Fattah	Maloney	Roemer
Fazio	Manton	Rose
Fields (LA)	Markey	Roukema
Filner	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Flake	Mascara	Royce
Foglietta	Matsui	Rush
Ford	McCarthy	Sabo
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sanders
Frost	McHale	Sawyer
Gejdenson	McInnis	Schroeder
Gephardt	McKinney	Schumer
Geren	McNulty	Scott
Gibbons	Meehan	Serrano
Gonzalez	Meek	Sisisky
Gordon	Menendez	Skaggs
Green	Mfume	Skelton
Gutierrez	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Hall (OH)	Mineta	Spratt
Hamilton	Minge	Stark
Harman	Mink	Stenholm
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Stokes
Hayes	Montgomery	Studds
Hilliard	Moran	Stupak
Hinchey	Murtha	Tanner
Holden	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Neal	Tejeda
Jackson-Lee	Neumann	Thompson
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thornton
Johnson (SD)	Obey	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Torres
Johnston	Ortiz	Torricelli
Kanjorski	Orton	Towns
Kaptur	Owens	Tucker
Kennedy (MA)	Pallone	Velazquez
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Vento
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Visclosky
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Volkmer
Kleczka	Pelosi	Ward
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Waters
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Watt (NC)
Lantos	Pickett	Waxman
Levin	Pomeroy	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Poshard	Wilson
Lincoln	Rahall	Wise
Lipinski	Rangel	Woolsey
Lofgren	Reed	Wyden
Lowey	Richardson	Wynn
Luther	Rivers	Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Furse	Tauzin
Bono	Hefner	Young (FL)
Collins (MI)	Moakley	
Fields (TX)	Reynolds	

□ 1202

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1977, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 187 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1977.

□ 1203

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, first of all I want to thank those of my colleagues that supported the rule because I think we have a good bill here given the fact that we are under the constraints of the Budget Act which reduces our amount of money over 10 percent, and also I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle that we had a very bipartisan subcommittee. We worked well together. We tried to be as totally nonpartisan as we had to make these difficult choices, and we did as much as possible to address the challenges of the Interior and related agencies' responsibility with the funds that were available, and I think on balance we did a good job of achieving that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the whole team worked well; the staff and the associate staff worked as a team. We worked very closely with the authorizers. I say to my colleagues, ''There isn't anything in this bill that's not approved by at least the chairman and the members of the authorizing committee so that what we have here is a team effort.''

Mr. Chairman, obviously we are going to have differences, and that will be reflected in the amendments, some substantial policy issue differences. I will say at the outset, ''We'll do everything we can to expedite this so Members can get home but not in any way stifle debate in the process.''

I am going to be very brief in my opening comments here. I think it boiled down to three areas, as I would see it, given the constraints of the budget reductions.

First of all, we had the must-dos. The must-dos were keeping the parks open, keeping the Smithsonian open, keeping the visitor facilities at Fish and Wildlife and Bureau of Land Management open to the American people. Two hundred sixty million Americans enjoy the public lands, and they enjoy them in many ways. They enjoy them in terms of looking into the Grand Canyon and seeing a magnificent thing created by our Creator. They likewise enjoy going out and fishing in a stream or hunting in a national forest. They enjoy going to a Fish and Wildlife facility to see how we propagate the species of fish and how we nurture the fishing industry. They enjoy going to the Bureau of Land Management facilities, the millions of acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, we made every effort to do those things that the public enjoys, and we held the operating funds at roughly a flat level given our constraints, meaning that we would in no way restrict public access to these great facilities that people care a lot about, and about a third of the United States is public land owned by all of the people of this Nation, and we make every effort to insure that their experience with that will be very enjoyable, and that led to the second category of things, and that is the need-to-dos.

As I see it, the need-to-dos were to insure that sanitary facilities at our national parks, and forests and other facilities were good. The need-to-dos included fixing a road if it is in bad shape. It included finishing buildings that were under way. I say to my colleagues, ''You can't stop a construction job in midstream, and those things had to be taken care of, and we have done so.''

The third group was the nice-to-dos, things that are nice if we had the money. There are a lot of activities that we could no longer afford to do. Many of the grant programs had to be terminated, some of the research programs in energy. We had to downscale land acquisition 78 percent. We put in, of course, some money for emergencies, but essentially we will not be doing additional land acquisition because I tell my colleagues, ''When you buy lands, you have to take care of it, and that gives you enormous downstream costs.'' We did some construction where it was necessary to finish buildings, but we do limit new construction. We limit new programs so that we had some tough cuts that we had to make in the things that are nice to do.

Mr. Chairman, we just had a lot of discussion on the NEA, and of course the NEH is similar to that. We have had change. We eliminated the National Biological Survey, and rather than that we have a natural resource science arm in the U.S. Geological Survey. But we are not getting into that now because that will come up to the debate.

I think we have addressed energy security. We want to be sure that the United States will be secure in the future, that we will have energy independence, that we will not have to depend totally on foreign sources, and so we have addressed that in our bill to the best of our ability.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is our responsibility, and in the bill we said at the outset we are going to take care of education, the basic education, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the basic health. That is the responsibility