brought such great savings to our constituents and dramatically reduced emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases that contribute to global warming? It is not because global warming is not a problem. Today's New York Times reports that last year was the warmest year since records were first kept in 1856; and that the years 1991 through 1995 were warmer than any similar 5-year period on record. Why would we raise the cost of energy to our constituents to allow for greater pollution of their environment and an increase in global warming?

Innovative companies like Whirlpool, Frigidaire, and Maytag support the Federal efficiency standards and are developing new technologies that lead to more efficient appliances. Unfortunately, other companies have not stepped up to the challenge and now want Congress to reward their poor performance.

This rider brushes aside consumer interests, technological innovation, and environmental protection to please a select group of companies who have lobbied for a special interest gift. The winners are the whiners—the least efficient companies, the ones that pollute the most. The losers, again, are our constituents who are being threatened with policies they do not support that would deplete our natural resources and bring great harm to our environment.

This is awful policy, and it should be deleted from this bill. Support the President's veto.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1996]

'95 THE HOTTEST YEAR ON RECORD AS THE GLOBAL TREND KEEPS UP

(By William K. Stevens)

The earth's average surface temperature climbed to a record high last year, according to preliminary figures, bolstering scientists' sense that the burning of fossil fuels is warming the climate.

Spells of cold, snow and ice like the ones this winter in the northeastern United States come and go in one region or another, as do periods of unusual warmth. But the net result globally made 1995 the warmest year since records first were kept in 1856, says a provisional report issued by the British Meteorological Office and the University of East Anglia.

The average temperature was 58.72 degrees Fahrenheit, according to the British data, seven-hundredths of a degree higher than the previous record, established in 1990.

The British figures, based on land and sea measurements around the world, are one of two sets of long-term data by which surface temperature trends are being tracked.

The other, maintained by the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, shows the average 1995 temperature at 59.7 degrees, slightly ahead of 1990 as the warmest year since record-keeping began in 1866. But the difference is within the margin of sampling error, and the two years essentially finished neck and neck.

The preliminary Goddard figures differ from the British ones because they are based on a somewhat different combination of surface temperature observations around the world.

One year does not a trend make, but the British figures show the years 1991 through 1995 to be warmer than any similar five-year period, including the two half-decades of the 1980's, the warmest decade on record.

This is so even though a sun-reflecting haze cast aloft by the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines cooled the earth substantially for about two years. Despite the post-Pinatubo cooling, the Goddard data show the early 1990's to have been nearly as warm as the late 1980's, which Goddard says was the warmest half-decade on record.

Dr. James E. Hansen, the director of the Goddard center, predicted last year that a new global record would be reached before 2000, and yesterday he said he now expected that ''we will still get at least a couple more'' by then.

Dr. Hansen has been one of only a few scientists to maintain steadfastly that a century-long global warming trend is being caused by mostly by human influence, a belief he reiterated yesterday.

Other experts would go no further than the recent findings of a United Nations panel of scientists in attributing the continuing and accelerating warming trend to human activity—specifically the emission of heat-trapping gases like carbon dioxide, which is released by the burning of coal, petroleum products and wood.

The United Nations panel concluded, for the first time, that the observed warming is ''unlikely to be entirely natural in origin'' and that the evidence ''suggests a discernible human influence on climate.''

Previously, few scientists apart from Dr. Hansen had been willing to go even that far, contending that the relatively small warming so far could easily be a result of natural climate variability. Even now, most experts say it is unclear whether human activity is responsible for a little of the warming or a lot.

''I think we're beginning to see it,'' Dr. Phil Jones of the Climatic Research Unit at East Anglia said of the human influence on climate, adding that he agreed with the United Nations report.

''I don't think you can say much from one year's values,'' he said, ''but this figure from '91 to '95 is quite illuminating.'' He said it was nearly half a degree above the 1961–90 benchmark average of 58 degrees.

Both the 1995 record high temperature and the strikingly warm half-decade of the early 1990's are ''consistent with the sort of expectation we have of the interplay between natural and manmade influences.'' said Dr. Tom M.L. Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo. If things had not turned out that way, he said, ''we would have been pretty surprised and maybe a little concerned'' about the United Nations panel's conclusion. Nevertheless, he said, ''it's not the sort of thing you want to overinterpret or overemphasize.''

Dr. Wigley was a member of a subcommittee of the United Nations panel that dealt specifically with the question of detecting a human role in climate change.

The panel predicted that the heat-trapping gas emissions would cause the average global temperature, now approaching 60 degrees Fahrenheit, to rise by a further 1.8 to 6.3 degrees, with a best estimate of 3.6 degrees, by 2100.

By comparison the world is 5 to 9 degrees warmer now than in the last ice age more than 10,000 years ago. The predicted warming, if it materializes, would likely cause widespread climatic disruption, the United Nations panel said.

The margin of seven-hundredths of a degree by which the 1995 global average exceeds that of 1990, according to the new British data, sounds small. But it represents an increase of nearly half a degree from the post Pinatubo low, in 1992. As scientists had previously predicted, the recovery from the Pinatubo cooling became obvious last year, though no record was set.

The 1995 figure is all the more remarkable, Dr. Hansen said, because it was established at a time when two natural warming influences were neutralized. The solar energy cycle was at a low ebb, and the warming effect of El Niño, the pool of warm Pacific water that appeared in early 1995, was offset by a turn to cooler-than-normal conditions in the tropical Pacific later in the year.

A different picture emerges from an analysis of satellite measurements of global temperature by Dr. John R. Christy of the University of Alabama and Dr. Roy Spencer of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Hunstville, Ala. While their data show temperature fluctuations roughly paralleling

those in the surface measurements, the values are lower: 1995 was only an ordinary year compared with the data set's 1982–91 average.

But that was a warm period to start with, said Dr. Christy. And, Dr. Jones said, the satellite measurements combine temperature readings for the entire lower atmosphere, rather than measuring just at the surface, while the most prominent warming—over the Northern Hemisphere continents—does not extend very far upward. That explanation of the difference in the data sets ''makes sense,'' Dr. Christy said, adding, ''Of course we only live in the bottom'' of the atmosphere.

In the past, skeptics about global warming have cited the satellite data. But Dr. Christy said that even the rate of warming measured from the satellites has begun to move into the range scientists expect to result from human-caused warming.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for this, his observation. There are many things, all these riders do not belong in a spending bill. This is not just about spending. It is about bad policy and it is about bad priorities in this bill.

In fact, the veto of this bill was not even a close call, I would not think, of the President. What has happened here is we have had Republicans in the House and Senate, after 14 months, agreeing with themselves and not making any effort or not a substantial enough of an effort to in fact come to resolution on these issues which have been 30 years of environmental policy by both Democrats and Republicans, Presidents and Congresses.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], an excellent member of our subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier I spoke about the importance of overriding the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about some of the negotiations that went on with this administration, because I think it is an important illustration of the problem we are facing on the entire budget.

Back in September, before these bills had finished their work in the House and the Senate, there was a discussion between staff and between the chairmen with the administration about some of their key funding priorities. Here is what they said about some of them. Here is what the conference did.

On the Bureau of Indian Affairs, something that affects my State tremendously, the administration said they needed a minimum of $110 million more, and we ended up giving $135 million more, $111 to the Senate level for the BIA and we added $25 million to the Indian Health Service. So we added more than the administration said was necessary in order to meet their objections to that.

In the Department of Energy, this is a department where the administration's idea of conservation is chartering jets for Hazel O'Leary to fly to South Africa, in the Department of Energy they said the Energy Information Administration needed to be much closer to the House funding level. We added $7.5 million. We split the difference between the Senate and the House. It is a compromise which all appropriation bills represent, as they have in the past, as they do this year.

In the Forest Service they said they needed to increase the stewardship incentive program to double the Senate level. We did not double the Senate level. But we provided $4.5 million, whereas the House had not originally provided that.

Then some of the key legislative appropriation items, they said they needed to have the House mining patent moratorium. Yes, we went back and forth on that and twice in this House took this issue to the floor here. But it is in there. So it is an item that the President said that he needed to have in there. Tongass, I will not discuss that. It has been discussed enough here on the floor. It is a compromise between the two positions.

The California Desert, the administration said they needed to have the National Park Service in charge, that the House language would not work. We modified the language so that the park service can use planning and use of seasonal employees. The Bureau of Land Management will operate it in its coming fiscal year while they are developing the plan for management of it.

The administration said they needed Senate language on AmeriCorps, and it has the Senate language on AmeriCorps. The administration said it needed to have the grazing reform moratorium for a maximum of 90 days and it retains the moratorium for a maximum of 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one that we can support. It is one that represents a compromise between the interests. It is one that represents an opportunity to fund the vital agencies of this Government, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes, to put Federal employees back to work, to open the national parks.

Let me take my remaining time to say one word about the issue that has been raised about Mount Graham because there too is a good example of the kind of back and forth that this administration has done over the last 6 years. For last 6 years the Justice Department of three administrations has defended the position of this Congress and of the administration to build those telescopes on Mount Graham in a way that protected the red squirrel and allowed science to go forward. To say no now to that after we had passed it and made it very clear that that is what we intended to do is to say no simultaneously to protecting the squirrel, to protecting the environment, to the endangered species and to say no to good science. That is the kind of thing that we have seen here today, the kind of hypocrisy that we have heard about.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans just do not get it. They do not get it. They do not understand. Some of us served in the majority under Republican Presidents and when a bill was vetoed because the President, by the way, has that authority in the Constitution of the United States, they are not the President, the majority is not the President, the majority does not run the whole country, believe it or not, I know that is hard to accept, especially by their freshman Republicans, but I have got to tell them something. When the President vetoes a bill, what we try to do is work out what it is that we need to do in order to see to it that the President can sign the bill. We negotiate.

Instead what they have taken the position of doing is saying, it is our way or no way. So let us not do this hype business about the reason that parks are closed is because the President vetoes a bill. Some of us have served in the majority under Republican Presidents who have had to deal with vetoed legislation. We did not shut the Government down for 3 weeks like Republicans are about to do. Is it not about 21 days? I think so, 19 or 20. So I just say to my colleagues, try to understand the process. It is called the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH]

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican freshman and I am very proud of it. I made a decision recently to not pass continuing resolutions until we got the President to deal realistically about a balanced budget scored in 7 years.

However, upon that decision, that led to the closure of Yosemite National Park in my district. Not only do my Federal employees suffer, but also the communities of Mariposa, Oakhurst, Coarsegold, Three Rivers, and Auberry. Private property owners, private businessmen who are not being, who will not be repaid, one motel owner Jerry Fisher has lost a quarter of a million dollars so far.

I am proud of what I am doing and what I stand for. My community is suffering. I ask my colleagues to override this veto. This is a reasonable bill. It is a fair compromise. It should not be used as a pawn in this game. I want this bill overridden.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are policy reasons why this bill should be rejected, serious and substantial policy reasons. There are three basic broad reasons.

First, this is a bill that is unacceptable because it would unduly restrict our ability to protect our natural resources and our cultural heritage. The second reason this bill does not promote the technology that we need for long-term energy conservation and economic growth.

Third, the one perhaps most important to me and many others that have native American populations in their States, is that this bill seriously undermines our commitment to provide adequate health, educational and other services to native Americans.

Let me also talk about the Tongass. I have been to the Tongass. Just because you may represent that area does not mean that you have all the wisdom of that area. In the Tongass, this bill would allow harmful clear-cutting, require the sale of timber at unsustainable levels. And it would dictate the need for an outdated forest plan for the next fiscal year.

In the Columbia River basin, the bill would impede implementation of a comprehensive plan. The result, gridlock, court challenges on timber harvesting, grazing, mining and other important activities.

In the California Desert, the bill undermines our designation of the Mojave National Preserve by cutting funding for the preserve and shifting responsibility for its management from the Park Service to the BLM. The bill would also put a misguided moratorium on future listings and critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act. The bill slashes funding for DOE's energy conservation program so our commitment to energy conservation and renewable energy once again is suspect.

Native Americans perhaps are hit the worst than anybody. If you look at the effect of the shutdown, it is native Americans that are suffering the most. This bill would make it worse. Funding for Indian Health Service totally inadequate, Indian education programs, cuts at BIA programs that are important for child welfare, adult vocational training, law enforcement, detention services, community fire protection and general assistance to low income Indian individuals and families.

□ 1215

Moreover, the bill would unfairly single out certain self-governance tribes in Washington State for punitive treatment. Specifically, it would penalize these tribes financially for using legal remedies in disputes with non-tribal owners of land within reservations.

Finally, the bill represents a dramatic departure from our commitment to support for the arts and humanities. It cuts funding of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities so deeply as to jeopardize their capacity to keep providing the cultural, educational, and artistic programs that enrich America's communities large and small.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen poll after poll say that the American people care about the environment, and hopefully there are moderate forces on that side, on the majority side, that will see that and are seeing that, and I acknowledge several Members from midwestern, from eastern States that recognize that there is no reason why we should not keep our commitments to the environment.

There is no reason to sign bad bills. The President constitutionally can veto bad policy bills, and the argument just does not wash that, if we just sign this bill, everyone will go back to work at the national parks or the BLM. There are no good reasons to sign this bill.

I come from a Western State, and I realize many of my colleagues on that side will disagree. This is a bad bill for Western States that want quality of life, that want to have balance on timber harvesting and mining and grazing.

I urge rejection of this bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for yielding this time to me.

I would like to respond to the last couple of speakers. One a couple a speakers ago said Republicans do not get it. I would hope that we, and, as my colleagues know, this place is inherently political, so we are going to talk about politics here, and politics enters into the veins of what goes on in this House, but I do not see this Interior bill as a political issue. I see this Interior bill as an issue to get the Nation back to work, to open up the Park Service, to talk about legitimate policy differences, and it is my understanding that basically we worked out the policy differences before the bill left the House floor. There was a great deal of discussion on this for a period of many weeks, so I think we solved those problems, and, as a representative of the State of Maryland, I think the Interior bill is not a perfect bill, it is not an excellent bill. It is a moderate approach to solve the problems of the Federal lands, and I think it should be voted on, and I think we should override the Presidential veto.

On a couple of the policy differences, restricting our natural resources with this bill I do not think is correct. I think this bill goes a long way in enhancing the policies to improve the natural resources of the United States. It is not perfect, but there is no utopia.

Let us move in the right direction. This did not take a huge step in the right direction, but it did take a couple of steps in the right direction. We continue to work on this to promote technology for conservation. I think we have shifted in the right direction.

One of the things this country can do, this Government can do, to enhance conservation is to enhance the environment conducive in the private sector to look for the technology to do that. We cannot do everything here in Government.

Native Americans. We increased the amount of money from what the President wanted. Now, if we look at native Americans and we look at reservations today, I think we are improving the quality of life for native Americans.

I want to say something quick about Tongass. The President did not like the fact that there could not be legal challenges. We changed that. We moderated that.

The President did not like the fact that we were not going to protect goshawks, we did not have conservation areas. We changed that. We now have those changes.

There is a lot of discussion about how is there going to be clear-cutting. There is nothing in the bill that states there is going to be clear-cutting, and the Forest Service manages the way the trees are going to be cut, and I trust this Interior Department so that there will not be clear-cutting.

I think we ought to override the President's veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST]. I know that he is a reasonable person and that he goes into these issues very carefully. I think he has come to the wrong conclusion if he believes that the environmental deficits of this bill have been settled. If it were true, that there were no environmental flaws and big environmental flaws in this bill, why then would the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy, the Wilderness Society, Defenders of Wildlife all be opposed to this bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me, and the reason that I asked for the time was to reply to the rather astounding claim for preferential treatment by the gentleman from California representing the area around Yosemite National Park, Mariposa County, and adjoining counties. I fail to understand how the gentleman can come to the well of the House and say that he is proud to be a Republican freshman who is going to impose or try to impose his ideology over the welfare of the general citizenry and at the same time ask us now to override the President's veto because people in his district are hurting, because business in his district is hurting.

I think I can speak about tourism at least as well as the gentleman from California, having represented the No. 1 tourist destination area in the world for more time in more legislative

venues than anybody in this Congress. When we cannot issue visas, we cannot get people to come to this country, let alone to Hawaii to be able to help with our balance of trade deficit. Tourism is the positive force in that area, and yet someone can come here to the floor and say, ''Your people stay out or work, but put my people back to work,'' and then claim some kind of moral high ground in a political debate about being proud to shut the country down, standing up for the principle of I want mine, but my colleagues do not get theirs?

Some people have come into this Congress happy that they have never had any legislative experience, citing that as some kind of virtue. I think that kind of claim is so blatantly exposed with that kind of rhetoric to come here on the floor and say, ''I want mine. I don't want to take responsibility for what I'm doing to the rest of the people of this country, but help me out because I have got a political problem.''

I say to my colleagues, ''Shame on you, grow up, learn what a legislature is all about.''

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], an excellent member of our subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to strongly support overriding this Presidential veto that the President has signed recently on this particular bill that affects so many people in the Department of Interior.

As my colleagues know, we have heard a lot of talk about putting Federal workers back to work, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Interior and agencies that come under the Department of Interior, and I am all for that. I think it is time that we do that, but I think we have to understand that the President of the United States, in the stroke of his veto pen, sealed the fate of Federal workers, but he also sealed the fate of non-Federal workers who rely on the forests for their livelihood.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and a lot of Democrats and Republicans worked very heard to present a bill to the President that would be acceptable, and I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] say earlier today that the goalpost had moved, and they consistently moved during the negotiation period. That is true. We made a special effort to talk to the President, talk to the Interior Department and get a bill that would be acceptable to everybody, and we sent it down to the White House, and the President, as I say, as my colleagues know, boldly strokes his veto pen and seals the fate of people in the Department of Interior and people out of the Department of Interior, and, so I say, he sealed the fate of non-Federal workers in our Nation's forests who have been devastated by the no-harvest policy of this administration, and that is the crime here, is that the President in vetoing this bill not only hurts people who are Federal workers, but he hurts people who are non-Federal workers who rely on the forest for jobs.

In addition I have to ask the question of my friends on the other side, ''Who is thinking about the jobs of the people who are non-Federal employees?'' Anyone who votes to override this veto will think about and will support jobs in the private sector that would come about by this signing, overriding this bill, and also the people in the public sector, and I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the President was wise in vetoing this bill. This is terrible energy policy, terrible environmental policy. It is an all-out assault upon the environment in our country. We can go down the litany from Tongass to California Desert, through all of the parks decisions which are made under the guise of an appropriations bill, but there is a 50 percent cut in money for low income weatherization, thousands, thousands of poor and elderly across this country dependent upon this money—cut 50 percent for the poor in this appropriations bill. The energy efficiency standards that were put on the books in 1987, 1989, 1991, which have improved the efficiency of stoves, of refrigerators, and people say, ''Who cares?'' I will tell my colleagues who cares. Because of those laws we have saved 4 billion barrels of oil from having to be imported in the United States from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, 4 billion in the last 8 years. We saved the need for us to build 50 500-megawatt nuclear power plants in this country. We saved consumers in this country $132 billion in electricity costs, untold billions of dollars in nuclear power plants that would have had to have been constructed, and they say, well, this is just a small compromise. No new energy standards for any refrigerator, or stove, or light bulb, when we know the gains that are made by working smarter and not harder in environment, in energy efficiency in energy.

This is terrible policy. It is a direct assault upon the environment of this country. This bill must be vetoed, the veto must be sustained, if we are to have an environment in this country that is worth respecting.

Please, instead of having the EPA turn into every polluter's ally, support the President and sustain the veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto. While it is true that the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriation bill does not provide for the same level of funding we have seen in previous years, it does provide funding for such important functions as management of our Nation's parks and refuges which, I think, is very, very important. The American people want a balanced budget, and all areas of the Government must contribute toward this goal, and they want their parks and refuges open. As long as the President's veto is able to stand, our Nation's treasured 369 parks and 504 refuges will remain closed, and the people who we hire to manage them will be out of work.

□ 1230

These parks and refuges are funded by millions of American taxpayers' dollars who paid for them with entrance fees, excise taxes, duck stamps and income tax payments. It is unfair for the American people to continue to be shut out of these lands.

No bill is perfect. Would I write this one differently? Yes, I would. But it does achieve two primary goals: It provides funding to maintain the park and refuge system, and it moves us toward the all-important goal of a balanced budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so Americans can once again have access to the parks and refuges for which they have paid.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override the President's veto. The fact is that this, as I said earlier, is not a close call. I understand, and I think most Members understand, there is a new majority in this House. We understand there is not enough money in the Park Service or the BLM or the Forest Service, and some of that I guess I do not like. They are not my priorities, if that was all that this bill did in terms of changing funding, if it did not target things like the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program for the poor.

I, as a Representative, feel a special obligation to defend and represent the powerless in our society, not the powerful, the special interests. But this bill goes way beyond that.

We have heard a litany of suggestions about the fact that if we do not pass an appropriations bill, the parks cannot open up, the refuges cannot function, the Smithsonian remains closed. That is because, of course, the majority in this body will not take up the Dole resolution which, in fact, would provide a CR, which is the normal course of what has been done year in and year out with few exceptions. This is unprecedented, to be in the 20th day of a shutdown without appropriations.

The fact of the matter is that this is a sham, the suggestion you could pass this and the parks would be open, because we know that at the end of this month, the debt ceiling is going to have to be addressed, that issue is

going to have to be addressed, and then not just the Park Service, but everything, the advocacy here; and make no mistake about it, I understand it and you understand it.

You know what the scheme has been since last year when the Speaker announced that he would bring the Government to a halt to get what he wants in terms of issues.

Now, I do not think that there is anything wrong with a balanced budget. I commend you for the emphasis and effort and impetus that has been brought to that particular issue. I commend Ross Perot for the impetus that has been brought to that. But the fact is that a balanced budget and the good things here with parks and others that you want to hold up as a shield to deflect the bad policy that lies behind it is where the concern comes.

You have to compromise. You have to address those issues. You cannot step back and suggest that we want a balanced budget; everyone wants that. I would just like to mention to my friends, you are not the first that have been here with a plan for a balanced budget in 4 years or 5 years or make it 7 years. Intuition? I think not. I think, more, political motivation to justify getting reelected. But it is a tough goal to accomplish.

You cannot justify a balanced budget with bad policy. Good environmental policy will, in fact, lend itself to achieving that particular balanced budget. But you cannot pour more money into the southeast part of Alaska for building roads and losing money on timber and all of the other natural resources that you have in here; in other words, in the Pacific Northwest, reneging on the Columbia Basin.

Mr. Speaker, science to this group seems to be very selective. Everybody wants to have more science, but science seems to this new majority to be what the Inquisition was to religion. You just cannot selectively use that. If you wore this bill out in public, you would be arrested for indecent exposure.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this vote override. We need to reopen our national parks, wildlife refuges, museums, and monuments.

The fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior was vetoed by the President on December 18. Had it been signed into law—along with the many other appropriations bills that the President has chosen to veto—our precious national parks would be open today. Park guides and wildlife managers would be at work as we speak. Children would be touring our national museums on class trips and history would be relived for the many visitors to our national monuments.

Instead, these national treasures remain closed—not because of our inability to pass an appropriations bill, but because the President has refused to open them.

In my district, this means that the Timucuan National Preserve is closed to the countless visitors it enjoys on a daily basis. The Timucuan Preserve includes wetlands, forests, prehistoric archaeological sites, and historic sites. This veto means that the Fort Caroline National Memorial and Fort Matanzas National Park are unable to accommodate visitors and school children wishing to learn about the area's rich 16th century history. Further, the President's veto means that visitors to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, a historic fort in St. Augustine, are unable to actually enter that historic fort.

I urge my colleagues to support the override to open our national parks and send these Federal workers back to work.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of us can tolerate the misrepresentation of why the parks are closed down. The parks are closed down for one very simple reason. The Republicans have yet to receive their crown jewel in the Contract With America, which is a $245 billion tax break for the rich in America. You guys are holding up the whole Federal government in order to get that. Whether it be the parks or Medicare or student loans, you are going to hold your breath until you get that $245 billion to fulfill your contract with the country club in America.

Do not lay off the closing of the Federal parks on Bill Clinton. All he is saying is, open the parks, but do not expect me to cut Medicare and student loans and give a big tax break to the wealthy as the price for doing it. You can open the parks this afternoon if you want to, but you do not want to because you cannot as a result stop the Federal Government from operating in order to give your huge tax break for the corporate officials and country clubs across this country.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the louder the voice, the weaker the argument, and we have heard a lot of loud voices. But the basic thing that is wrong with this whole exercise is inconsistency. We are lobbing grenades at one another time after time over every minute issue in every bill, and this is another veto override that I think should happen.

There is nothing wrong with this bill, the Interior bill from an environmental standpoint, from a practicality standpoint; and just to illustrate to you that you should not cave in, Carlsbad Caverns was kept open because the local communities dug up the money with the State to keep it open.

If you want these people to go back to work in the Federal sector, override these vetoes and put them back to work.

As an illustration, and as an example, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee bill passed. The Department of Agriculture is operating today. Every bureau, every system that has anything to do with agriculture is working today. If you also want to see an inconsistency, here is the IRS, one of our greatest examples of bureaucracy thievery, extracting from people who are on half-time withholding on income tax during this period of time. Another inconsistency.

Folks, I think it is about time we quit beating ourselves over the head and get down to the business of actually doing something definite about providing these bills and this legislation by overriding the foolish kind of a veto, to stop proposing foolish kinds of rhetoric and keep our voices down a little bit and have respect for one another.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have the utmost respect for my good friend from New Mexico, but I insist that his was not a foolish veto by the President of the United States. There is a difference between a good bill and bad bill, and the President recognized that this was a bad bill. His veto was entirely justified, and in spite of all of the suggestions that the President ought to sign this bill and put people back to work, it still remains a bad bill, and his act in rejecting it was totally justified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The majority leader and the front-running candidate for the Republican nomination for President right: Enough is enough. It is time to put the government back in business again.

This override attempt is just public relations. This debate we have been having over the last month is, what is the Government supposed to do and who is it supposed to help?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], my friend and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, gave away just how the Republicans view this debate and how they view our government. That happened right after the President signed the Defense appropriations bill.

My dear friend, Mr. LIVINGSTON, said that the President has lost his negotiating edge because he and the Democrats were the only ones who had an interest in the constituencies involved in

the remaining appropriations bills. But that is so wrong.

The veterans who need health care are not Democrats; they are Americans who need our Government. The pregnant women and the mothers who need help getting a decent meal for their babies are not Democrats; they are Americans who need our Government. The people who count on the government to keep the environment clean are not Democrats; they are Americans. And the people who yearn to visit our historic sites, our national museums and national parks are not Democrats; they are Americans.

The President was right to veto this bill. It cuts too much and would hurt our environment. Let us bring the bill back and do it right.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity before us today to send 133,000 Federal employees back to work and at the same time reopen all of the national parks and museums of which we have heard so much about in recent weeks. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this override.

A vote ''yes'' on the override will also provide welfare assistance to Indian children, keep Indian schools open and ensure essential services on Indian reservations. A vote ''yes'' will continue the mining patent moratorium and stop the giveaway of Federal lands.

The problem that we have is that this was indeed a carefully crafted piece of legislation that met demands from liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, on both sides of the Capitol; and despite the fact that it was returned to conference on many occasions, when it went to the President, he vetoed it.

Let me underscore that. He vetoed this bill, and the parks, the museums and all of the other good effects of this bill were shut down for the Christmas holidays. He kept 133,000 Federal employees from returning to work before Christmas. He has shut down the parks and the Smithsonian and the National Gallery which now I am glad to see has reopened. He is the one that told the native Americans that they cannot get welfare assistance for Indian children, funding for Indian schools. So what we are trying to do is simply fix the problem.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric on both sides. The time has come to put aside the rhetoric. The time has come to accept a good, a carefully crafted bill.

Understand, this is the best we can do. Override the President's veto. Send it back to him. Let us put these people back to work. Let us open the parks, be done with politics. We have already overridden his veto last week on a bill that was far less significant than this issue. This is a good bill.

I invite my friends on both sides of the aisle to override the President's veto and put these people back to work.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I think the point is that you can blame whomever you want. You can blame the House, you can blame the Senate or the President in terms of this measure. It has been around, and the fact that communication has not gone forward to resolve the differences is clear when we get a veto from the President.

□ 1245

So whatever the good intentions of my colleagues in trying to iron out the differences, they did not achieve it.

Nobody consulted me on this particular bill. I have worked on this. What is wrong with this is, this is a spending bill but nevertheless it has in it many, many policy provisions that should not be in a spending bill.

And some of the priorities of course in terms of spending, I understand my colleagues' difficulty, but there is no reason to suspend the reform efforts in terms of the roaded or unroaded areas in the West which are in this bill, to suspend the grazing reforms which are present in this bill. There is no reason to undo the Columbia Basin study areas and to put that science to use so it can serve us in these needs. There is no reason to address the policy issues.

These are measures that do not belong in a spending bill. These are the riders that are being put in here at the insistence of extreme individuals in the House and the Senate that do not belong in these particular bills and, often supported by various interest groups, they do not belong in here.

So you brought into this the fact that you do not want to bring these issues up on the floor and debate them in the normal process that is afforded the House and the Senate to consider these issues, so they are being jammed into this particular proposal. As I said, even if this bill were to pass and we could open it up, we would be right back to the same problem because of the debt ceiling, and you know that that debt ceiling is going to be used for the same purposes with the same goal.

You can wrap yourself in a balanced budget mantra all you want in terms of no matter how often you repeat it, but it is not going to happen. You cannot do that with bad policy. You cannot have a balanced budget, you cannot deal with the deficit if you are going to create an environmental deficit, and that is what is going on here.

Much of what has passed as legislative process this past year has been a direct assault, a covert assault, I might say, on the environment, but nevertheless having a devastating effect. That is why we need to reject this effort to override.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate with interest, and I have listened as we have been told that the parks are closed because of tax cuts, the parks are closed because of Medicare changes, the parks are closed because of veterans' issues.

Maybe I misunderstood, but I thought this was the Interior appropriations bill that we were talking about. I served on that committee and I worked, as we looked at an account-by-account basis, trying to make the changes, to set the priorities. We did save $1.4 billion in this as we moved toward balancing the budget.

I heard speaker after speaker talk about wanting to balance the budget on the other side. But we do not balance the budget unless we take action, and this budget does take action. It does preserve priorities, and it will get 133,000 people back to work if we will just vote to override.

We have the opportunity today to open the parks, to open the monuments, to open the museums, and stay on track to balancing the budget. It will not happen with talk. It will happen with action. This bill takes the action necessary.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Government for 200 years stayed open when a President vetoed a bill. The Congress could sustain the veto, the Congress could override the veto, but the Government continued to work.

The only reason the Government is shut down is the Republicans have decided, after 200 years, they are going to use as a technique laying off hundreds of thousands of employees and the services that they provide for Americans, including their ability to walk into national parks across this country.

Why are we going to suspend that constitutional, historical, and successful way of governing this country? Because there is an emergency in this country, and the emergency is that the one thing the Republicans cannot do is get this $245 billion tax break for the wealthy in America. That is what the whole debate is over.

The bills which they are insisting upon the President passing include other parts of the Contract With America which include gutting of environmental laws. The historical mechanism by which we change environmental laws was through the appropriations process, by which you brought the EPA, Superfund, and the national parks laws out here separately. They do not want to do it that way. We are in emergency, martial law, to get that tax break for the wealthy. We will hold every ordinary Federal employee hostage. America held hostage to this tax

break for the wealthy. That is what it is all about.

We are going to gut environmental laws, we are going to cut Medicare, but we cannot keep the Government going. For 200 years, and, by the way, there are a lot of things that can be said about the Democratic Party, but for the 60 years we ran this place, the Government did not shut down. Once the Republicans get in charge, the whole thing comes down around their ears.

That is why we should sustain the President's veto and ensure that regular constitutional process is continued.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend from Massachusetts, this Government closed down nine times under the Reagan and Bush administrations when Congress did not come up with the appropriate resolutions and there was a veto and an impasse. The difference was in those days that it never lasted longer than 3 days or a weekend because the President would be up here after a veto trying to work out the differences. We have not seen that in this case.

I think our side is equally responsible. We ought to bring a continuing resolution and move it through, but I do not think you are blameless in this. Frankly, the President can end this right here by signing this bill.

The issues that you claim are policy issues are not enough money for weatherization, not enough money for the National Endowment for the Humanities, not enough for native Americans, but what is in this bill is a lot more than what you have got on the table right now, which is a Government shutdown altogether.

This bill will put 133,000 Federal workers back to work. It will open up our national parks. It will open up the U.S. Geological Survey, which is doing a lot of research on earthquakes, on health and safety, water quality assessment, that is not being done right now. We have to balance the good this bill does against a few of what I think are ideologically driven objections on the other side.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest over the course of the last several months to the passion with which the Republicans have attacked the welfare system of this country, talking time and time again about a system of dependency, a system which instead of breaking a cycle of poverty in fact maintains a cycle of poverty.

But it is interesting to me that when we talk about a different form of welfare, a welfare where taxpayers are robbed of their paychecks in order to pay huge subsidies to our mining companies, in order to pay huge subsidies to our timber companies, all of a sudden there is quiet on the Republican flank for that kind of welfare, that kind of dependency, that kind of denial of free market tactics. Why do we not stand and ask our lumber companies to really determine whether or not on their own, without taxpayer subsidies, they go into the Tongass?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I will yield in one brief moment.

Why do we not ask whether foreign mineral companies would come and mine on our lands if in fact they had to pay the below-surface value of those mines rather than just the surface value of those mines?

What we have here is the denial of a real corporate kind of equity in America. We have a situation where we have welfare for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. That is the kind of system that the Republicans want to put upon the people of this country. It is time that we are consistent with what we expect the poor standards to be as well as what we expect the corporate standards to be in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Is the gentleman aware there is a moratorium on issuing mining patents which is included in this bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am also aware that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] was very much involved in trying to get a better law, which he was not successful in convincing his fellow Republicans to do.

What you have essentially done is given them the keys to Fort Knox, you have given them the rights of Fort Knox, but you have not asked anybody to pay for the gold.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, let us put into perspective what seems to be one of the most contentious parts of the Interior appropriations bill, harvesting part of the Alaska Tongass Forest.

If this table represented Alaska, the Tongass Forest would represent a postage stamp. The area that we are talking about for harvesting would represent the size of a pinhead. Is this what the President and the Democratic Members of this body are willing to close down the Government about?

I lived in the Pacific Northwest for a number of years. There should be balance in weighing the benefits of logging versus the environment. This bill makes reasonable compromises in the use of this forest, and I respect Members such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], who are strong environmentalists and who support this bill. We should vote to override this veto.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the rhetoric that has been on the floor this morning. The President's veto has more to do with politics than with the substance of this bill.

Now in the 20th day of current partial Government shutdown, the reason the national parks are closed is the direct result of bad faith bargaining by President Clinton. This ought to be crystal clear to all of the furloughed Government workers who are affected by this bill. If the President had not vetoed this appropriations bill, they would be back to work and citizens who want to visit their national parks would be having a good time.

The citizens in this country should take notice. Those who vote against this veto override are as responsible for this stalemate as the President.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are being given an extraordinary constitutional argument, namely that when the President of the United States exercises his constitutional right to veto, he is then to be held responsible for a shutdown of the Government. That is of course nonsense but it is confirmation of what we have here: people who want to make very drastic changes in public policy, who lack the two-thirds that the Constitution says you need to override a veto, who in the absence of the two-thirds want to hold the Government hostage.

But even on its own terms the arguments fail, because the problem is that the appropriations bills, this one included, were not passed by this congressional majority until months after they were supposed to. We are in a crisis in part because of the absolute incompetence of the majority, which kept them from passing the great majority of appropriations bills for months, did not get any passed on time, or maybe one. That is why we are in this crisis.

The Constitution allows the President to veto a bill, and then we have time for him to have the veto override considered, and then negotiations. When you wait 2½ months after the deadline and pass the bill, you have lost your right to complain about a veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, we are in this crisis on this bill I think for one reason. It probably was summarized in a letter the President sent to the Senate committee considering the bill on property rights.

His letter said, ''I don't care how you modify the bill, I don't care how you modify the environmental reform that the House passed, I will veto that bill. I will stand in the schoolhouse door and veto any environmental reform because I don't want to see any changes in the status quo.'' We see it reflected here. The President of the United States has said, ''I don't like the environmental reforms, I don't want any more trees cut in the Tongass Forest, so I will put 133,000 workers at risk of

not going to work because I am going to veto this bill.''

This President is not about to negotiate these changes. He is simply against them. He has promised his environmental friends he will stand in the schoolhouse door and veto bill after bill after bill that makes any attempt to modestly restrain the environmental extremists who have written some of these laws and regulations into existence. He will veto risk assessment/cost-benefit analysis, he will veto property rights, he will veto reforms in environmental legislation. He will veto them even if it means putting 133,000 workers out of business and the parks closed.

That is what this is all about. We ought to override that veto. We ought to put those workers back to work. We ought to make these modest reforms. It is a bill that has been approved by this House and by the Senate, by numbers sufficient to represent the majority will of the people of the United States. This President will not negotiate with us. We ought to override the veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman takes some poetic license here. I would like to see a copy of that letter where the President says, I will put 133,000 workers out and I will veto this bill because I do not want any reforms. The gentleman is taking some poetic license with this in quoting the President of the United States. I would like to see a copy of the letter.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to is a letter he sent to the Senate committee on property rights.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the quote in the letter that says, I will put 133,000 people out of work. The gentleman may produce that.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to, I will tell my friend, is a letter the President sent to the committee considering property rights legislation, one of the environmental reforms we have been fighting for on this House floor.

The letter I referred to is a letter from the President telling the chairman of that committee: I do not care how you change this bill, I will veto any bill on this subject matter that hits my desk regardless of how you change it. That is the upshot of his letter.

I will send the gentleman a copy of it. What I said is that that letter reflects the attitude of the White House. They will not negotiate with us on the environmental reforms. They will simply veto legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, but the point I am making, the gentleman stood in the well and he said the President said, I will put 133,000 people out of work. I do not believe he has that in print from the President of the United States. I do not care what rhetoric he uses about a letter that he sent to the other body. Show me in print where the President of the United States said, I will put 133,000 people out of work.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the President said that when he vetoed this bill. When he vetoed this bill, he said I would rather have 133,000 out of work than sign legislation that has modest environmental reforms.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, that is a conclusion; that is not a fact. And the gentleman knows it.

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite clear what is happening here. The Government is shut down for one reason. That is because we have not passed a bill which passed the Senate. All we have to do is get that bill out on the floor here. With regard to the provisions of this bill before us now, what is happening simply is this: The Republicans want to override a veto.

The President vetoed that bill for a host of very good reasons. Among them is the fact that this bill would provide for the expedited application of mining patents, mining patents that are worth literally billions of dollars. Under the provisions of this bill, which the President vetoed, those applications would have to be processed in an unprecedented short period of time, in effect giving away to mining companies, many of whom are foreign mining companies, billions of dollars of American resources at bargain basement prices. That is what is at stake here.

These people tell us that they want to balance the budget. If they really wanted to balance the budget in a responsible and appropriate way, they would allow us to treat the resources of this country in accordance with their true value. If we believe in the free market, let that free market principle apply to public resources as well as private resources. Stop giving away the treasury of the country. Stop giving away the resources which will be passed on to future generations. You are allowing those resources to be exploited at bargain basement prices. Stop it. That is what this veto is all about.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. No amount of rhetoric about men out of work or Federal workers out of employment can change that fact. That it is a bad bill was recognized on two occasions by the House in voting to recommit the bill. The President was right in vetoing this bill. It is a bad bill, and his veto should not be overridden.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves to be supported, and we should override the President's veto.

I wanted to just get some facts out here in the little time I have left. Indian education is above 1995. Indian health is above 1995. The native Americans get one-fourth, 25 percent of this bill, about $3 billion goes to native American programs.

I want to point out that we negotiated with the White House people, but they kept moving the goal posts. To show you how reluctant they were, they vetoed the bill, and then it took them 6 hours to decide what should be in a veto message. Normally you decide why to veto a bill and then veto it, but they were uncertain about what was wrong because they recognized that it basically was a good bill.

This is not about the EPA, that is not in this bill. It is not about welfare, that is not in this bill. It is not about Medicare. I have heard all these things from my colleagues on the minority side. It is about a mining moratorium. We just heard a speaker say we are going to give away our mineral resources. The moratorium in this bill stops that, but the President vetoed it. He wants to go ahead and give out all these patents and give away our mining lands because without this bill there is no moratorium.

My colleagues, we have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open the parks. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to put 133,000 people back to work. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open up 500 national wildlife refuges. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open up 155 national forests. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to support the Indian schools, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to welfare assistance to Indian children, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to the opening of the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, the Holocaust Museum, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to retain the patent moratorium, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to collect $8 billion in revenues that are generated by the Federal lands.

I would say to the 89 Members that voted ''yes'' to override the President to help securities litigation lawyers, I would think that, at a minimum, you would vote ''yes'' to open up all of the resources to the 260 million Americans that this bill represents. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to override the President's veto and open up

these facilities that belong to all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays, 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—239

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—177

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stokes
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
DeFazio
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Hoke
Lightfoot
Mfume
Norwood
Quillen
Stark
Stockman
Studds
Visclosky
Wilson
Wyden

□ 1328

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen and Mr. Lightfoot for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

So, two thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

□ 1330

EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643), with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment, the Dole proposal, to open the Government, and that a motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 532 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the leadership on this side of the aisle has authorized me to make the motion I just did. Can we have any indication at all from the majority side as to whether or not there is any plan at all for them to allow the Dole proposal to be brought before us?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we will now be turning our attention to special orders for a period of time. During this period of time, the majority leadership will be working with and consulting with the majority Members on a broad range of questions and issues related to the temporary Government shutdown that has resulted from the President's veto of recent appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, we intend also during this period of time, while the House is entertaining special orders, to do some consulting with the minority leadership as well, and in anticipation of what might come of these sessions, I must advise the Members that until notified otherwise, we should expect that we would be coming back to the floor for business requiring votes at some time later in the day.

We will proceed with special orders; it would be my expectation that we would be able to come back, if things go well, and interrupt those. If not, and the special orders scheduled for the day were to be completed, we would even expect possibly to go into a period of recess while these discussions go forward.

The short point, of course, to the Members at large is, until notified otherwise, the Members ought to anticipate that there will be additional business which would include votes later in