HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 10, 1994*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 1994.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, for all those who devote themselves to their responsibilities that assure that the concerns of this place will go forward, and we recognize that many people use their talents and abilities in devoted service with this institution. On this last day of service by our pages, we remember them for their dedication and commitment, for their long hours of labor and for their lively spirit and attitude. May Your blessing go with them in the days ahead as they return to their homes and may Your benediction be with them and each of us, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. OLVER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

A MOMENTOUS 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION OF THE NORMANDY LANDING

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Normandy landing, in my wildest dreams, I did not expect the occasion to be as historic, as moving, as momentous as it turned out to be.

I want to pay tribute to you, Mr. Speaker, for leading with great distinction and effectiveness the bipartisan congressional delegation, and I want to recognize the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], a hero of the landing, for his contributions to the festivities. I want to say a word about SAM GIBBONS, our colleague who landed in Normandy before the D-day invasion with the first wave of paratroopers, who represented the President as a personal representative at many of the ceremonies.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute again to those heroes 50 years ago who saved civilization and free and open and democratic societies.

I must add that the President and Mrs. Clinton represented our Nation with enormous dignity, effectiveness, and brilliance. I had the privilege of attending many of the memorial functions with them, but the most moving perhaps was the one at Colleville-sur-Mer the last day at the American national cemetery. As the International Herald Tribune reported, the President expressed his deep feelings for our Nation's veterans, as follows:

Looking out across the cemetery where 9,386 Americans lie under trim rows of white crosses and Stars of David, the President spoke movingly of the fathers we never knew, the uncles we never met, the friends who never returned, the heroes we can never repay.

We will remain in permanent debt to the heroes of Normandy and all the heroes of the Second World War who stood up against tyranny and made democracy triumph.

ARE THE TAXPAYERS REALLY GETTING THEIR MONEY'S WORTH?

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are some pretty good reasons why the polls continue to show a growing shift away from the Democratic Party among those Americans who have families.

It is because they see more and more of their hard-earned income going to fund more and more inefficient Government programs.

And they realize that because of the tax, spend, regulate, and mandate mentality espoused by their leaders in Washington, their children are going to have a much tougher time of it when it comes time to go to college or go to work.

And they see little evidence that they are getting their money's worth out of Washington.

And they are beginning to realize that it is the Democratic Party that has controlled this House for the last 40, long years.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats have had a long run. But time is running out. The working families out there have had it. And they are not going to take it much longer.

OUR ECONOMY IS COMING BACK TO LIFE

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, across the country the economy is coming back to life, good news after that long, hard, Bush recession.

More jobs have been created in the last 16 months than in the previous 4 years combined, inflation is low, the deficit has been cut in half, the unemployment rate has dropped steadily.

Even in my district of western and central Massachusetts, that traditionally lags in recovering from recession, the economy is picking up steam.

And this House should take pride in contributing to these improved conditions.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough.

We must now work for a health care system that is always there for every citizen, not just a privileged few, and for job training that works by getting people back to work.

Let us capitalize on the growth of our economy and help Americans become more secure in their jobs, their health, their futures.

WELFARE REFORM: QUINCY'S WAITING

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, next week the President will introduce his long-awaited, much-anticipated, but so far undebated, welfare reform bill.

Supposedly, recipients will only be able to get welfare for 2 years if they haven't made a good-faith effort to find work.

America is eager to see it and one American in particular. His name is Quincy; he is an auto mechanic in McLean, VA.

Last week he told me he was a Republican and that he could never vote for a Democrat. I asked him why. Quincy told me that he doesn't have any money. But Quincy knows he will someday because he works hard every day. And he believes when he makes his money, the Democrats will just take it and give it away.

Bill Clinton has talked about welfare reform to Americans like Quincy for 2 years. Now America and Quincy are waiting to see what it looks like.

NAFTA IS WORKING FOR MEXICO

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, first the good news: Customs officials on the United States-Mexican border say trade is booming. After only 6 months of NAFTA, ladies and gentlemen, trade is literally jumping across the border. That is the good news.

Now, the bad news: Mexican trade is booming. Mexican imports have increased 10 percent.

Now, check this out: Sara Lee; we all know about Sara Lee, all the good food items, they are going to cut 8,000 jobs. They have a plant in Martinsville, VA, and a plant in Mexico. Martinsville versus Mexico.

None of the jobs will be cut in Mexico, but people in Martinsville, VA, will be in unemployment lines.

Ladies and gentlemen, NAFTA is working all right. It is working for Mexico. I think Jesse Jackson was right on target. This is not NAFTA, this is SHAFTA.

Think about it.

THE KOREAN PENINSULA SITUATION

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post has a front-page story stating that Japan and China are resisting United States efforts to impose sanctions against North Korea.

Yesterday the Scripps-Howard News Service published a column by B.J. Cutler, its chief foreign affairs columnist, which accurately states what our position should be. He wrote this:

Before we take a collision course to armed conflict, a number of issues should be clarified for Americans. How many lives are we prepared to sacrifice given recent trends in South Korea? Seoul is not spending enough on its own defense. Its youth is increasingly anti-American, and its bureaucrats discriminate against the United States in trade.

Korea is often described as a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan. Please note, "at Japan's heart." Not America's heart. What is Japan going to do militarily if the peninsula erupts? In Korea and in World War I, the answer is: Nothing, except to profit by selling supplies to the American people.

Can the American people trust President Clinton and his team, who have shown modest diplomatic and military skills, to effectively wage a land, naval and air war in Asia? The United States should stop boasting that it is "the only superpower" and "the leader of the free world"; it should convene a conference of the foreign and defense ministers of Russia, China, Japan and South Korea to gain their advice. We should say, "It's your neighborhood, you know North Korea better than we do. What should be done? What will you do?" And, for once, we should listen.

□ 1010

WALK THE WALK WITH OUR PERSIAN GULF VETERANS

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, for too long this country has talked the talk about how important our veterans are to us, but not walked the walk with followup support. A good example is the struggle that the Vietnam war veterans have had with Agent Orange syndrome.

Well, I am proud to report my President and his Veterans Affairs Secretary Jesse Brown are going to walk the walk with the Persian Gulf veterans. They support a piece of legislation offered by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], of which I am a cosponsor. This important legislation will compensate victims of the mysterious Persian Gulf syndrome ailments. My New Hampshire office is collecting data from veteran surveys to assist in getting treatment to these brave men and women. This first step toward treatment of these serious ailments is unprecedented.

Secretary Jesse Brown, the Veterans' Administration, and the President deserve praise for the action they are taking.

Mr. Speaker, all Persian Gulf veterans who are suffering these symptoms should come forward so that more can be learned and so that they can receive treatment or compensation which is available to them.

PUT OUR VETERANS FIRST

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

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, the repeated flip-flops in the Clinton administration's policy toward Haiti are no longer only an issue for front-page debate.

The failure of this policy has now become a matter of critical personal concern for many veterans in Florida.

You see, Mr. Speaker, many of the medical professionals employed at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa have been moved to Guantanamo Bay to assist with the processing of Haitian refugees.

In its haste to devise a plan to implement its most recent Haitian refugee policy, the Clinton administration decided to raid hospital staff from a facility used by many veterans.

Veterans in my district report that their regular checkups have either been rebuffed at the door or canceled by phone.

This is an outrage.

Charles Gurey, a veteran from Brandon, FL, said it all:

What irks me is, I'm having something taken away from me that I earned and it's being given to someone overseas. We need to be taken care of first and then the rest of the world.

Mr. Gurey is right. He and all of west-central Florida's veterans deserve better.

Put MacDill's medical professionals back where they belong: serving American veterans and active-duty personnel.

ASSISTING OUR VETERANS EVERYWHERE

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this has kind of become a veterans issue morning with respect to the previous 1-minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] that we will be glad to work with him in my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I had not heard of that problem, and we certainly will be glad to work with him.

Also, to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT], who mentioned the Persian Gulf veterans bill compensation which I have introduced, it is good legislation, and I would hope that more Members would sign onto it. It is needed.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

My final subject, Mr. Speaker, is to follow up on the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], about our trip to Normandy. I certainly hope there would not be too

much criticism. That was one of the most important events in the 20th century of our Nation and of the world, the Normandy invasion. We honored the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who represented the President of the United States, who is a Member of this House, and was a representative of the President.

Mr. Speaker, we had 27 Members from Congress, the House of Representatives, and we honored the minority leader, BOB MICHEL.

Certainly, President Clinton, in my opinion, was well prepared. He made the proper remarks at the different sad ceremonies at Normandy. It was a great event, and we should all be proud of it.

WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL AND COINS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the intention of the entire world this past weekend was focused on the northern coast of Normandy as we witnessed historic ceremonies and eloquent speeches, all in commemoration of the day 50 years ago which is still imprinted firmly on the collective mind of the world and of America. The depths of feeling that these ceremonies tapped in the hearts of the citizens of our Nation is a priceless tribute to the heroism and magnitude of the events of that day which the world remembers as D-Day, the turning point of the most important battle that turned the world toward freedom and toward ultimate allied victory.

Mr. Speaker, one way to remember and to honor our World War II veterans and the freedom which they preserved is to support the construction of the World War II memorial now planned here in our Nation's capital. This memorial will be built with funds that are being collected from the sale of these three commemorative 50th anniversary World War II coins being sold through June 30 of this month through our U.S. Mint here in Washington. The $5 gold coin is emblematic of the allied victory, the silver coin commemorates the Battle of Normandy, and the clad half-dollar coin honors members of the five branches of the U.S. armed services who fought in that war.

Mr. Speaker, I purchased this set in memory of my own uncles, who fought both in the Atlantic and Pacific campaigns, and I would urge all citizens who are watching—and Members of Congress who may not be aware—that these coins are only being sold through June 30 of this month, to contact your Member of Congress or the U.S. Mint in order to purchase your coins and help contribute toward the construction of the memorial here in our Nation's capital.

INSTABILITY ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman in the chair for his remarks about Normandy.

My colleagues, we live in a dangerous world. It is a world in which there is continuous instability in the Middle East; the former Soviet Union has broken down into at least four former Soviet states which still have nuclear weapons, many of which are still directed at us.

China has taken an increasingly aggressive attitude in the South China Sea and, probably most alarming, North Korea is developing and building nuclear weapons.

We could be at war in North Korea on the Korean Peninsula in a fairly short period of time.

Against this backdrop of a dangerous world, the Clinton administration has continued to cut the national defense budget to a dangerously low level.

□ 1020

We now have about 50 percent of the fighter force that we had a few years ago. We are slashing people out of the military. Young people are being terminated at the rate of 1,700 per week, 6,000 a month, 72,000 a year, and yet we have these dangerous situations like Korea, where the President is going to need options, and one of those options requires a strong American military. Unfortunately the House joined the President in slashing the defense budget to a dangerously low level yesterday by passing a drastically reduced defense budget.

We need to reverse that course, my colleagues. The President of the United States needs to remember we achieved peace in the last 10 years by being strong, not by being weak.

NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL ACCOMPANYING H.R. 4299, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to notify all Members of the House that the classified schedule of authorizations and the classified annex to the report accompanying H.R. 4299, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 1995, are now available for review in the offices of the Intelligence Committee, room H-405 in the Capitol. Access to these documents, which is restricted to Members, will be provided from Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:30 and 5 p.m.

The schedule and annex contain the committee's recommendations on the fiscal year 1995 budget for intelligence and intelligence-related activities. These budgetary matters, and the issues associated with them, cannot be discussed publicly. The intelligence authorization will be on the floor within the next few weeks. In order to increase understanding about the actions the committee is recommending for the programs and activities covered by the bill, I urge Members to take time to thoroughly review these classified documents. The committee staff will be available to provide any assistance necessary to facilitate the review of these materials.

THE WELFARE PLAN

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Clinton administration is getting ready to unveil its welfare reform plan in the next 2 weeks. It is about time. When President Clinton was still candidate Clinton, he promised to end welfare as we know it. Let us hope the administration's plans is as good as its rhetoric.

How can we tell if the Clinton welfare reform plan is any good? Here are some guides:

Will it get people off the Government dole and on to real jobs? Will it shrink the size of government? Will it encourage people to take responsibility for their own lives? Will it save the American taxpayers money?

Unfortunately, it appears that this plan, like all of the President's proposals, will be looking for new taxes, for $9 billion in increased spending.

THIRD CIRCUIT RULING ON CHILD PORNOGRAPHY IS WELCOME

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Thursday, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals sitting in Philadelphia reinstated an earlier decision it had reached concerning a child pornography case, the now famous Knox child pornography case. In a 40-page opinion, which I have not yet had time to fully read, I am well advised that the court told the Justice Department of the United States that it was off-base in the decisions it reached and in the position that it took concerning this child pornography case.

Basically the Justice Department's position, which I objected to in a letter to Janet Reno, the Attorney General of the United States, was basically that the children depicted in these films had to be provocatively posed or lasciviously acting, and had to be unclothed

or scantily and revealingly clad or the case of pornography had to be dropped. The court has set that aside, and I think now we are on a better track because if there is any activity which is absolutely heinous and grievous and cries to the Lord for retribution, it is that of people who engage in child pornography and the damage that they cause psychologically and physically to their models and to the people depicted in their degraded materials.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the court reached its position. I hope that becomes the position taken from now on by the U.S. Justice Department.

REPRESENTATIVES OF DESERT COMMUNITIES TREATED UNFAIRLY BY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Members, I believe that the House knows me to be largely a person who does not involve himself in an overt way in pure partisan politics. I must say that I share with the public their concern about ofttimes the debate around here being dominated by the extreme voices, the shrill voices, of partisanship. But today we have on the House floor, one more time, the natural resources product dealing with my desert communities.

Mr. Speaker, if indeed there is a reflection of partisan rhetoric in extreme, it is the way the four Members of the House who represent the desert communities, who have been elected to represent it, have been treated by this committee. In my years of public service I have never seen such arbitrary action. It brings forth this reminder, Lord Acton's quote; that is, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." In this case, this committee reflects the problem of one party dominating the House for over 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the public will look with interest as we go forward with this debate today.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS AND MINORITY PROCUREMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1994

(Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to applaud the other body for passing the procurement goals for small business concerns owned by women amendment to the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. I applaud Senators KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN for working for the concerns of women-owned small business.

I have introduced a similar amendment to H.R. 4263, the Small Business and Minority Procurement Opportunities Act of 1994, in the Committee on Small Business. I applaud the leading organizations across the country representing women's business interest, lead by the National Women's Business Council, in joining together to make sure that procurement reform contains provisions to assist women-owned business to gain access to Federal Government procurement.

Currently, there are more than 6.5 million women-owned small businesses. These businesses employ more workers than the Fortune 500 and are found in all industry sectors. This number has grown by more than 60 percent in the past 5 years. In the same period, total receipts for women-owned small businesses have nearly tripled—raising to $278.1 billion in 1987 and projected to reach $1 trillion in 1995.

However, one of the major obstacles faced by women business owners is the lack of access to Federal procurement contracts. The U.S. Government is the world's largest buyer of goods and services. Each year, the Federal Government contracts billions of dollars out to businesses, but women rarely are the recipients of these luractive agreements. In fiscal year 1992, women received only 1.5 percent of the $190 billion in Federal contracts awarded that year. Women-owned businesses must be granted the opportunity to compete fairly in the Federal marketplace.

I hope that here in the House we will all work in a spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship in order to achieve "measurable goals" for women-owned business. The time is now.

CONSERVATIVE STYLE UNIVERSAL COVERAGE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a conservative health care plan in November 1993. This was a plan that was developed by the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank here in Washington. They developed this plan over a 7-year period. What it does is to offer taxpayers and all Americans universal coverage. It is the only Republican plan here Congress on the House side that offers universal coverage. Senator NICKLES has offered this plan on the Senate side.

But what I have done, Mr. Speaker, is to improve this bill, and I dropped this bill 2 days ago. It is now H.R. 4550, and what is important about my bill now is that it is completely voluntary.

Make no mistake about it. This is something that every Republican and every Democrat could support. Also still provides universal coverage.

Another feature is that it makes a broader range of insurance plans eligible for tax credits, and that is how we do it, all through the tax credit system. In order to provide the most affordable insurance options, the deductible limits of $1,000 for any individual and $2,000 for a family has been deleted. The bill would limit out-of-pocket expenses for both insurance premiums and medical expenses to $5,000 or 10 percent of the adjusted gross income. In order to preserve the bill's budget neutrality I have decided to push back the effective date to January 1, 1998.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have added a provision to ensure that the tax credits do not grow faster than private health expenditures.

With these changes I ask my colleagues to look at this bill, H.R. 4550. It is an alternative that provides universal coverage. It is the conservative approach, and I firmly believe it delivers on the idea of increasing access and affordability for all Americans without new taxes and without any mandates.

□ 1030

THE CLINTON REEMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1994

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, since President Clinton took office, his economic policies have produced 6,000 new jobs a day. That is 6,000 new jobs a day, every day, including Saturdays and Sundays.

Imagine the sigh of relief in the homes of America where people know they are going to be able to pay the rent, make the house payments, buy food, and meet the needs of their families. More, of course, needs to be done, and that is why I am proud to work under the leadership of Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO in promoting President Clinton's Reemployment Act of 1994, which will help even more workers make job connections.

The Reemployment Act presents a comprehensive reemployment proposal that includes early intervention to prevent long-term unemployment through rapid response to mass layoffs, one-stop shopping that consolidates and streamlines access to career counseling information on jobs, training, unemployment insurance claims processing and other services, universal access to reemployment services for all workers seeking new or better jobs, individual reemployment plans worked out with career counselors to help workers find new jobs, and a national labor market information system.

Mr. Speaker, the President's election gave us hope, his economic policies gave people confidence, and now his policies will give people jobs. We need again to pass the President's reemployment proposal in order to spread those jobs around.

THE D-DAY CELEBRATION—NO PLACE FOR PARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as someone born after World War II, it is hard for me to put into words my feeling about the 50th anniversary of D-day. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was proud to have been part of the congressional delegation representing the United States there.

To meet the veterans of D-day, to hear their firsthand stories, to see the beaches where so much American blood was spilled in the name of freedom—all of this gave me a deepened lifelong sense of gratitude and respect for the courage and sacrifices of American veterans.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time to put patriotism above partisanship, it should have been in the commemoration of our World War II veterans. I am saddened and sickened that some Members of this House have chosen to criticize President Clinton for his efforts to ensure that the world would never forget D-day. For the world not to have sent its leaders there to that historic event would have been unconscionable.

To those Members who would politicize D-day's anniversary for cheap partisan political publicity, I say to you that you do a disservice to yourself, to this House, and, most importantly, to the men who died on the beaches of Normandy 50 years ago.

THE REAL MEANING OF THE D-DAY COMMEMORATION—NO TIME FOR PARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those American veterans and Members of this body who joined hundreds of thousands of others, Americans, Britons, French, Belgians, Poles, Czechs, and others in assembling on the beaches of Normandy to celebrate an event of great courage and of great moment in the history of this world.

I am proud that our President led that delegation.

I am proud that he remembered D-day. I am proud that he joined us in honoring those great Americans and soldiers and veterans of other nations in the great crusade led by General Eisenhower. A bipartisan group of Members of this body joined the President at the site of this great invasion. It was one of the greatest and most moving celebrations of courage, of human dedication to freedom and liberty, that I have ever had the privilege of seeing. And it was an event in which there was no whit of partisanship.

It was an event which commemorated an event 50 years ago in which thousands of Americans, British, French, and others died for liberty and freedom. It was an event which was celebrated every place in this country, and it was an event in which the leaders of every Nation involved in the Allied effort was present.

Our President went, and he led the commemoration on behalf of the people of this country. In his addresses, he restored in good part the memories of that great even which are now growing dim with the passage of time. He helped Americans and others understand why we were there. He helped Americans to understand what it is that we must do in the future so that we do not have to have more D-days, so that we can have a national and international dedication of freedom and liberty, and so we can prevent the kind of events that led to that unfortunate day.

It is a proud event, and it was an event that was worthy of this country, the leadership of this country and the leadership of others in the free world. It was an event which set in place 50 years of freedom.

I understand there are some who are now carping in a partisan fashion about the fact that the President and others, veterans, Members of this body, Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, in a bipartisan fashion, went to celebrate this event. To those who are saying this, I say, Shame. It is clear you do not understand what took place on D-day. It is equally clear you do not understand why D-day took place. It is perhaps even clearer that you have no great desire to forge the national consensus and the international consensus that this Nation and this world needs to avoid that kind of unfortunate event.

Mr. Speaker, to those who would make a political event of criticizing this kind of occurrence, I say, "Shame."

THE D-DAY CELEBRATION—A REMINDER THAT PEACE IS PRESERVED THROUGH STRENGTH

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond to the distinguished gentleman who just talked about the visit to the D-day celebration by Democrats and Republicans, and let me just say as one Republican that I concur in his statement that it is important to those who celebrate D-day to remember that this country needs to be strong, to remember that we preserve peace through strength, and from my perspective, I would like to see every single American go to Normandy and understand that the few dollars we save by cutting the defense budget may be paid for ultimately in American blood when we are found to be weak by an adversary or a potential adversary and that weakness is exploited.

I think D-day is a reminder to all of us that America needs to stay strong, and I am reminded that after World War II, after D-day, after we had the mightiest military in the world and we started to demobilize, General Marshall was asked one day, "How is the demobilization going?" He said, "This isn't a demobilization; this is a rout."

I would suggest that what we are doing in slashing the defense budget, as we did yesterday, is exactly the same thing we did after World War II, and we are not going to be prepared for what happens in the Korean Peninsula and we are not going to be prepared for what happens in the Balkans, and it is going to accrue to the detriment of the American people.

I would like to see everybody in the White House, everybody in the administration, and every American have a chance to set foot in Normandy and understand what occurred and why it occurred.

CALIFORNIA DESERT PROTECTION ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to House Resolution 422 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 518.

□ 1039

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 518) to designate certain lands in the California Desert as wilderness, to establish the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Parks and the Mojave National Monument, and for other purposes, with Mr. PETERSON of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1040

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 17, 1994, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title is considered as read.

No amendment to the substitute shall be in order except those amendments printed in that portion of the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII prior to consideration of the bill.

The amendment caused to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCCO] relating to an east Mojave preserve may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 518

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "California Desert Protection Act of 1994".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the federally owned desert lands of Southern California constitute a public wildland resource of extraordinary and inestimable value for this and future generations;

(2) these desert wildlands display unique scenic, historical, archaeological, environmental, ecological, wildlife, cultural, scientific, educational, and recreational values used and enjoyed by millions of Americans for hiking and camping, scientific study and scenic appreciation;

(3) the public land resources of the California desert now face and are increasingly threatened by adverse pressures which would impair, dilute, and destroy their public and natural values;

(4) the California desert, embracing wilderness lands, units of the National Park System, other Federal lands, State parks and other State lands, and private lands, constitutes a cohesive unit posing unique and difficult resource protection and management challenges;

(5) through designation of national monuments by Presidential proclamation, through enactment of general public land statutes (including section 601 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 90 Stat. 2743, 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and through interim administrative actions, the Federal Government has begun the process of appropriately providing for protection of the significant resources of the public lands in the California desert; and

(6) statutory land unit designations are needed to afford the full protection which the resources and public land values of the California desert merit.

(b) In order to secure for the American people of this and future generations an enduring heritage of wilderness, national parks, and public land values in the California desert, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that—

(1) appropriate public lands in the California desert shall be included within the National Park System and the National Wilderness Preservation System, in order to—

(A) preserve unrivaled scenic, geologic, and wildlife values associated with these unique natural landscapes;

(B) perpetuate in their natural state significant and diverse ecosystems of the California desert;

(C) protect and preserve historical and cultural values of the California desert associated with ancient Indian cultures, patterns of western exploration and settlement, and sites exemplifying the mining, ranching, and railroading history of the Old West;

(D) provide opportunities for compatible outdoor public recreation, protect and interpret ecological and geological features and historic, paleontological, and archaeological sites, maintain wilderness resource values, and promote public understanding and appreciation of the California desert; and

(E) retain and enhance opportunities for scientific research in undisturbed ecosystems.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will designate title I. The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—WILDERNESS ADDITIONS

FINDINGS

SEC. 101. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) wilderness is a distinguishing characteristic of the public lands in the California desert, one which affords an unrivaled opportunity for experiencing vast areas of the Old West essentially unaltered by man's activities, and which merits preservation for the benefit of present and future generations;

(2) the wilderness values of desert lands are increasingly threatened by and especially vulnerable to impairment, alteration, and destruction by activities and intrusions associated with incompatible use and development; and

(3) preservation of desert wilderness necessarily requires the highest forms of protective designation and management.

DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS

SEC. 102. In furtherance of the purpose of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890, 16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), and sections 601 and 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2743, 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the following lands in the State of California, as generally depicted on maps referenced herein, are hereby designated as wilderness, and therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-four thousand eight hundred and ninety acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated May 1991, and two maps entitled "Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 2" and "Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 3", dated January 1989, and which shall be known as the Argus Range Wilderness.

(2) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately ten thousand three hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bigelow Cholla Garden Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Bigelow Cholla Garden Wilderness.

(3) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, and within the San Bernardino National Forest, which comprise approximately thirty-nine thousand two hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bighorn Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as the Bighorn Mountain Wilderness.

(4) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, and the Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty-seven thousand five hundred and seventy acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Big Maria Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the Big Maria Mountains Wilderness.

(5) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirteen thousand nine hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Black Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Black Mountain Wilderness.

(6) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately nine thousand five hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bright Star Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Bright Star Wilderness.

(7) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately sixty-eight thousand five hundred and fifteen acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Bristol Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 1", and "Bristol Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as Bristol Mountains Wilderness.

(8) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Cadiz Dunes Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Cadiz Dunes Wilderness.

(9) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately eighty-four thousand four hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Cady Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Cady Mountains Wilderness.

(10) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and Eastern San Diego County, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately fifteen thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Carrizo Gorge Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the Carrizo Gorge Wilderness.

(11) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately sixty-four thousand three hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Chemehuevi Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Chemehuevi Mountains Wilderness.

(12) Certain lands in the Bakersfield District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirteen thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Chimney Peak Wilderness—Proposed 1" and "Chimney Peak Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Chimney Peak Wilderness.

(13) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred fifty-eight thousand nine hundred and fifty acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 1" and "Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated January 1989, and which shall be known as the Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness.

(14) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise thirty-four thousand three hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Cleghorn Lakes Wilderness—Proposed", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as the Cleghorn Lakes Wilderness. The Secretary may, pursuant to an application filed by the Department of Defense, grant a right-of-way for, and authorize construction of, a road within the area depicted as "non-wilderness road corridor" on such map.

79-059 O—97 Vol. 140 (Pt. 9) 22

(15) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Clipper Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as Clipper Mountain Wilderness.

(16) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately fifty thousand five hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Coso Range Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as Coso Range Wilderness.

(17) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventeen thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Coyote Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as Coyote Mountains Wilderness.

(18) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately eight thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Darwin Falls Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as Darwin Falls Wilderness.

(19) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty-eight thousand eight hundred and fifty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Dead Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated October 1991, and which shall be known as Dead Mountains Wilderness.

(20) Certain lands in the Bakersfield District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-six thousand three hundred acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Domeland Wilderness Additions—Proposed 1" and "Domeland Wilderness Additions—Proposed 2", dated February 1986 and which are hereby incorporated in, and which shall be deemed to be a part of, the Domeland Wilderness as designated by Public Laws 93-632 and 98-425.

(21) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-three thousand seven hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "El Paso Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the El Paso Mountains Wilderness.

(22) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-five thousand nine hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Fish Creek Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as Fish Creek Mountains Wilderness.

(23) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-eight thousand one hundred and ten acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Funeral Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as Funeral Mountains Wilderness.

(24) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Golden Valley Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986 and which shall be known as Golden Valley Wilderness.

(25) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-one thousand seven hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Grass Valley Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986 and which shall be known as the Grass Valley Wilderness.

(26) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-two thousand two hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Hollow Hills Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Hollow Hills Wilderness.

(27) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-six thousand four hundred and sixty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Ibex Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Ibex Wilderness.

(28) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-four thousand and fifty-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Indian Pass Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1994, and which shall be known as the Indian Pass Wilderness.

(29) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Bakersfield District, of the Bureau of Land Management, and within the Inyo National Forest, which comprise approximately two hundred five thousand and twenty acres, as generally depicted on three maps entitled "Inyo Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", numbered in the title one through three, and dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Inyo Mountains Wilderness.

(30) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-three thousand six hundred and seventy acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Jacumba Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Jacumba Wilderness.

(31) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred and twenty-nine thousand five hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kelso Dunes Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated October 1991, a map entitled "Kelso Dunes Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated May 1991, and a map entitled "Kelso Dunes Wilderness—Proposed 3", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as the Kelso Dunes Wilderness.

(32) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Sequoia National Forest, which comprise approximately eighty-eight thousand two hundred and ninety acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kiavah Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated February 1986, and a map entitled "Kiavah Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Kiavah Wilderness.

(33) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately two hundred forty-nine thousand three hundred and sixty-eight acres, as generally depicted on four maps entitled "Kingston Range Wilderness—Proposed", numbered in the title one through four dated May 1994, and which shall be known as the Kingston Range Wilderness.

(34) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-nine thousand eight hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Little Chuckwalla Mountains Wilderness.

(35) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-three thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Little Picacho Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Little Picacho Wilderness.

(36) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-two thousand three hundred and sixty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Malpais Mesa Wilderness—Proposed", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as the Malpais Mesa Wilderness.

(37) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand one hundred and five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Manly Peak Wilderness—Proposed", dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the Manly Peak Wilderness.

(38) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-four thousand two hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mecca Hills Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Mecca Hills Wilderness.

(39) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty-seven thousand three hundred and thirty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mesquite Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Mesquite Wilderness.

(40) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-two thousand nine hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Newberry Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the Newberry Mountains Wilderness.

(41) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred ten thousand eight hundred and sixty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Nopah Range Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Nopah Range Wilderness.

(42) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-two thousand two hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "North Algodones Dunes Wilderness—Proposed", dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the North Algodones Dunes Wilderness.

(43) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-five thousand five hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "North Mesquite Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the North Mesquite Mountains Wilderness.

(44) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred forty-six thousand and seventy acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Old Woman Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated May 1994 and a map entitled "Old Woman Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the Old Woman Mountains Wilderness.

(45) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately fifty-seven thousand four hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled

"Orocopia Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1994, and which shall be known as the Orocopia Mountains Wilderness.

(46) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Bakersfield District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-four thousand six hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Owens Peak Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated February 1986, and two maps entitled "Owens Peak Wilderness—Proposed 2" dated February 1986 and "Owens Peak Wilderness—Proposed 3", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Owens Peak Wilderness.

(47) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-four thousand eight hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Pahrump Valley Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986 and which shall be known as the Pahrump Valley Wilderness.

(48) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately two hundred seventy thousand six hundred and twenty-nine acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Palen/McCoy Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated July 1993, and a map entitled "Palen/McCoy Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Palen/McCoy Wilderness.

(49) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-two thousand three hundred and ten acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Palo Verde Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Palo Verde Mountains Wilderness.

(50) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seven thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Picacho Peak Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Picacho Peak Wilderness.

(51) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-two thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Piper Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Piper Mountain Wilderness.

(52) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-six thousand eight hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Piute Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Piute Mountains Wilderness.

(53) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-eight thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Resting Spring Range Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Resting Spring Range Wilderness.

(54) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty thousand eight hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rice Valley Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Rice Valley Wilderness.

(55) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-two thousand three hundred eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Riverside Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Riverside Mountains Wilderness.

(56) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-seven thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rodman Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated January 1989, and which shall be known as the Rodman Mountains Wilderness.

(57) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Bakersfield District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately fifty-one thousand nine hundred acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Sacatar Trail Wilderness—Proposed 1" and "Sacatar Trail Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Sacatar Trail Wilderness.

(58) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one thousand four hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Saddle Peak Hills Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Saddle Peak Hills Wilderness.

(59) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand nine hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "San Gorgonio Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which are hereby incorporated in, and which shall be deemed to be a part of, the San Gorgonio Wilderness as designated by Public Laws 88-577 and 98-425.

(60) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately sixty-four thousand three hundred and forty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Santa Rosa Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated March 1994, and which are hereby incorporated in, and which shall be deemed to be part of, the Santa Rosa Wilderness designated by Public Law 98-425.

(61) Certain lands in the California Desert District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-five thousand and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sawtooth Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Sawtooth Mountains Wilderness.

(62) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred seventy-four thousand eight hundred acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Sheep Hole Valley Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated July 1993, and "Sheep Hole Valley Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Sheephole Valley Wilderness.

(63) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately forty-four thousand four hundred and ten acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Slate Range Wilderness—Proposed", dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the Slate Range Wilderness.

(64) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand seven hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "South Nopah Range Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the South Nopah Range Wilderness.

(65) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seven thousand and fifty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Stateline Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Stateline Wilderness.

(66) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately eighty-one thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Stepladder Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the Stepladder Mountains Wilderness.

(67) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately twenty-nine thousand one hundred and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Surprise Canyon Wilderness—Proposed", dated September 1991, and which shall be known as the Surprise Canyon Wilderness.

(68) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventeen thousand eight hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sylvania Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986, and which shall be known as the Sylvania Mountains Wilderness.

(69) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately thirty-three thousand seven hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Trilobite Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Trilobite Wilderness.

(70) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred forty-four thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Turtle Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated February 1986 and a map entitled "Turtle Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated May 1991, and which shall be known as the Turtle Mountains Wilderness.

(71) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area and the Yuma District, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately seventy-seven thousand five hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Whipple Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated July 1993, and which shall be known as the Whipple Mountains Wilderness.

ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 103. Subject to valid existing rights, each wilderness area designated under section 102 shall be administered by the appropriate Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this title and any reference to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary who has administrative jurisdiction over the area.

GRAZING

SEC. 104. Within the wilderness areas designated under section 102, the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary deems necessary, as long as such regulations, policies, and practices fully conform with and implement the intent of Congress regarding grazing in such areas as such intent is expressed in the Wilderness Act and section 108 of Public Law 96-560 (16 U.S.C. 133 note).

BUFFER ZONES

SEC. 105. The Congress does not intend for the designation of wilderness areas in section 102 of

this Act to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around any such wilderness area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

MINING CLAIM VALIDITY REVIEW

SEC. 106. The Secretary of the Interior shall not approve any plan of operation prior to determining the validity of the unpatented mining claims, mill sites, and tunnel sites affected by such plan within any wilderness area designated under section 102, and shall submit to Congress recommendations as to whether any valid or patented claims should be acquired by the United States, including the estimated acquisition costs of such claims, and a discussion of the environmental consequences of the extraction of minerals from these lands.

FILING OF MAPS AND DESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 107. As soon as practicable after enactment of section 102, a map and a legal description on each wilderness area designated under this title shall be filed by the Secretary concerned with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and each such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in each such legal description and map. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, or the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, as is appropriate.

WILDERNESS REVIEW

SEC. 108. (a) The Congress hereby finds and directs that except for those areas provided for in subsection (b), the public lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, managed by the Bureau of Land Management, not designated as wilderness or wilderness study areas by this Act, have been adequately studied for wilderness designation pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2743, 43 U.S.C. 1782), and are no longer subject to the requirements of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 pertaining to the management of wilderness study areas in a manner that does not impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness.

(b) The following areas shall continue to be subject to the requirements of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, pertaining to the management of wilderness study areas in a manner that does not impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness:

(1) Certain lands which comprise approximately sixty-one thousand three hundred and twenty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Avawatz Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1991.

(2) Certain lands which comprise approximately eighty thousand four hundred and thirty acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Soda Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 1", dated May 1991, and "Soda Mountains Wilderness—Proposed 2", dated January 1989.

(3) Certain lands which compromise approximately twenty-three thousand two hundred and fifty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "South Avawatz Mountains—Proposed", dated May 1991.

(4) Certain lands which comprise approximately eight thousand eight hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Great Falls Basin Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1986.

(c) Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal lands referred to in subsection (b) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws; from location, entry, and patent under the United States mining laws; and from disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing, and mineral materials, and all amendments thereto, and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782).

DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREA

SEC. 109. In furtherance of the provisions of the Wilderness Act, certain public lands in the California Desert Conservation Area of the Bureau of Land Management which comprise eleven thousand two hundred acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "White Mountains Wilderness Study Area—Proposed", dated May 1991, are hereby designated the White Mountains Wilderness Study Area and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

SUITABILITY REPORT

SEC. 110. The Secretary is required, ten years after the date of enactment of this Act, to report to Congress on current and planned exploration, development or mining activities on, and suitability for future wilderness designation of, the lands as generally depicted on maps entitled "Surprise Canyon Wilderness—Proposed", "Middle Park Canyon Wilderness—Proposed", and "Death Valley National Park Boundary and Wilderness 15", dated September 1991 and a map entitled "Manly Peak Wilderness—Proposed", dated October 1991.

WILDERNESS DESIGNATION AND MANAGEMENT IN THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

SEC. 111. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act, the following lands are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Certain lands in the Havasu National Wildlife Refuge, California, which comprise approximately three thousand one hundred and ninety-five acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Havasu Wilderness—Proposed", and dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the Havasu Wilderness.

(2) Certain lands in the Imperial National Wildlife Refuge, California, which comprise approximately five thousand eight hundred and thirty-six acres, as generally depicted on two maps entitled "Imperial Refuge Wilderness—Proposed 1" and "Imperial Refuge Wilderness—Proposed 2", and dated October 1991, and which shall be known as the Imperial Refuge Wilderness.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas designated under this section shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act (or any similar reference) shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act and any reference to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) As soon as practicable after enactment of this section, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated under this section with the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and Natural Resources and Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. Such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made. Such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of California: On page 6, delete lines 13 through 22 and insert the following in lieu thereof: "(1) Certain lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, the Bureau of Land Management which comprise approximately seventy-four thousand two hundred and fifty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 1', dated May 1991, and two maps entitled 'Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 2', dated January 1989, and Argus Range Wilderness—Proposed 3', dated May 1994, and which shall be known as the Argus Range Wilderness."

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is both a substantive discussion and perhaps an illustrative and graphic one of the process that we are operating under.

The substance is there is an exciting new technology by which we will be able to recharge satellites' batteries using a laser from Earth. As most of us know, those batteries on satellites now need panels to soak up the solar light to power the batteries. They are very heavy. It is a load that has to be sent into space. The idea is that you would need smaller batteries because you would be powering them by a laser beam from Earth. It also means you could possibly move to electron or ion electric motors for thrust to the adjuster rockets, it could save as much as $72,000 per pound in terms of thrust lift capability.

It is a technology that has a chance of being perfected in the California desert. The Naval Air Warfare Center at China Lake is obviously an ideal location because of the number of days a year it is clear—over 260. In addition to that, there is a functioning geothermal site on the base that not only supplies the power for the base, but has excess power currently going into the Pacific Gas & Electric power grid in that area. So we have a source of power and an emerging technology.

The only problem is as we examined the desert bill, and to give you an idea of the scale of the discussion, this piece of blue paper is 1 mile. The entire discussion has been the question of the deletion of 1 square mile from wilderness.

This is the Naval Weapons Center current boundary. This is the proposed wilderness in which this intrusion would not be wilderness. This area would be wilderness. Once again, the interlocking relationship between wilderness and non-wilderness.

The only problem is, the bill, as it was written, would provide access road to the site location, proposed site location, along a 2,000-plus-foot ridge, when

if we did a 1 square mile deletion, they could run a road through a wash which had less than an 800-foot elevation shift through the entire area.

It made perfect sense to me. On May 2, I wrote a letter to the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], indicating the facts and the requested amendment. I never got a reply. I thought I was following the procedure that was appropriate.

That is why, on May 16, I offered an amendment to the bill to in fact delete 1 square mile.

Following the filing of the amendment, I waited, and it was 10 days before we were able to negotiate a discussion about the possibility of doing something other than deleting the 1 square mile.

The original counter offer from the staff on the committee was that we will allow the opportunity over a 5-year period. We are talking about an emerging 21st century technology, which is in its infant stages. We are dealing with the development of a new type of laser with a new type of energy source combined with a new type of satellite. And they said a 5-year window is what you are going to get.

We countered with a 25-year window, which was, after all, in the original bill that was in the other body by the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], because that is what they said was going to be available for grazing rights. It seemed to us that if cattle and grazing rights had a 25-year window, that emerging 21st century technology ought to have the same window.

That, of course, was not acceptable.

On June 9, we had a second redraft of the proposal which then put a 15-year window into the structure. The problem was that along with the 15-year window came the language that the road route had to be necessary.

Well, we all know the ability to interpret necessary, and it seemed to me I was getting 15 years, and you may get the runaround forever on the definition of necessary. That entered into additional negotiations, and we are now into June, in which I was able to get the suggestion that you change necessary to desirable, because then, obviously, if you have to expend enormous sums of money building a road along a ridge, verses when less than half a mile away there is a route for millions of dollars less.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. If you are going to have to build a road along a ridge, when less than half a mile away was a route that would save the taxpayers an enormous amount of money, then I would prefer desirable, rather than necessary. The counter offer was, yes, you can have desirable but you have to add their language "and such road be located so as to have the minimum practical impact on wilderness values."

Now they gave me desirable, but it has to have minimal impact. It is entirely possible the ridge route, which was the unacceptable route, may be the one with the desirable impact. On the one hand they give you 15 years, and on the other they take it away with new language that had to be put in there. The dance continued.

I said why is it you cannot understand that all I wanted is the opportunity to save taxpayers money in building a road in an area less than 1 square mile? My original amendment was to simply delete the 1 square mile. The deletion of even 1 square mile produced this ongoing marathon language dance to try to indicate that they would hold in front of me a promise that I could not tell people honestly that I could deliver. Deleting the 1 square mile was certainly way to do it.

We have now come to the point where in the negotiations, the language is desirable. Not necessary, but desirable. Desirable so that the taxpayers could save money. And the closing sentence is: "Now, so far as practicable any such road shall be aligned in a manner that takes into account the desirability of minimizing adverse impacts on wilderness values." Not that it was necessary or absolutely required, but so far as practicable.

Over a month of waltzing with language about 1 square mile, which is, using our mileage gauge, less than 1 mile away from an area that is nonwilderness to begin with is exempted from day one, is a graphic example of the kind of relationship Members who represent the area in this bill have to carry on in a working relationship.

□ 1050

Remember, my initial discussion with the author of the bill was left unresponded to, an ongoing discussion over word games, which frankly I thought was a bit much, to preserve the possibility for a 21st century technology, up until just 1 hour before the beginning of the bill on the floor of the House. This is as graphic an example as I can give the Members of the kind of working relationship that has gone on in this institution. It is the area I represent, and I resent the way in which I have been treated.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is going to be an extended discussion, probably over several days, regarding this desert wilderness and park bill. Fundamental to the discussion that we are going to have relative to the amendments that will be before us today is for people of the House to understand exactly what has taken place here on the part of the committee and the way it has been dealing with Members who are elected to represent this vast territory.

Mr. Chairman, there are four Members of the House who represent the California desert. All of them happen to be Republican. All of them are very interested in the desert, having represented it for years and spending much of their lives in the region. Yet it is very, very apparent to me as a Representative of the region that those Members have not just been almost entirely ignored, they have been arbitrarily rolled over by this committee.

I said earlier in our discussions that it is reflective of the thought that in this process, often power does corrupt, but absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Many years ago, approximately 20 years ago, the House addressed itself first to the question of desert wilderness and eventual park development in this region. The House recognized it to be a very complex subject, a subject of critical interest to our national defense, a subject that was very important in terms of the natural resources available to the country's interest, a subject that at least deserved the attention of those who have an understanding of all of the mix of this complexity. So, the House passed what is known as FLPMA, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act which essentially says the complexity is important enough for the country to address. We are going to create a commission that will review this in great depth and make recommendations to the House.

Mr. Chairman, that commission was formed by House action in 1976. It was made up of people who represented all of the interests: The miners, grazers, the environmentalists, all citizens who care about the desert. They met for several years. There were some 40,000 individual comments.

Near the end of the process, a very small group of people, people that I can only describe as elite environmentalists, decided they were opposed to the work of this public commission, and so going back, kind of like throwing mud at the wall, they took all of their wish list in terms of future park and wilderness and put it into a bill. For all intents and purposes, this legislation—H.R. 518—is a reflection of that arbitrary action.

Indeed, this amendment today, Mr. Chairman, represents the extremes to which those extreme environmentalists have gone. We are talking about, out of over 7 million acres proposed in this bill for park and/or wilderness, considering only 640 acres to be placed in wilderness study area status.

Let me share with the Members the significance of this arbitrariness. SELENE is the Greek word for moon, an acronym for space laser electric energy. The purpose of SELENE, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration program, is to develop and test

and then provide the technology for beaming laser energy through the atmosphere to high altitude space-borne vehicles, satellites, lunar facilities, and other extraterrestrial objects. I happen to serve as the ranking member of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations that deals with NASA programs. I know of the significance of this effort to not just our national defense, but indeed, the edges of our technology.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has indicated, this location is an ideal location for our going forward with this technology. The SELENE Program calls for an array of six ground stations that would provide nearly complete global coverage of space. The first site is sited for the Naval Weapons Station at China Lake, CA, an area that has involved this sort of activity for many, many years. Remember, 640 acres is what this is about.

Arbitrarily this committee played games with the author of this amendment, who happens for many years to have lived in, loves, understands, and represents the desert. It is very important for us to know that what we are about here is not just fighting for the sake of fighting. There is not a Member of this body, not a Member, Democrat or Republican alike, who would not be outraged if they were treated like this in terms of their district, as this committee has arbitrarily rolled over those of us who represent the desert.

Indeed, it is incredible to me that we could go forward in this fashion and allow a little outside group to dominate the debate within the committee in such a fashion, and in turn, the interests that are truly American interests, as well as the interests of the people.

Indeed, the very thought that a committee would act in this fashion ought to be unacceptable to the entire House. In the years I have been here, I have never seen this process so tainted.

In the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, where I have served in the past, we have a bipartisan environment; indeed, in the Committee on Appropriations, none of this extreme arbitrary action: No consultation of significance with any of those four Members of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at his own request) Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, that is totally unacceptable, and I would hope the Democrats of the House would think "How would I react if this chairman or this committee treated me this way?"

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would simply ask my colleague a question. As we look at this map my colleague from Bakersfield has in the well, we are talking about a 7 million acre plan here.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Correct.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield further, at the same time we are seriously jeopardizing the national security interests of this country and the space program over a minor part of that, a total of 640 acres, is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, how in the world could the committee have done this without having adequate consultation with the Committee on Armed Services and others who are very involved in national security questions?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I certainly cannot begin to answer that question. They will suggest that there has been some consultation here or there.

The gentleman in the well is a gentleman who is the author of this amendment because he represents the territory and knows it very well. I would appreciate it if he would use the balance of my time, the additional time I have asked for, to explain some of those details.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is an emerging technology. As the Navy began looking at sites where they could locate the SELENE with the understanding of laser sight lines and energy resources, this area adjacent to the Naval Weapons Center was found to be appropriate.

As we began examining, and as you might imagine, this is a very, very large scaled map of only several square miles, and when we look at most of the maps provided by the Sierra Club or other groups that people have relied on, you tend not to get this kind of scale in your general examination.

We have found, however, that when we went to the topographical lines, which show us elevations, the only available route for the Navy was along a ridge route, which was an extremely expensive way to go. Members need to understand if this technology is perfected the Navy will build the road. They will build it either along the ridge, at an expense of millions of dollars beyond what it would have been for the taxpayers, and they would have preferred to have gone through the wash area, so I notified the committee, I notified the author, that this was in fact a problem we discovered. I did it in a timely fashion, prior to the consideration of the bill's final passage in the committee, and this was not considered. It was not brought up.

I suggested to the author in the letter, and I will include this in the RECORD, that the letter be made part of the RECORD to examine this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Redlands, CA, be given 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Which gentleman from California?

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman from Redlands, CA. There is only one gentleman from Redlands, CA, here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] recognizes that. I am not sure that the chairman of the committee understands that, but I do appreciate it.

(By unanimous consent, and at the request of Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The point was, Mr. Chairman, I went what I thought was the appropriate pattern of notifying the committee that this was a concern. I got no response back.

That is the reason why I introduced the amendment to delete the one square mile, only for the purposes of providing an option for the route of the road and saving the taxpayers money. There ensued this waltz of amendment language basically trying to get me to accept language which in fact did not do what I wanted to do in the first place.

□ 1100

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I might ask my friend a question?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to ask my friend, we have the saline project which is an emerging technology. If we in fact do not pass the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Bakersfield, CA, what happens to the saline program?

Mr. THOMAS of California. It will go forward. The road will be built along the access structure that was provided, which will mean taxpayers will be spending millions of dollars more than they would have if we had not come to an accommodation on 1 square mile of area that was otherwise to be classified as wilderness, which I might point out again, once again, is exactly abutted with areas that were excluded from the beginning from wilderness. I am not talking about pulling a pristine heart

out of a big chunk of wilderness. I am talking about an area adjacent to the Naval Weapons Center and adjacent to areas that had always been designated nonwilderness. I was simply looking at a corner of access to save the taxpayers money.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] testified before the subcommittee on the issue of the California desert. The gentleman at that time was not aware apparently of this particular emerging need and problem, is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Yes, more than several years ago I testified. I just said, perhaps the gentleman was not on the floor at the time, but I said it became apparent to us when we examined the final iteration of the maps.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I wrote a letter on May 2 prior to the final consideration of the committee.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, did the gentleman write a letter to the subcommittee chairman or the chairman of the committee?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I wrote a letter to the author of the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am very happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California, to explain why he did not respond to the letter.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the letter arrived in my office the night before the markup in the subcommittee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is only 1 acre out of 7 million. It was the night before the subcommittee's markup.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there was no amendment offered in the subcommittee or the full committee consideration of it. I think the thing is that we have obviously tried to make an effort here to accommodate the concerns of the gentleman. I understand the chairman has a second degree amendment which will address this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DREIER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee was not on the floor when I indicated to him that this was something that came up when we got to maps that more precisely allowed us to more fully understand where the area was. I wrote a letter to the author of the bill on May 2 and did not get a response.

The first paragraph says, "It is my understanding that the Natural Resources Committee will be marking up your California desert legislation, H.R. 518, on May 4, 1994. I would like to take this opportunity to request that you consider offering an amendment to this bill on this subject that is brought before the committee."

Mr. Chairman, I then go into an extensive explanation of why the amendment is needed. I got no response on that letter. I tried to follow the process. I introduced the amendment on May 16. I do not believe the gentleman was here when I reiterated that on May 25, there was a proposal which was unacceptable. On May 26, we countered with what we thought we wanted to do. On June 2, there was a reoffer which was unacceptable. On June 9 there was another counter. Later on June 9 there was a counter back, and today we have had two exchanges along the way over less than 1 square mile to try to save the taxpayers a couple of million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants to enlarge discussion to the more than 7 million acres that are in the bill itself, this can be magnified just as this map was to discover all kinds of problems like this. I discovered this problem in a timely fashion, I thought I had offered a possible solution, and we have gone through all of this rigamarole to the point that we are here today.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only point I tried to make, in trying to point out the ability to save the taxpayers millions of dollars by offering an alternate route. What I got was language back which denied me, although it looked like I had the ability to offer that as an alternate route, that denied me the ability to do it.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from California, I flew this area with the Bureau of Land Management for a number of days, and I think I know the location. But would the gentleman explain the terrain involved in the 1 acre under discussion and what it might entail relative to the border as it now exists?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I will tell the gentleman it is not 1 acre, it is 1 square mile, 640 acres, it represents the 1 square mile area that we want to delete out of the wilderness.

Once again, it is adjacent to an area that is not and never has been designated as wilderness. It is, as the gentleman knows, in that area which is very arid desert that has a lot of erosion that has gone on over the years, natural erosion, and that there are peaks and valleys, there are gullies that are dry washes, and that within a hundred yards of two points, there is an elevation change of 1,500 feet, sometimes 2,000 feet.

The problem was that the area that had been designated as access for the taxpayers to build a road has an average elevation of over 2,500 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McCANDLESS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Riverside, CA.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the area adjacent to it has an average elevation of 800 feet in relation to the saline project. There are millions of dollars saved by this little finger being excluded.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, what we have is a cut through an area that offers drainage from a higher elevation to a lower elevation.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCANDLESS. It is a dry wash in the vernacular of desert terminology. There is nothing in the way of pristineness about it, the acre in question. It is simply a matter of geography and the ability to reach the site in question?

Mr. THOMAS of California. It is geography. But I also pointed out in the letter and to the folks on the committee that the amendment did not block in any way the application of the Endangered Species Act or other laws. I just wanted to keep the option open for building a road in an area that would save the taxpayers money. There was no game-playing on my part.

I thought it was a simple addition because of a failure, frankly, to examine in greater detail, the area.

It only came to my attention, no question, at the 11th hour. That is why there is only the 1 square mile. I did not offer 100 square miles, I did not offer an area adjacent to the Naval Weapons Center running over several other areas that the road could be built. I talked about 1 square mile.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Let us go back to the terrain, if the gentleman will permit.

If we build the road on the area in question, being proposed by the committee, and we are building this road at a higher elevation, is that my understanding?

Mr. THOMAS of California. It is to preserve the option of building it along several routes. If we do not have the amendment, there is only one route.

Mr. McCANDLESS. That one route would then be at a higher elevation?

Mr. THOMAS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Which would then be a paved road.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Which would create an additional erosion problem at the lower elevations.

Mr. THOMAS of California. In all likelihood. When it rains in the desert, it rains hard, and if it rains on that pavement, it will run off and it will run off down a slope which will cause greater erosion.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, what we have here, then, is actually something that will create greater erosion to the area in question than we would do with what is being recommended by the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, that is the dialog we have had all along. The fact is they wrote the bill, it was in it and they were not going to let it come out all along no matter what. It was the question of losing 1 square mile, not necessarily where it was, it was the loss of 1 square mile. Most of the discussions I have had with these folks is over bulk acreage. No one objected to certain sites which everyone agreed were appropriate wilderness areas. It is this mass grab for bulk acreage that is so difficult for someone like myself to understand who wants to preserve areas that clearly should be preserved. It just came home to me in trying to deal with 1 square mile. They would not give language which would allow it to occur.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time and closing my remarks regarding this amendment, it is very obvious that there are two points to be made here:

First to the Members of the House, if this were their district, how would they react to this treatment that is so arbitrary and capricious? First, our national defense is involved. The cutting edge of our technology is involved. I deal daily with NASA's programs, and this is absolutely ludicrous treatment of that part of the process. Above and beyond that, a Member's district who knows it best.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members to seriously consider how they would react to this kind of arbitrary treatment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California to the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of California: Revise the amendment to read as follows:

On page 6, line 24, after the period add the following:

If at any time within 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary of the Navy notifies the Secretary of the Interior that permission has been granted to use lands within the area of the China Lake Naval Air Warfare Center for installation of a space energy laser facility, and that establishment of a right-of-way across lands within the Argus Range Wilderness is desirable in order to facilitate access to the lands to be used for such facility, the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, may grant a right-of-way for, and authorize construction of, a road to be used solely for that purpose across such lands, notwithstanding the designation of such lands as wilderness. So far as practicable, any such road shall be aligned in a manner that takes into account the desirability of minimizing adverse impacts on wilderness values.

Mr. MILLER of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, what we have been treated to here over the last 20 to 30 minutes is a discussion between the Members on the other side of the aisle about an amendment that the committee has agreed to accept. When the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] came to me with this amendment, I believe after Committee on Rules, I said that we would take care of it, that we would work it out, and, in fact, we have worked it out.

When the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] came to me this morning and said that he thought the staffs were being somewhat nitpicking, I said, "Let me take a look at the language, we will work it out," and we have, in fact, worked it out. But rather than discuss this amendment on its merits and the need to accept it and to take care of the problem, they have chosen to try to use this amendment to stigmatize the presentation of this bill and the process by which this bill has been brought to the floor.

□ 1110

Now, the Members of the House were treated to the same debate and discussion during the consideration of the rule, and at that time the suggestion was that somehow the Committee on Natural Resources and its chairman, me, were somehow steamrolling the Members from this area of which this bill is so important to and in fact it is.

At that time I relayed to Members of the House that none of these Members has ever asked me for a meeting, a discussion, or any other type of dialog on this legislation or amendments thereto. That stands true as we stand here today.

It may be very important to them, but apparently not important enough to come and to talk to me about their concerns or their problems. That has not happened.

So let us not try to use this amendment to stigmatize a process that has been very open during these deliberations.

This amendment apparently was known at the subcommittee and was not offered at the subcommittee. This amendment was known at the full committee and was not offered at the full committee, where each and every member of the committee was entitled to offer any amendment they sought.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who spoke on behalf of this amendment, was present during the consideration of this bill in that committee, and the amendment was not offered.

So I appreciate what is going on here to try to stigmatize the bill, because they have not been able to carry the day on the merits of the legislation and the protection of the California desert that is overwhelmingly desired by the citizens of California, a bill that has passed the Senate by 69 Senators voting for it and, I believe, 29 voting against it, a rule that passed overwhelmingly here. This has been, in fact, an open process.

The Committee on Natural Resources at each and every markup protects each and every member of that committee with the right to offer those amendments. That is the way we run the committee, and that is the way it should be run for the committee, for the benefit of all Members, be they majority or minority. The same is true with respect to the consideration of this bill on the floor.

We went to the Committee on Rules, and we asked for an open rule, as we have, I believe, each and every time that we have come to the floor. We have been in request of an open rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. When I am done; when I am done. I sat here and let the gentlemen have their debate, and their argument, and now it is my time on the amendment. So the fact is that the record is replete that this has been an open process, and that is the way it will continue today as we consider through the amendments.

We have had negotiations over this amendment. We have had negotiations on other amendments, and that is the legislative process, and the fact is it has worked out in that vein.

So I would hope that the Members who are listening to this debate would understand that is how this bill has been considered, that is how each and every bill was considered in the Committee on Natural Resources, no matter how complex the bill or how simple. Members are entitled to have their say, to get their vote, to get a rollcall, however, in fact, they desired.

Now, those who were not on the committee apparently think they know a lot more about the committee than the members of the committee, but that is how this committee is run, and that is why we continue to come to the floor and ask for open rules, because, in fact, you cannot protect us from anything that would not be considered in the committee, because that is the basis on which we consider legislation in our committee.

So I would hope that we would, rather than trying to dredge up an old stigmatizing of the committee, that was attempted during the discussion of the rule, that we would get on with the discussion of the amendments and get to votes if that is required, to work them out if we can, and get on with the consideration of the legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would simply like to clarify this issue of open rules.

You know, I have regularly praised my friend from Martinez, who has come before the Committee on Rules and requested open rules. In fact, I enjoy calling him "Mr. Open Rule." But the fact of the matter is the preprinting requirement which was imposed under this rule, does, in fact, deny Members from having the opportunity to offer amendments under the standard open amending process. I think the RECORD should show that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows that, in fact, each and every Member of this House was entitled to offer amendments. There was no preclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, each and every Member was entitled to offer those amendments. We made our case for preprinting of the amendments because of this very exact point that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] stands there with the map. We needed to know the impact of the amendments on the land base which is the subject of this legislation. We are able to go to the map and look at this.

In this case, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] makes a case that is far more expensive if you have to build a road through the mountains.

At the same time we want to also make sure that, you know, we have problems with this and concerns with this bill and issues that have been raised all along the boundaries, because the boundaries have to be drawn somewhere. So that was the purpose of preprinting, not to preclude Members' rights to offer amendments. We have some 60 amendments, I think, that were offered.

Mr. DREIER. And yet there was a similar situation in Montana but there was no preprinting requirement.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my time. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will be recognized for debate only by the Chair.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I just wish the gentlemen would show some of the courtesy that they complain so hard about. We have rules of debate in this House. Nobody is going to preclude you. You will be yielded to. You do not have to interrupt the gentleman from California. We can go along in regular order, and we can hash this out, and we can have our votes, and you will win and lose.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] came here and said he had a time problem. He wanted to know if I was going to recognize members of the committee first. I said, "BILL, go ahead and offer your amendment. You have got to go to the Ways and Means Committee. You have the trade representative over there. Fine, go ahead."

This is a wonderful response to that kind of courtesy, to that kind of deference. But we have come to expect it from the other side.

The fact is we will shortly, when this debate ends, we will accept the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] as modified by my amendment, which will allow the road to go through, if necessary, if the technology proves itself out, and in fact this land base is needed, so that is what has been going on here.

At some point I would hope we would vote on the amendment to the amendment as perfected.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California oftentimes gets on a roll, and that I think he properly criticizes the fervor of some Members in terms of interrupting him, and then in the next breath he criticizes this gentleman from California because I refused to deny or talk other Members out of their right to strike the last word and have 5 minutes.

I did not go beyond any more than the gentleman went beyond in his time limit.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. No, I have not criticized anybody.

Mr. THOMAS of California. No? You clearly left the inference that I wanted to get on here and get out of here, and then through subterfuge wanted to spend the rest of the time here. The rest of the time, after my initial statement, was not of my doing.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am trying to point out we have not tried to prejudice Members' presentations of the amendment. That was not a characterization of what followed.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Reclaiming my time, if you will check what you said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD——

Mr. MILLER of California. I know what I said.

Mr. THOMAS of California. You expected that kind of behavior from this side of the aisle, clearly indicating, when I came to you and asked if I could go first, you said the chairman of the subcommittee had en bloc amendments. I said if he shows up at the beginning of the process, certainly, let him go first. I would like to try to be accommodated. He did not make it here.

Mr. MILLER of California. You were accommodated.

Mr. THOMAS of California. He did not make it here. I was accommodated. I used my time, and then the chairman goes ahead, and this is typical of the way in which you turn things. The chairman goes ahead and then, in inference, accuses me of sandbagging the operation.

And the only way I could have not had this extended was to cut off Members who, under the rules of the House, have every right to carry on debate under the 5-minute rule. That is all I want to point out.

Mr. MILLER of California. You have really lost the sun in this debate. You have absolutely lost the sun; if that is your characterization, then your vision is badly distorted.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I have the time. I thought he said he wanted to make sure the rules were honored, and here clearly he violates the rules that he wants to use to stop us. That is an example of the kind of duplicity that goes on around here. You cannot have it both ways. Either you want this side to honor the rules, then your side has to honor the rules. You use that as an argument to silence the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and then you go ahead after I said I reclaim my time yet you continue talking, because you believe you have the

right not to have to follow the rules, and I resent the kind of double standard that you use on the floor all the time.

All I wanted to do was point out that a simple amendment offered timely to the author of the bill was not considered. I offered an amendment which solved the problem.

□ 1120

I offered an amendment which solved the problem. We went through six alliterations of a change. And somebody who was not as stubborn as I was would have given up. What we finally did at the 11th hour was beat you back to a minimally acceptable language because frankly if you did not want to go to the one-square mile question of an amendment, I was willing to do that and you knew it and so I got the language that was minimally acceptable. And that is what has been done on every square mile in this desert bill. Your behavior on the floor clearly indicates, and the amendment process here clearly indicates, what we have had to go through and, frankly, this gentleman from California resents it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment and move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us in terms of the one-square mile road is of some concern. The basis for some of the negotiations, I might say, are directly related to the military withdrawal of China Lake which has been a long-time military reservation. The issue in the negotiations went on eliminated from perpetuity to a 15-year time period exactly matches those of what we are advocating as the House position in terms of the Engle pact and the withdrawals we have to renew every 15 years. That is the basis of the compromise.

Furthermore, this, of course, is a speculative project. I know some of my colleagues are convinced of the space-age technology and so forth, think that this is and they are absolutely convinced that this is going to become a reality. I do not know as much about it as some of the Members apparently who are present who obviously were trying to work in a fashion that will leave a window of opportunity so that if this goes forward the technology could be developed on such public land area.

I might further say that one square mile area, through a wilderness area, especially a road with the attendant type of activities that go on on roads is has a fairly significant impact on a much broader area than just the one-mile square area. As the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] well knows, who has worked on wilderness with this gentleman before, and on other land use questions, roads have a significant impact in terms of the delivery and access to individuals.

So the question about this really impacts a whole wilderness area, an area that, of course, is in a natural state now. Many of us know, and I know many of the Members on the other side, too, share the view that these wildernesses are not wasteland, that they are not lands that are worthless but are sensitive and should receive our care. So the concern and care with which we approach this—this gentleman was not aware of the gentleman's amendment about which he said he sent a letter. I saw the letter—and he is correct—to Mr. LEHMAN. But we were not contacted and it was not offered. So I was not aware until it was printed in the RECORD. So I instructed staff, along with Chairman MILLER's instruction to work on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Perhaps the gentleman was not here when I pointed out that the 1-square mile that was suggested for deletion was directly adjacent to a corridor that abuts the Naval Weapons Center which is nonwilderness and that a significant finger to carve out a mine, is adjacent to the other side of the 1-square mile.

So the comments about that I think, need to be looked at in light of the map. Finally, the gentleman said 15 years in the amendment is the appropriate number because of other things that you have done. If that is the case, why was not the 15 years offered originally? Why did your staff come back with a 5-year window?

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, I think the concern was to eliminate, if there is so much certainty with regard to this, why was not 5 years enough? In other words, once the execution of this was to taken place, the window that is open here, once the execution takes place then the road would, of course, be used, or I assume this site would be used in perpetuity. So that is the basis of the decision. We thought the project was—the concern is how imminent is the project? Of course, that is the degree of confidence that the gentleman apparently did not have with 5 years, and it is 15 years now in the compromise. But the 15 years obviously is the China Lake situation, so there is some symmetry here.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The original offer was 5 years.

Mr. VENTO. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Then the counter was 15. But the 15 years then was accompanied by language which made it an absolute necessity or it would not be approved. So it was not just the 15-year addition. It was additional language which limited the options and then there was a discussion over what is necessary. We got it too desirable. You then came with another sentence which made it impossible for the phrase desirable to work.

So the gentleman's characterization that we simply came back with 15 years is not borne out by all the facts as between the staffs. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VENTO. The gentleman is welcome to the time.

The point with regard to the 15 years I did not characterize with the other language, but I do not agree with the gentleman's interpretation of the argument over "necessary" and or "desirable" in terms of what the impact would have been. The concern, of course, is that we wanted to go forward. I am supporting the chairman's amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and would just suggest that this is a workable, a reasonable alternative in terms of addressing this particular issue. The other ancillary suggestions, of course, are something that came up late, was not offered in committee and, therefore, we are trying to work it out here on the floor today and I hope that that would be accomplished.

I might say too the gentleman from California has repeatedly stated that the gentleman from Minnesota was not here when he conducted his debate. This gentleman has been here throughout the debate. The gentleman from Minnesota has been here throughout the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(On request of Mr. LEWIS of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for securing this time for me.

Mr. Chairman, this gentleman from Minnesota has been here throughout the debate on the matter, although I did arrive after the amendment was read and entered into the RECORD. I did hear the entire explanation of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I must say the point the gentleman is making is an important point. This is precisely the point that caused these Members who represent the desert to object so strenuously to the fact that the chairman of the full committee, the night before the full committee markup brought in a substitute that was his substitute without benefit of these Members seeing it beforehand. Rather than having the subcommittee deal with complex details like this, he chose to arbitrarily deal with it in the full committee.

I would submit the least that could have happened with 14 new Members on your committee, that you could have had a subcommittee hearing on this process during this session of the Congress.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, the subcommittee, as the gentleman knows—and he testified before the subcommittee—did have a hearing on the California desert bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Not on the substitute.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would restrain, I would be happy to yield as time permits.

The point is that the procedure that was followed here is the usual procedure in the committee. Although there is no requirement to submit amendments of substitutes that are substantive, are very significant changes, as the gentleman is aware, there is a practice of trying to submit those to the minority and to the majority Members the day before, as early as possible. Obviously, with a complex bill that is sometimes late. But there is no requirement.

Indeed, of course, many of the amendments being offered today, are on the day of the markup, were not submitted.

If the gentleman will withhold, I will yield as time permits. I would ask for additional time myself if necessary. But the point is there is nothing unusual about this process. It is difficult for Members, I realize it is difficult to keep up with all the issues that we have before us, especially if the Member is not on the committee. But this process is the usual process, it is an open process and it is a difficult process.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must say that you are clearly making my very point about the way the committee does operate. It is suggested that the committee often operates in this fashion, submitting substitutes at the last minute. This is a very complex subject, it involves the districts of four Members of this House. An entire substitute at the full committee the night before, on complex issues like this, surely that might have been better handled at the subcommittee level.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, I might say that the Natural Resources Committee is one of the most productive committees and produces—works on a lot of different proposals that are complex. The types of changes included in this substitute, I might add, were very much a mirror of what had been introduced by Congressman LEHMAN in the initial bill, and were provisions that had been included in the Senate-passed measure. I do not believe that there were very many issues that were not dealt with by Members.

□ 1130

Now I understand for Members to go home and read a couple hundred pages of material at night is difficult. I must say that, if I want to play the role that I have to play, it is not uncommon occurrence for me, or for other Members around here, to do that. I say, "If you want to be a participant in this type of process, this is the sort of assignment that we get on a regular basis day in and day out."

So, I would just say, "Furthermore, this bill came up the next day, the substitute, all with unanimous consent."

Now I am not saying that our Members were happy with the circumstances, that they had this load of work and this particular prospect facing them. I am just suggesting to my colleagues that this is a process in terms of that we have to deal with, and clearly, in writing this, these subjects have been dealt with by the committee for the last 7 or 8 years. Here on the committee table before us is a whole record of hearings, of issues, almost all—I do not know of any that had been entirely new. There may be different policy initiatives and compromises in here, but all of which, I might say, also went in the direction of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] in terms of some of the suggestions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have one very brief question.

In this committee that operates in such a democratic fashion (small d; big D perhaps) just how frequently has there been a discharge of a measure of this significance in the full committee without a subcommittee markup?

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, this is not unusual. We have done it for any number of proposals before the committee, the Columbia Gorge, many others, with the concurrence of the subcommittee chairman and the unanimous consent request. This was a unanimous consent. Where any Republican or any Democrat could have objected if he wanted to take on that particular responsibility.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And I presume the gentleman understands that none of the four Members who represent the desert serve on the committee.

Mr. VENTO. I am aware of that, and I think it is regrettable. I wish the gentlemen had taken the time and would have the opportunity to do so, but admittedly I think there are many Members who are friends of the gentleman that do serve on the committee and are associates, and I think, as the gentleman even talks to the Members, and that is big D on this side, but they would have responded. Maybe not in agreement, but I think in fairness.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS]. The minority accepts this. We think it is a good amendment. It adds perfection to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in a generic sense and not with specific reference to this bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] said that there is nothing unusual about this process, and that is true. There is nothing unusual about this process except that the whole process is unusual in that there is very little comity extended to the Members whose districts are affected if their point of view happens to be different from that of the elitist majority. I know; I used to be a member of the subcommittee. I have cooperated with the gentleman from Minnesota, and I have opposed the gentleman from Minnesota.

However, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is this House could not and would not pass an omnibus national wilderness bill because, if we had such a bill, every Member of the House would be affected in the manner that the four gentleman from southern California are talking about. Everyone would have problems of this sort to be resolved, and consequently everyone would vote against it because they would not be accommodated in their representative capacity.

The way we go about passing wilderness legislation in this body is generally district by district by district, and it is easy for everybody to gang up on one individual Member; in this case, four individual Members, because it does not affects us. It only affects them.

I know. I had a wilderness bill, it only affected my district, the Irish wilderness bill. I know the gentleman will remember it back in 1983. The language of the law, as I recall, the enabling act of 1964, says that wilderness must be pristine, untrammeled by man, no manmade structures. Well, we made wilderness out of this area in my district that once had been totally denuded, completely logged. A great forest has arisen there again because of good multiuse management by the Forest Service, and at this point they

wanted to make a wilderness out of it. We had manmade ponds in this wilderness area that had been built to collect water to be used by the steam engines to haul the logs out. There were barbed wire fences all over the place and fallen-down farm buildings, but still it was designed a wilderness because it happened to be the next best place in Missouri, which produces 94 percent of all of the lead produced in the United States, to find lead. It happened to be the next best place in the country to look for lead and zinc. I realize how unpopular lead and zinc is in this body, but I want to tell my colleagues it provides a lot of jobs in Missouri, and it is worth about $2 billion to our economy. But the elitist interests wanted to shut down this industry and succeeded pretty well. We have got more mines closing every day.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that my sense of empathy and comity for the gentlemen from southern California has been greatly aroused as I listened to this debate. I really believe it would be the better practice of the House to listen in the early instance, the first instance, to concerns of Members who represent the district in which the wilderness is proposed to be located. There are some very serious representational rights involved here that I believe should have the opportunity to come to the top and to be heard, and I do not believe that our process allows for that.

I understand where the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the subcommittee, are coming from. Their point of view happens to be different from those of us on the other side of these issues. So, I raise the point I do because I think it is instructive for the whole House. I say to my colleagues, "Remember that what is happening here, should the Thomas amendment fail, is something that could happen to any single one of you if they want to put a wilderness in your district. Local interests need to be accommodated."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for having yielded this time to me. Let me just follow up briefly with the general defect and flaw of this plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. HANSEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, we have a problem in California right now, and the problem is that the people who live in California and the businesses that operate in California, and even the Government presence, the Federal Government presence in California, senses that we represent absolutism and extremism with respect to the heavy hand of Government suppressing any attempt to accommodate either people, or business, or even in some cases national security interests, and because of that the U-Haul trailers are heading in a one-way stream out of California, and it saddens me that we have this situation where there is never bipartisanship, there is never cooperation.

We have 7,000,000 acres that are being proposed in wilderness, and yet the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] in whose district this 640 acres, roughly one ten-thousandth of the land proposed for wilderness, is not accommodated when he makes a very compelling argument, and I just want to recount for my colleagues, who also have lots of good blue-collar constituents who work in the aerospace industry, and the high-technology industry, and many of these businesses that are leaving California, the fact that we would never see this, perhaps, in other States; in Texas for example.

Mr. Chairman, I have some relatives here from Texas today watching these proceedings, and their Democrats would accommodate the Republicans, and they would sit down with the people whose districts were being affected, and I just want to recount for my friends on the other side, because I think it is an important California problem because our people have to eat, they have to put food on the table, they have to send their kids to college, the words of one of our aerospace leaders who made a statement last year: "I will never build another plane in California because of the heavy hand of government."

Mr. Chairman, we are seeing this manifestation of this heavy hand of government in the treatment of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and his district.

□ 1140

There is a lot of difference here. I wish we had a relief map here which is 3-dimensional where we could see the extreme difficulty of trying to build this one access road to get to this very important site that the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has described to us in this debate. There will be a lot of extra expense, and the committee could have accommodated the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and they did not. I think that was a tragedy.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 518, the so-called California Desert Protection Act.

The proponents of this bill claim to represent the people of California when in fact Californians affected by it support a bill that has over 15 years of study behind it, and that is the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and I urge my colleagues to support that bill.

Under the substitute, 2.1 million acres of wilderness would be protected as a result of the studies that include on-the-ground inventories, many public meetings, and the completion of environmental impact statements and mineral reports on such areas recommended for wilderness. Yet the proponents of this bill neglect to tell us about that.

In contrast, H.R. 518 is nothing more than blatant special interest legislation that will negatively impact millions of Californians. Only these few environmental groups support H.R. 518.

The economic impact of H.R. 518 is of great concern to me. The bill comes at a time when our State is in a deep recession. The Bureau of Land Management estimates that management costs for just the South Algodones for law enforcement, equipment, materials, and maintenance in the first year would be $1.2 million. Thereafter annual costs would be $604,000 just for the South Algodones, which is a very small portion of the millions of acres involved.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will yield at the end of my statement.

Mr. VENTO. What I have to offer is related to the statement the gentleman just made.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will yield if I have the time, and I will be happy to do that in just a moment.

But for just the South Algodones, if we have to appropriate additional funding, that is no problem for this body because we do spend money that we do not have, but I guarantee that the check will bounce.

The Bureau of Land Management and the Department of the Interior have identified $6 billion in costs. This is the Department of the Interior, not a Republican group. It is the Interior Department itself.

Moreover, with the existing National Park boundaries, there are private lands totaling 336 areas that have long been authorized for acquisition, but we could not afford to buy the land. If we pass this bill, we still cannot afford to buy it, but the Federal Government is going to have to come up with new appropriations to buy these lands. That is no problem for this body which loves to spend money.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I would just point out that on the South Algodones, the land the gentleman referred to is deleted by an

amendment for wilderness in committee, and, therefore, it is not designated as wilderness in this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank, the gentleman. As a matter of fact, we have hundreds and thousands really of people all over this community who are affected by this.

Mr. VENTO. May we now, with that information, convince the gentleman to support this bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I said, that is just one small portion of the total, I would point out to the chairman of the subcommittee.

There are further fiscal hardships on Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks. These parks need adjustment. How can we add 30 million new acres when we are having trouble managing the 80 million we already have?

From a local standpoint, with the unemployment in Imperial County over 22 percent, this legislation would certainly aggravate a serious economic situation. Historically, the desert of California has afforded many of us uses—wildlife habitat, military training, mining, ranching, and farming. And I want to say also that I ride three-wheelers, and I appreciate the gentleman restricting the South Algodones from this bill.

Recreational use in the desert has provided a way of life, as my friend, the gentleman for California [Mr. HUNTER], said, for the blue-collar worker who cannot afford to go on rich hunts. Let us not lock out our people. Let us not lock people out of the desert.

Let us support the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] that provides for the recreational purposes and for all of the needs we are looking for in the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman mentioned the substitute we will be considering later, and I think it is important that the public as well as the Members understand that the four Members from the desert, who represent the desert, are not opposed to wilderness and they do support our Park System.

Our substitute, which is the item the gentleman mentioned, would still create the largest wilderness legislation in the lower 48 States separate from Alaska by designating 62 areas covering 2.3 million acres. My legislation would also increase the size of Death Valley National Monument an the Joshua Tree National Monument by transferring 108,00 acres from the BLM to the Park Service for Death Valley and 4,800 acres from BLM in the Joshua Tree. These are areas I represent.

The public should know that currently there is a backlog of 22,000 acres that have been authorized for wilderness that have not been acquired. The Santa Monica Mountains alone would cost some $500 million. It is very apparent the public in California is concerned about these kinds of expenditures and they are not ready to produce the money. We just had the defeat of a major parks bill that was on the ballot in California. Indeed that proposition that would create funding for parks was defeated in the very district of the chairman of this committee who is proposing that we add millions and millions of unneeded parkland to the park system.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—42

Ballenger	Grandy	Royce
Barton	Hastert	Sanders
Bevill	Hastings	Schumer
Blackwell	Laughlin	Sharp
Clay	Machtley	Shuster
Collins (MI)	McCurdy	Skelton
Cooper	Meek	Slattery
Cox	Moakley	Solomon
Dicks	Murtha	Sundquist
Faleomavaega (AS)	Orton	Tucker
	Packard	Washington
Flake	Rangel	Weldon
Foglietta	Ridge	Whitten
Frost	Romero-Barcelo (PR)	Williams
Gejdenson		

□ 1206

Mr. GRAMS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote 229, the Thomas of California amendment, as amended, I was unavoidably detained in committee and entered the Chamber as the vote was being announced.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments that were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in accordance with the rule, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments, as modified, offered by Mr. VENTO:

Page 11, line 1, after "a road" insert "and utilities".

Page 16, lines 18 and 19, strike "two hundred forty-nine thousand three hundred and sixty-eight acres" and in lieu thereof insert "two hundred nine thousand six hundred and eight acres".

Page 17, line 4, strike "May 1991" and in lieu thereof insert "July 1993".

Page 32, after line 2 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(5) Certain lands which comprise approximately thirty-nine thousand seven hundred and sixty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kingston Range Potential Future Wilderness," dated May 1994.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, the modifications in the amendment, and incidentally, I appreciate the cooperation of the minority members of the Committee on Natural Resources and other members, the modifications merely correct the page and line references. They have already been discussed with the minority and they had no objections.

These amendments respond to a number of concerns raised by the Department of Defense. The first of the en bloc amendments would make clear that the authority for a right-of-way between Fort Irwin and the Twenty-Nine Palms area could also be used for utilities.

□ 1210

Mr. Chairman, there is already language about a road there, but there was some question from the Department of Defense whether or not utilities could also be placed based on the language in the bill, so we have clarified that in the first en bloc amendment.

The other three en bloc amendments would change the wilderness designation to leave a number of areas immediately adjacent to Fort Irwin in wilderness study status. The effect of this is to defer decisions about the designation of these areas until Congress acts on the proposals for the expansion of Fort Irwin. We expect these proposals will be forthcoming later.

This is the same as the Senate bill. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the initial wilderness study areas and the designation decisions and so forth were made early in the process over a period of 6 or 7 years, and obviously events have evolved and Fort Irwin is in a plan and they are looking at perhaps seeking further withdrawals and other modifications that would impact if we designated this as wilderness.

That is to say, we have historically not taken wilderness areas and withdrawn them for military purposes. The effect of this is to leave it in wilderness study status where it will be managed as wilderness but leaves the possibility open for any expansions or modifications to withdrawals for Fort Irwin.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments, I think, are noncontroversial.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority has looked at this particular amendment. We support it. I believe it is supported by the DOD, and I remember the Committee on Armed Services supported this, we feel it takes care of the problems that we are having with the military issue on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was not able to catch the first part of the gentleman's dialogue relative to this amendment. I would ask to engage in a colloquy.

My specific question is, there has been an expression on the part of the Marine Corps at the Twenty-nine Palms Base to have access to the north for a main rail spur which then they would be able to move on the rails the tanks that are a part of the activity there and the training exercises to the west coast or to some location in a rapid deployment procedure as well as to have a means by which to deploy into the Fort Irwin area and vice versa. It is roughly about a 22-mile corridor.

Have we been able to accommodate this?

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's question.

The first part of the en bloc amendment dealt with utilities as well as a road. That was the first en bloc amendment. The remainder keeps the areas around Fort Irwin in wilderness study status. Based on our discussions with the Department of Defense, the bill and the modified version that we are making here with regards to this will meet any of their concerns at this time. I have a letter which so states. We will later be adding, of course, another title, noncontroversial, I think, with the concurrence of the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and myself on the withdrawals.

As far as we know, there has been no additional or new requests made. But if a request is made, these lands around here will be wilderness study so a request can be made and studied at that time. So far we have no such request for the withdrawal of the corridor that the gentleman has pointed out. So far as we know, the bill meets all the concerns and considerations of the Department of Defense at this time.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Do I understand, then, that the language of the bill as it currently exists, in the event that the armed services wish to proceed with what it is that I have discussed earlier, that the language of the bill would accommodate that as it now exists, or would this require an act of Congress to readjust the wilderness boundaries?

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, we have accommodated the corridor between Twenty-nine Palms and Fort Irwin in this legislation. We have taken other areas and placed them in the wilderness study rather than in the wilderness designation, so if there are further withdrawals, some of those withdrawals would have to come before Congress, being over 5,000 acres under the Engle Act and the bill when we finally conclude it based on the amendments that we have agreed to, that is, by the gentleman from California, Mr. FARR, myself and others, will, in fact,

deal with the concerns that the military has raised.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding.

I want to ask a general question, for I am not sure the House understands the reason for our focusing upon items relative to military land available in this region.

This area is the home of the National Training Center for the Army, that territory which General Schwarzkopf described as the most important in terms of the training required for us to be successful in the Middle East. Adjacent to it by about 30 miles as the crow flies is the Twentynine Palms training base. There are plans in the future to coordinate those activities extensively.

Can the gentleman give me some specific indication as to how many acres would be available under this measure just to the east, if there is a need to move to the east, in terms of Fort Irwin's operation?

Mr. VENTO. The gentleman is aware, of course, there are literally millions of acres of BLM land that is not designated as wilderness or park in the measure that is before us. Immediately in this area, of course, there was a concern in terms of designating wilderness in some area, 100,000 acres. What we are doing in this instance with this amendment is keeping it not as a wilderness designation but as a study area. The concern, as the gentleman from California knows, is that the military, the Army and the Department of Defense, have not requested or asked us for withdrawal or sought a withdrawal of any other land as of this time.

We do not know what the request will be, if there will be a request forthcoming. We are going the extra mile by obviously recognizing that this is in the planning stages at various points, and in this particular instance responding by not designating it, by treating it as wilderness study. Potentially we will have this decision before us when it is sought for withdrawal under the Engle Act as required, over 5,000 acres, and/or we would have it before us at such time as potential consideration of wilderness or nonwilderness.

We are really keeping it in a holding pattern at this time based on the Vento amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I guess the chairman understands the reason for my question. I am very, very concerned that even the current military who may be operating the facility do not have a full recognition of its long-term potential in terms of the training and retraining that we are going to need.

To the east of Fort Irwin is a sizable piece of territory that, as I understand it, is within the part designation. It was territory where we had the training and retraining of troops that were involved in World War II.

Is there a significant number of acres just to the east of Fort Irwin that would be available for expansion under this provision?

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, yes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Could the gentleman give me an indication of the number of those acres?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. I would suggest to the gentleman, I do not have the exact acreage number before me, but it is more than 170,000 acres. We responded to the Defense Department's requests concerning lands available for wilderness by leaving these areas in wilderness study area or undesignated lands and it is adequate to what the request is of the Department of Defense as to the amount.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question for the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman for one additional question.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is apparent to the membership that this vast area has huge potential in terms of activity that involves flight and overflight, very important to the military. This is territory where the stealth airplanes fly, for example.

What kinds of provisions does the gentleman have in this bill limiting overflight in terms of military activity?

□ 1220

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, there are no provisions in the current bill. The plan is with regards to adding another title that deals with the military withdrawal, which would, of course, provide for continual operation and ensure a compatibility with the designations made in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, this particular language and these designations would not restrict the military flights. I would point out to the gentleman though that the gentleman from Minnesota and others have introduced legislation dealing with the overflights issue.

As a matter of fact, it is a very significant outstanding issue, and I know that the chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], of the Armed Services subcommittee, is interested in it, was planning a hearing next week, but had to postpone it. But the subcommittee on Natural Resources, Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, will have a hearing next Friday. So there is a continuing focus on the overflights issue over public lands with regards to all sorts of aircraft in BLM and Forest Service lands.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the chairman's response. If I could just comment further. This is important for the membership to understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. LEWIS of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It is very important the membership understand, but especially the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the appropriate Appropriations subcommittees, there is little doubt that there is serious potential impact to our ability to prepare for the national defense in this bill. It is my view this bill should have been designed in a fashion to deal with those questions straightforward, that is, in the bill, so it would have gone to the Committee on Armed Services. There is no question it was designed to bypass that committee in terms of this debate. It is very important that the membership know that we need to look at this very carefully.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, we have worked very closely with them. We have passed separate bills on these withdrawals. We have passed separate bills in the previous instance and worked with the committee. We have received a letter of correspondence which I will place at this point in the RECORD from the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. There has been an absolute close working relationship here.

The prerogatives and the powers and the needs of the military, the Department of Defense, are dealt with, will be dealt with in this bill in a way that is noncontroversial and completely supportive of the U.S. military capability and training.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 1994.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have reviewed Mr. Vento's proposed amendment to H.R. 518, the California Desert Protection Act. This

amendment addresses all of the matters that are the subject of H.R. 880, a bill which was jointly referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources. Although Mr. Vento's amendment does involve matters within the legislative jurisdiction of this committee, the Armed Services committee will interpose no objection to Mr. Vento's amendment if it is offered on the House floor, assuming that you will not object to a perfecting amendment that Mr. Farr will offer regarding military overflights.

Thank you for your cooperation on this matter, and if I may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS, *Chairman.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. MCCANDLESS and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do not want to belabor the issue, but we talked about the posture of the Defense Department.

Although this is not directly in my territory, it is aligned to my territory, meaning my constituency, and the problem we have here over the last couple of years in discussing this corridor is that those in the defense family at the management levels in the area have said in so many words, "We need to incorporate something like this into the plan that you fellows are discussing at the Congress," but because of what one fellow described, and this is nothing to do with the gentleman in question, but because of the buzz saw complexity of the way that discussion is taking place and has taken place over the years, "I cannot necessarily get some of my superiors to get involved because of the complexity of what has taken place in the way of a desert plan."

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and that is the explanation that I got from the Defense Department not getting involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

The amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER: Page 34, after line 25, insert the following:

LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS

SEC. 112. Nothing in this Act, including the wilderness designations made by this Act, may be construed to preclude Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies from conducting law enforcement and border operations as permitted before the enactment of this Act, including the use of motor vehicles and aircraft, on any lands designated as wilderness by this Act.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, we have a complication with respect to the border that is manifest in the Desert Protection Act.

Let me tell you what it is: A number of the smugglers' routes that cocaine smugglers, marijuana smugglers, and alien smugglers use to come into California across the international boarder abut and are adjacent to these proposed desert wilderness areas that come right down to and touch the international border.

As the bill was being developed, we solicited comments from the Border Patrol agencies, and let me tell you what they said to us. They said we have to maintain vehicularized access and aircraft access to these smugglers' routes, even though they now will overlay wilderness areas, because we regularly go in with four-wheel-drives, off-road vehicles, aircraft, to not only pursue smugglers that are going through the wilderness areas, coming back up into the United States, but also "to check our sensors which, out in the boondocks, out in the country, are necessary. These are sensors that allow us to know when large numbers of people, either illegal aliens or narcotics smugglers, are moving north," so it is very, very important that we maintain the right for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials to pursue smugglers of illegal aliens and narcotics, even though they are coming across now into what will be called wilderness areas which heretofore were not wilderness areas.

Let me just tell you what has happened with respect to the narcotics smuggling industry immediately to the south of San Diego, CA. We have built a steel fence, and the gentleman from San Diego, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], has been a partner in building this fence. We have built a steel fence now that covers 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean to the coastal hills. That steel fence has stopped all the drivethrough drug traffic. We had some 300 drug trucks a month that were coming through roaring across the international border with cocaine, going up and hitting the major freeway arteries at highway 5 and 805, going north to Los Angeles, going north to Sacramento, going to Portland, OR, going to every major city in this country, with a cargo that kills our children: cocaine.

Now we have built this steel fence made out of Desert Storm landing mat that is now 15 miles long, and the smugglers initially were interdicted in massive numbers. We increased cocaine interdiction by 1,000 percent when we built the fence, because there were still a few gaps in the fence, and we were able to concentrate our Boarder Patrol and drug enforcement agents at this fence. We were able to catch 10 times as smugglers the year after we built the fence than we had the year before.

However, the smugglers got smart. They moved out into the desert area to flank the fence. Because of that, in Imperial County where these proposed desert areas lay, the narcotics interdiction went from about $113 million worth of narcotics 2 years ago to almost $600 million worth of narcotics last year. That means they have gone up fourfold because the smugglers are now exploiting the desert area.

Now, I have on this map some of the smuggling routes that they are using right now to bring cocaine to our children. One of these smuggling routes that we got from the Border Patrol goes right through the Jacumba Wilderness Area. Another one comes straight up the Imperial Valley and comes up into the Chuckwalla Wilderness Area. Another one comes up right along the Colorado River Valley right into the Pacacho Peak Wilderness Area, the Indian Pass and Julian Wash proposed wilderness areas. Now, I want to read to you just for a second the statement from Manuel Cazares, Deputy Chief Patrol Agent in Imperial Valley with respect to the desperate need to maintain vehiclularized access by law enforcement officials.

He said that for a successful interdiction program:

We must have total and unlimited access to these areas. We have gone on record stating that we will assist any law enforcement agency in enforcing whatever restrictions are finally arrived at in these areas. Since 1985, there have been 31 deaths in these desert areas. Our officers have rescued 81 people that would have died had our officers not rescued them when they did.

□ 1230

These people were already dehydrated and in bad shape. So in many cases you have illegal aliens coming across the border, getting dehydrated in the desert and it is only because our border patrol is able to come in and save them, either by coming in with helicopters and landing and giving them emergency service before the mobile units or the 4-wheel-drives arrive, and by working the area and finding them they were able to save 31 a year. In addition, though, about 31 a year die in the desert.

So we are going to have a lot of bodies out in this desert if we do not allow the Border Patrol to have continued access.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Agent Carreras says further,

We are in the Jacumba and also Fish Creek areas almost daily with either 4x4 vehicles or

aircraft. The purpose being to detect the illegal entry of aliens and drug smugglers. We do this by looking for tracks of both people and vehicles and by utilizing electronic detection devices, which have to be checked and serviced on a regular basis.

My friends, it is desperately important that we not, in putting this desert bill together, which is well intentioned, that we do not open up drug havens, safe havens for drug smugglers, because they are very flexible. They will exploit any safe alley created by this act. Unless we maintain the status quo, which is vehicular access, we are going to see people dying in the desert, we are going to have massive doses of narcotics come across this line that destroy our American children.

I would be happy to yield first to my colleague from San Diego, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and second to my colleague from California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, who has been very concerned about this matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is important in pointing out as in Florida when the antidrug efforts put a lot of pressure on the dealers, they moved. With the 300 drug trucks coming through just the San Diego area, we are putting pressure, the gentlemen from California and myself and several others, we supported 6,000 border patrol in the crime bill and we got 600 border patrol last year working with Janet Reno. That will help.

What we are going to do is see them move away from the population areas to the desert. There has also been news in the San Diego press about illegal attempts, because we are shutting them off at those drug corridors and they are attempting to come through the desert. That flow will increase if we do not allow access to the border patrol and law enforcement agents.

The second thing is that aircraft will make low-level flights there if there is no one there protecting it. This is why it is important, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, generally I think that first of all wilderness permits emergency and lifesaving and so forth and does permit the use of motorized vehicles in those instances. There is a unique problem here, a dilemma, apparently, in essence.

I just want to ask a question of the sponsor. On page 6 of his amendment his talks about "before the enactment of this act." In other words, he is talking about a date immediately before the enactment of the act. Is that the concern here? In other words, the standard here is what are the activities immediately, the activities that have gone on for 50 years? I think there is some misinterpretation here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. VENTO and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman understands my question: The language, "before the enactment of this act," we are talking about the immediacy, the status quo which is taking place now.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. In other words, we are talking about the fact that in asking law enforcement agents to tell us what they are doing, they have come back and told us that they are in the wilderness areas daily with 4-wheel-drive vehicles, and with aircraft, I might add. But that is the status quo. That is what we are referring to, that we continue to have the access.

Let me just say to my friend that as the drug smugglers flank the efforts being made to stop them in the coastal area and they come into the desert in increasing numbers, with increasing sophistication, we may need more of these thousands of new border patrol agents that Democrats and Republicans agree we need, and perhaps more vehicles, more 4x4 vehicles.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield further, I appreciate his clarification. I understand that nobody wants to create a safe haven here for anymore by virtue of limiting ourselves in terms of the tools that law enforcement officers need to challenge the illegal aliens and, tragically, those who find themselves in a life-threatening situation because of an action of an illegal entry into the country in this area.

So the issue is a tough one, but I just want to be certain as to what the gentleman precisely means. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and thank him for his clarification.

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from San Diego once again.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One quick point: There is emergency language, emergencies to allow these vehicles to get in, but if you take those border patrol law enforcement agents out of there, you are not going to have as many people in the field to find those people, and deaths would result.

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's amendment does not set any precedent here. It deals with a unique situation that we have in this desert area. It allows for those activities to continue, at least not be restricted, that are being engaged in today. It makes sure that nothing in the bill will hamper or restrict or hinder law enforcement in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment. I think he has an excellent way of dealing with the problem here.

I point out this is different than the Senate solution, which would restrict the language to just the three wilderness study areas on the border. This would apply to the entire region as well.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; I think it is important to read the Border Patrol's answer where they say, "We must have access to all areas because the smugglers would quickly identify which areas are areas in which vehicular access might be restricted." They also find meth labs in this area.

I thank the gentleman for his support and the efforts he has made in putting together this idea that we need to maintain law enforcement capability in the wilderness areas.

I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment. We have had a chance to review the amendment, and we would accept the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the minority also accepts the amendment and feels it is an excellent amendment as an addition to the bill.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a little confusion here on the part of the issue, as I see it, and that is why I wish to comment on it.

First and foremost, we have to clarify the separate issue. We are concerned here with existing activities in the desert on the part of narcotics, smugglers, and other types of illegal activities, not the least of which are meth laboratories and a number of other facilities which are stationary but temporary, until they are caught.

Now, if there are meth laboratories established and operating in what is currently a proposed wilderness area, to be made into wilderness under this bill, then without this amendment, law enforcement is hampered by the fact that it cannot move into the wilderness area for enforcement purposes. Therein lies a problem that I have.

The purpose of this amendment is simply to insure that local enforcement agencies will be able to continue their diligent work in these areas. To quote the sheriff of Riverside County, it is "absolutely critical" that they retain unrestricted access to all wilderness areas that are to be created by this bill.

In the desert, it is a well-documented fact that the bad guys are not going to

conduct their illegal activities according to the land uses in this bill. Under this bill, Congress will designate 8 million acres of California desert as protected wilderness. How long do you think it will take for drug makers to figure out where to set up their meth labs, or illegal alien smugglers to figure where to hide their human contraband? That certainly is not rocket science. Without regular access by law enforcement, there areas will be congressionally designated "safe havens" for criminal activity.

□ 1240

It is, therefore, essential that law enforcement be provided unrestricted access to all wilderness, all wilderness which will be created by this bill, including the use of motorized vehicles. Let me read for my colleagues two quotes from law enforcement agencies which provide some detail as to the nature of criminal activity in just one part of the desert:

The Riverside County Sheriff's department, in conjunction with federal authorities, recently conducted Operation Range Rover. This was a coordinated effort to stem the flow of narcotics through the Riverside County Desert Area. The scope of the project was from the Mexican border, north to Interstate Highway 10, between Blythe and Indio. As a result of this operation, we confirmed intelligence indicating that this area is a major thoroughfare for illegal narcotics, including marijuana, cocaine, and heroin. This path is chosen by smugglers to avoid detection by law enforcement authorities. There is also the problem of illegal immigration through the area.—Cois Byrd, Sheriff.

I would point out that two of the wilderness areas to be designated in Riverside County, the Orocopias and the Chuckwallas, are part of the area in which we are now discovering criminal activity taking place, and would be convenient passages north from the border in Imperial County. Therein lies the reason I am standing here.

I wish to do another quote here:

I can tell you that smugglers of both aliens and narcotics often attempt to circumvent our traffic check operation located on Highway 111, north of Niland, California. They do this by walking and driving vehicles through the Chocolate Mountains Naval bombing range utilizing existing roads that cut through the Chuckwalla Mountains and eventually intersect with Interstate 10, which carries them into the Los Angeles area and points outward. On July 11, 1993, we seized 899 pounds of cocaine worth $28 million attempting to traverse this area.—(Johnny Williams, Chief Patrol Agent, U.S. Border Patrol)

These are wide open and rugged areas, interlaced with designated wilderness areas in this bill. To patrol them effectively, we need to maintain a constant enforcement presence. In order to bust heavily armed drug traffickers, our law enforcement people cannot hike into a wilderness area on foot, nor can they charge up on horseback. Regular motorized access is essential to interdiction and enforcement operations in this kind of terrain.

It should be clear by now that these deserts are a major conduit for the narcotic garbage that is polluting the youth of our country. Much of these drugs go on to the big cities, but I can tell my colleagues that far too much of it stays in my district. I have seen the effects of these drugs in what used to be sleepy rural communities, and most of my colleagues can tell similar stories. So, I cannot be convinced that we can get by with less than this amendment. Do not tell me that, "We are serious about stopping the flow of drugs, but we have to tie the hands of the law enforcement personnel who are on the front lines."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. McCANDLESS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCANDLESS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCANDLESS. "Absolutely critical." Those are the words that best define this amendment. Without unrestricted access into wilderness areas, local law enforcement officers can't do their jobs right. The Hunter-McCandless amendment will send two strong messages. The first is one of unqualified support to the men and women in the field on our behalf. The second will signal that it is now open season on those who would commit crimes in the California desert. Help us send this message. Nothing else measures up.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentlemen from California, Mr. HUNTER and Mr. McCANDLESS, for their fine work on what I consider to be a very excellent amendment. Each and, I think, every Member of this body has heard from local law enforcement officials about their struggles in the ongoing war against crime and drugs. This amendment cuts right to the heart of their concerns.

As the law is currently interpreted, Mr. Chairman, local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies are severely hampered in their efforts to prevent the manufacturing of illicit drugs in wilderness areas—not just near the border but throughout the California desert. As if the job of the desert rangers, Border Patrol agents, and county sheriffs is not tough enough already, the bill that relates to the desert, as it was produced by this committee, and actually as it is designed in the other body, the bill ensures that one of the most notorious drug and alien smuggling corridors in the United States remains just the way it has been.

It is very important that the Members recognize that this amendment not only should pass, but it should pass substantially, and we should insist upon this language in the conference. This amendment is different from the bill as it passed the other body in the sense that all 71 safe havens for these drug producers is affected. The 71 wilderness areas, minus the three along the Mexican border, in the Senate bill is a drug lord's dream in my judgment. I say, "If you can only patrol the area on foot or horseback in much of the desert, then certainly you can't expect the law enforcement will be able to effectively enforce the law as it currently stands."

Keep in mind that this desert terrain is extremely rugged.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to travel to an area in the boondocks in my own district, to visit a facility of the kind that we are talking about not too long, not too far distant, from Needles, CA. I was taken to what would appear to be an out-in-the-country wilderness home. It turned out to be a 5,000-square-foot home that literally had not been used for family living. I wondered why we were visiting this facility, and we went downstairs, and there was 10,000 square feet of basement, a very, very elaborate electrical and watering system. The place had been designed in little squares, and they grew various stages of marijuana within this facility because it is in the countryside. It was designed perfectly for this kind of drug producer as well as being a smuggler haven.

So, I say to my colleagues, "It's very important that all of these wilderness areas be addressed as this bill goes forward. Instead of our just paying lip service to the hard-working men and women of the Border Patrol and other law enforcement agencies, it's very important that we address directly the serious drug problems."

Mr. Chairman, drug manufacturing, drug smuggling and illegal alien smuggling need a tourniquet. These problems are out of control in the desert.

Those of us who represent the areas are very, very concerned about making sure we do not send a message that just is lip service to law enforcement.

The message that they want us to pass along to our colleagues is to give them the authority to do the job and do it well. They need access to the wilderness areas. This problem does not just affect communities like Barstow, Needles, Twentynine Palms, and Lone Pine. The drugs that are manufactured in these safe havens in wilderness areas are sold in the inner cities. So, Mr. Chairman, it is all of our problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to enter into the RECORD the two very specific letters that I have received from sheriffs in my own territory, Dick Williams of San Bernardino County and Allan George of Inyo County, who very strongly feel we need to maintain this kind of language reflected in this amendment throughout the process.

San Bernardino County sheriff, Dick Williams, says:

* * * The illegal drug trade has used our desert areas as aircraft landing sites and as

the location for illegal drug manufacturing laboratories. It could literally take days for our officers to hike into some of these isolated locations where drug laboratories have been found and suspects have been arrested * * *

Inyo County sheriff, Allan George, says:

Our department is asking you to seek an amendment to allow local law enforcement access the areas covered in S. 21 and H.R. 518 by using motorized vehicles to preserve the area, and better serve the citizens which use these lands.

Sheriff George goes on to say:

Without being allowed to access to immediately respond to these calls, we will not be able to provide protection and will limit our duty to carry out the protection of life and property.

□ 1250

Whether or not it is the intent of the other body in their legislation, they have severely restricted law enforcement in connection with dealing with safe havens, and it certainly should go through the entire process. I hope the Members of the House will insist that this amendment go through the entire process. It should not be tinkered with in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, along with my other colleagues from California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. CALVERT, who are very concerned about this issue and who cosponsored this amendment. I want to thank the gentleman for all the attention and effort he has given this problem, because so often we move ahead with legislation that seemingly solves one problem and we find out shortly thereafter that we have massive bureaucratic problems in another area.

Let me say that the drug war is one place where we cannot afford to make mistakes. The guys on the other side who are shipping this stuff are very smart, and they will take advantage of any loopholes that can be exploited. The gentleman is absolutely right when he says that wilderness areas, should they be considered to be off limits for motorized vehicles, will instantly be exploited as havens not only for the transport of drugs but, I think, also for manufacturing. We are finding the meth-labs now in wilderness areas.

I want to thank the gentleman for rounding up the experts in his area who know what is happening and getting their comments on record.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the comments of my colleague, and I will not take any additional time except to say that the public out there that is worried about drugs and manufacturing and the illicit use of territories like this should be aware of the fact that we are not talking about a small territory. My desert alone in San Bernardino County is large enough to hold four eastern States. We have to give law enforcement the kind of tools they need, and I am very concerned that we will end up finally in conference having language like the other body has produced instead of this very fine amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for printing with my remarks the following letters from law enforcement officials addressed to me:

MAY 5, 1994.

Hon. JERRY LEWIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Subject: S. 21 (Desert Protection Act).

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEWIS: Throughout the process of Senate Bill 21 moving from the House of Origin to the House of Representatives, I and my staff have continued to raise the issue of law enforcement access to the areas being designated as wilderness area for the purposes of performing legitimate law enforcement functions.

I have attempted on many occasions to educate other members of the congress about the unique nature of San Bernardino County which contains a large portion of the area to be designated as a wilderness area.

San Bernardino County is the largest county in the continental United States with over 20,000 square miles of land mass. A major portion of that area will be effected by Senate Bill 21. Each year the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department responds to hundreds of calls for search and rescue of lost hikers, and mine explorers. In a desert environment, time is critical in the mortality rate of the victims.

Over the years, modern motorized equipment (i.e., modified motorcycles, trucks with wenches and helicopters with heat-seeking devices) have sped up our response to these emergency situations. This measure, as currently proposed, would prevent the use of this modern equipment in the saving of lives of individuals who find themselves injured or lost in this wilderness area.

An additional concern of ours is that the illegal drug trade has used our desert areas as aircraft landing sites and as the location for illegal drug manufacturing laboratories. It could take literally days for our officers to hike into some of these isolated locations where drug laboratories have been found and suspects arrested. Our experiences have found that many of these drug manufacturers will be heavily armed. The chemicals and solutions they use in the manufacture of narcotics are considered hazardous waste which would make the cleanup almost impossible, by preventing motorized vehicles to enter into the site to remove these dangerous substances from this wilderness area.

I am asking you to seek an amendment to allow an exemption for local law enforcement to enter these areas utilizing motorized vehicles in order to preserve the area for the law abiding public to utilize. It is important to note that currently in several national forests, especially in the Northern California area, drug dealers have taken over large tracts of property to grow illegal crops. The federal government is unable to respond to this problem and must rely on local law enforcement to conduct the investigations and eradication of these illegal crops.

The argument has been put forth that local law enforcement can operate in these areas if they are working in conjunction with federal officers. There is simply not enough federal officers available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year to provide protection to the citizens from both illegal activities and life-threatening emergencies in the area proposed in the desert protection act. Local law enforcement will be receiving the first calls for service and accordingly, should respond appropriately. Without this exemption, we will not be able to provide safety to the public.

We urge you to make our concerns known and for you to request of your colleagues that they not tie our hands in the enforcement of drug trafficking laws by providing a safe zone for drug manufacturers to set up in isolated areas.

I have assigned my legislative liaison, Sgt. Paul Curry to assist you or your staff in resolving these concerns. Please feel free to contact Sgt. Curry at (909) 387-0632.

Sincerely,

DICK WILLIAMS,
Sheriff.

COUNTY OF INYO,
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,
Independence, CA, May 9, 1994.

Congressman JERRY LEWIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEWIS: This letter is to express our concern with Senate Bill 21 and the issue of law enforcement assess to the areas being designated as wilderness for the purpose of performing legitimate law enforcement functions.

Inyo County is one of the largest counties in the Continental United States with over 10,000 square miles. Our primary industry is tourism and our department responds to hundreds of calls for search and rescues of lost hikers and mine explorers.

Our department is dependent on motorized vehicles, 4x4 vehicles, motorcycles, helicopters, and fixed wing aircraft to locate victims where time is of the essence to their survival in a desert type terrain.

Another concern is the use of our lands in Inyo County for illegal drug activities such as labs and landing sites. We feel that in closing the access to these areas by law enforcement vehicles will open the door for illegal Drug Manufacturers and traffickers to use federal lands for this purpose. It would take hours and in most cases days to access these areas by foot and expose our personnel to risks' of being detected by these normally heavily armed suspects. Also, the chemicals used by drug manufacturers are very hazardous and would limit the clean-up activities if motorized vehicles into remote areas were eliminated.

Our department is asking you to seek an amendment to allow local law enforcement to access the areas covered in Senate Bill 21 by using motorized vehicles in order to preserve the area, and better serve the citizens which use these lands.

This bill will affect a large portion of our country and currently much of our county is BLM, U.S. Forest Service, and Death Valley monument property. Our experience working

with the Federal Law Enforcement has been a positive one, however they are unable to provide the services 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Our department is usually the first notified and responding agency to any calls for service in these remote area's. Without being allowed access to immediately respond to these calls for service we will not be able to provide protection and will limit our duty to carry out the protection of life and property.

We urge you to make our concerns known and to inform your colleagues of our concerns. This situation will effect each and every citizen visiting the proposed area.

Sincerely,

ALLAN B. GEORGE,
Sheriff,
WILLIAM R. LUTZE,
Undersheriff.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I speak, southern California is being invaded. Invaded by drug dealers—and invaded by illegal aliens—tens of thousands each and every year.

We cannot afford to lose any weapons in the arsenal we use to keep dangerous drugs and illegal aliens out of our country.

But, that is exactly the effect the California Desert Protection Act would have. It would prevent the U.S. Border Patrol and other law enforcement officials from using motorized vehicles within the Coyote Mountains, Fish Creek Mountains, and Jacumba wilderness areas.

I strongly oppose this legislation, but I would plead with my colleagues to support the Hunter amendment to make sure—if this bill passes—that law enforcement officials will be able to patrol these areas and use motorized vehicles if necessary.

The U.S. Border Patrol has identified five popular smuggling corridors running through the proposed Jacumba wilderness area alone.

Please do not make our border more of a sieve than it already is. I plead with you to help our law enforcement personnel by supporting the Hunter amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] for his work on this particular amendment and his cosponsorship of this amendment.

I am reminded that the gentleman's district is very close to these wilderness areas where narcotics are coming through on a daily basis. The young children and all the gentleman's constituents in Riverside are very much affected, and there is a very large cocaine and marijuana market in Riverside, in the gentleman's district, that is fed and supplied by these narcotics dealers and the drug lords that are moving this train of narcotics across the international border in these wilderness areas, ultimately up through the roads past Palm Springs and the Palm Springs district, up through the Banning area and ultimately into the gentleman's district. I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work on this issue, and I hope we can continue to work together on it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is better crafted than the Senate amendment, but I think the Senate amendment also represents very strong language on this matter. But I am sure that if this amendment is adopted, the conferees on the part of the House will do their best to uphold the House position on the better crafted amendment. But both amendments will have been offered, and that subject is necessary to be addressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 389, noes 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—389

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—50

Bacchus (FL)
Ballenger
Barton
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Dicks
Faleomavaega (AS)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Foglietta
Frost
Gejdenson
Grandy
Hastings
Hilliard
Johnston
Kleczka
Laughlin
Machtley
McCurdy
Meek
Meyers

Moakley
Murphy
Murtha
Orton
Packard
Pickle
Rangel
Ridge
Roberts
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Royce
Sanders
Schumer
Shuster
Skelton
Slattery
Solomon
Sundquist
Thompson
Tucker
Washington
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten

□ 1315

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. POMBO

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. POMBO:

—Page 34, after line 25, add the following:

ACCESS ROADS

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are hereby designated access routes on existing roads, trails, and ways, as mapped by the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, and the Automobile Club of Southern California, as follows:

Argus Range, WSA 132B, Attached Map #7, Desert Map #3-5 & D12 (now Argus Range and Death Valley National Park Proposed—12):

Bendire Canyon Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Bruce Canyon Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

Knight Canyon road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Kopper King Springs Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

Stone Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

Water Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (74,890) 82,400 – 105=82,395—18 Miles.

Bighorn Mountains, WSA 217, Attached Map #8, Desert Map #8:

Rattlesnake Canyon Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (39,200) 39,200 – 36=39,164—6 Miles.

Big Maria Mountains, WSA 321, Attached Map #9, Desert Map #9:

Move north boundary to Quien Safe Road, Loss of appx. 4,480 acres):

Maria Mountain Road, 12 Acres, Corridor 2 Miles;

Quien Sabe Road, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (47,570) 49,700 – 42=49,658—7 Miles; Or 49,700 – 4,480=45,220 – 12=45,676—2 Miles.

Bright Star, WSA 160B, Attached Map #11, Desert Map #12:

Cortez Springs Road, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (9,520 10,800 – 30=10,770—5 Miles.

Cady Mountains, WSA 251, Attached Map #12, Desert Map #14:

Afton/Basin Loop, 54 Acres, Boundary 9 Miles;

Canyon Crest Road, 66 Acres, Cherrystem 11 Miles;

Hector Road, 36 Acres, Boundary 6 Miles;

North Canyon Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystone 5 Miles;

South Canyon Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

Valley Center Road, 102 Acres, Corridor 17 Miles;

WSA Acreage (85,970) 122,000 – 324=121,676—54 Miles.

Chemehuevi Mountains, WSA 310, Attached Map #14, Desert Map #16:

Blue Boy Mine Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

Picture Rock Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

Red Rock Falls Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem 5 Miles;

Studio Spring Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem 5 Miles;

Trampas Canyon Road, 66 Acres, Cherrystem 11 Miles;

WSA Acreage (64,640) 95,820 – 162=95,668—27 Miles.

Chuckwalla Mountains, WSA 348, Attached Map #16, Desert Map #19-21:

Lost Pony Mine Road, 12 Acres, Corridor 2 Miles;

WSA Acreage (80,770) 86,400 – 12=86,399—2 Miles.

Cleghorn Lakes, WSA 304, Attached Map #19, Desert Map #22:

Bullion Mountains Road, 24 Acres, Boundary 4 Miles;

Copper World Mine Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

WSA Acreage (34,380) 42,020 – 36=41,984—6 Miles.

Coso Range, WSA 131, Attached Map #20, Desert Map #24:

Joshua Flats Road, 54 Acres, Cherrystem 9 Miles;

WSA Acreage (50,520) 53,940 – 54=53,886—9 Miles.

Dead Mountains, WSA 276, Attached Map #21, Desert Map #27:

Ibis Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem 5 Miles;

Picture Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Boundary 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (48,850) 57,200 – 54=57,146—9 Miles.

Funeral Mountains, WSA 143, Attached Map #25, Desert Map #33 & D18 (now Funeral Mountains & Death Valley National Park Proposed—18):

Funeral Mountain Pass, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (28,110) 28,100 – 30=28,070—5 Miles; Originally 65,000, 36,890 went to DVNP.

Golden Valley, WSA 170, Attached Map #26, Desert Map #34:

Golden Valley Pass, 54 Acres, Corridor 9 Miles;

Steam Well Road, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (37,700) 37,700 – 84=37,616—14 Miles.

Granite Mountains, WSA 256, Attached Map #27, Desert Map #35, 36 & M7 (now Bristol Mountains & Mojave National Park Proposed—7):

Heritage Trail, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

Onyx Mine Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 84,980 – 78=84,902—13 Miles; Originally 134,900, 49,920 went to MNP.

Grass Valley, WSA 173A, Attached Map #28, Desert Map #37:

Bird Spring Road, 54 Acres, Corridor 9 Miles;

Grass Valley Road, 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (31,720) 33,000 – 78=32,922 13 Miles.

Ibex, WSA 149, Attached Map #31, Desert Map #40 & D21 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—21):

American Mine Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Confidence Road, 18 Acres, Boundary 3 Miles;

Gladstone Mine Road, 48 Acres, Cherrystem 8 Miles;

Rusty Pick Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

Sheephead Pass Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

WSA Acreage (26,460) 26,460 – 156=26,304—26 Miles; Originally 53,500 27,040 went to DVNP.

Indian Pass, WSA 355, Attached Map #32, Desert Map #41:

Julian Wash Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

WSA Acreage (35,015) 40,400 – 60=40,340—10 Miles.

Inyo Mountains, WSA 120/122, Attached Map #33, Desert Map #42-44, D6 & 7 (now Inyo Mountains and Death Valley National Park Proposed—6 & 7):

Blackrock Well Road, 48 Acres, Cherrystem 8 Miles;

Blue Monster Mine Road, 66 Acres, Cherrystem 11 Miles;

Bunker Hill Mine Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Burgess Well Road, 42 Acres, Cherrystem 7 Miles;

Pat Keyes Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

Seep Hole Spring Road, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

Side Hill Spring Road, 48 Acres, Corridor 8 Miles;

Squaw Spring Road, 18 Acres, Corridor 3 Miles;

WSA Acreage (205,020) 205,020 – 294=204,726—49 Miles; Originally 266,300 61,290 went to DVNP.

Jacumba Mountains, WSA 368, Attached Map #34, Desert Map #45:

Easy Pickins Mine Loop Road, 78 Acres, Corridor 13 Miles;

WSA Acreage (34,550) 37,000 – 78=36,922—13 Miles.

Kelso Dunes, WSA 250, Attached Map #35, Desert Map #46-48 & MB (now Kelso Dunes and Mojave National Park Proposed—7):

Bristol Mine Road, 42 Acres, Cherrystem 7 Miles;

Hytem Spring Pass Road, 96 Acres, Corridor 16 Miles;

Hytem Spring Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Natural Arch Road, 48 Acres, Cherrystem 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (129,580) 129,580 – 204=129,376—34 Miles; Originally 215,100 85,520 went to DVNP.

Kiavah, WSA 159, Attached Map #37, Desert Map #49 & 50:

McIvers Spring Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

Cholla Canyon Road, 42 Acres, Corridor 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (88,290) 90,200 – 78=90,122—13 Miles.

Kingston Mountains, WSA 222, Attached Map #38, Desert Map #51-54:

Eastern Star Mine Road, 42 Acres, Cherrystem 7 Miles;

Kingston Wash Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

Old Salt Lake Trail Road, 84 Acres, Corridor 14 Miles;

Shadow Valley Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

WSA Acreage (249,368) 269,500 – 246=269,254—41 Miles.

Little Chuckwalla Mountains, WSA 350, Attached Map #40, Desert Map #55:

Little Chuckwalla Pass Road, 18 Acres, Corridor 3 Miles;

Teague Well Road, 48 Acres, Corridor 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (46,460) 53,000 – 66=52,934—11 Miles.

Little Pichacho, WSA 356, Attached Map #41, Desert Map #56:

Copper Basin Road, 6 Acres, Corridor 1 Mile;

Hess Mine Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

Marcus Wash Road, 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

Senator Pass Road, 48 Acres, Corridor 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (36,440) 41,940 – 90=41,850—13 Miles.

Mecca Hills, WSA 343, Attached Map #43, Desert Map #59:

Hidden Spring Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (24,280) 25,360 – 24=25,336—4 Miles; Originally 35,280 9,920 was deleted on map.

Mesquite, WSA 225, Attached May #44, Desert Map #60:

Mesquite Pass Road, 42 Acres, Corridor 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (47,330) 57,800 – 42=57,758—7 Miles.

Nopah Range, WSA 150, Attached Map #46, Desert Map #63:

Chicago Valley Road, 48 Acres, Boundary 8 Miles;

Old Traction Road, 90 Acres, Boundary 15 Miles;

Pahrump Peak Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

Shaw Mine Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles;

WSA Acreage (110,880). 116,000 – 174=115.826—27 Miles

North Mesquite Mountains, WSA 223, Attached Map #48, Desert Map #66:

Cub Lee Road, 6 Acres, Corridor 1 Mile;

Old Salt Lake Trail Road, 12 Acres, Boundary 2 miles;

WSA Acreage (25,540) 27,800 – 18=27,782—3 Miles.

Old Women Mountains, WSA 299, Attached Map #50, Desert Map #67 & 68:

Delete from Wilderness Consideration – 146,070=0 (entire area); or

Black Metal Mine Pass Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles.

Enterprise Mine Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles.

Heritage Trail Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 6 miles.

Mercury Mountain Road, 18 Acres, Boundary 3 Miles.

Old Woman Loop Road, 66 Acres, Corridor 11 Miles.

Painted Rock Loop Road, 18 Acres, Corridor 3 Miles.

Sweetwater/Paramount Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 6 Miles.

Willow Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem 2 Miles.

WSA Acreage (146,070) 191,000 – 270=190,830—45 Miles.

Orocopia Mountains, WSA 344, Attached Map #51, Desert Map #69:

Orocopia Pass, 54 Acres, Corridor 9 Miles;

Red Canyon, 42 Acres, Boundary 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (40,770) 56,140 – 96=56,044—16 Miles; originally 77,900 21,760 deleted on map.

Owens Peak, WSA 158, Attached Map #52, Desert Map #70–72:

Cow Canyon Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Sand Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

Three Pines Canyon Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Walker Well Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (74,640) 78,200 – 84=78,116—14 Miles.

Pahrump Valley, WSA 154, Attached Map #54, Desert Map #73;

Blackwater Well Pass, 72 Acres, Corridor 12 Miles;

Old Traction Road, 78 Acres, Boundary 13 Miles;

Pahrump Valley Road, 54 Acres, Boundary 9 Miles;

WSA Acreage (74,800) 79,000 – 204=78,796—34 Miles.

Palen/McCoy, WSA 325, Attached Map #55, Desert Map #74 & 75:

Sand Draw Road, 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

Tank Spring Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (214,149) 225,300 – 60=225,240—10 Miles.

Palo Verde Mountains, WSA 352, Attached Map #56, Desert Map #76:

Clapp Spring Loop Road, 18 Acres, Boundary 3 Miles;

Flat Top Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

WSA Acreage (32,320) 32,320 – 36=32,284—6 Miles.

Picacho Peak, WSA 355a, Attached Map #57, Desert Map #77:

Bear Canyon Road, 18 Acres, Corridor 3 Miles;

Carrizo Falls Road, 18 Acres, Boundary 3 Miles;

WSA Acreage (7,700) 10,499 – 36=10,364—6 Miles.

Piper Mountain, WSA 155, Attached Map #58, Desert Map #79:

Horse Thief Canyon Road, 48 Acres, Boundary 8 Miles;

Lime Hill Pass Road, 48 Acres, Boundary 8 Miles;

Mount Nunn Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

Piper Pass, 42 Acres, Corridor 7 Miles;

Soldier Pass Road, 30 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (72,600) 86,200 – 204=85,996—34 Miles.

Piute Mountain, WSA 288, Attached Map #59, Desert Map #80;

Fenner Pass Road, 48 Acres, Corridor 8 Miles;

Piute Mine Loop Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (37,800) 52,800 – 84=52,716—14 Miles.

Resting Spring Range, WSA 145, Attached Map #61, Desert Map #81:

Old Traction Road, 36 Acres, Boundary 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (78,868) 84,000 – 36=83,964—6 Miles.

Rice Valley, WSA 322, Attached Map #62, Desert Map #82:

Eagle Nest Mine Loop, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles.

Riverside Mountains, WSA 321A, Attached Map #63, Desert Map #83:

Gold Rice Mine Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 6 miles;

Old Blythe/Vidal Road (Big Wash), 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (22,380) 25,300 – 60=25,240—10 Miles.

Sacatar, WSA 157, Attached Map #64.5, Desert Map #85 & 86:

Sacatar Trail, 42 Acres, Corridor 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (51,900) 52,600 – 42=52,558—7 Miles.

Santa Rosa Wilderness, WSA 341, Attached Map #66, Desert Map #89:

Pinyon Alta Flat Road, 42 Acres, Cherrystem 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (53,240) 78,200 – 42=78,158—7 Miles.

Sawtooth Mountains, WSA 060, Attached Map #67, Desert Map #90:

Canebrake Road, 18 Acres, Corridor 3 Miles;

Potrero Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (35,400) 35,610 – 42=35,568—7 Miles.

Sheep Hole Valley, WSA 305, Attached Map #69, Desert Map #91 & 92:

Delete from Wilderness Consideration – 174,800=0 (Entire Area); or

Make Sheep Hole Valley Road northeast Boundary =51,200; or

Sheep Hole Valley Road, 86 Acres, Corridor 16 Miles;

WSA Acreage (174,800) 208,900 – 96=208,804—16 Miles.

Stepladder Mountains, WSA 294, Attached Map #75, Desert Map #100:

Chemehuevi Valley Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

East Stepladder Mountain Road, 60 Acres, Corridor 10 Miles;

North Pass Road, 36 Acres, Corridor 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (81,600) 85,300 – 156=85,144—26 Miles.

Turtle Mountains, WSA 307, Attached Map #78, Desert Map #104 & 105:

Castle Rock Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

Heritage Trail Road, 90 Acres, Corridor 15 Miles;

Virginia May Mine Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem 3 Miles;

Horn Peak Well Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (144,500) 189,300 – 180=189,120—30 Miles.

Whipple Mountains, WSA 312, Attached Map #79, Desert Map #106:

Whipple Well Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem 5 Miles.

—Page 39, after line 4, add the following:

ACCESS ROADS

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are hereby designated access routes on existing roads, trails, and ways, as mapped by the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, and the Automobile Club of Southern California, as follows:

Greenwater Range, WSA 147, Attached Map #29, Desert Map #D19 & D20 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—19 & 20):

Greenwater Pass Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 163,900 – 48=163,852, 8 Miles.

Greenwater Valley, WSA 148, Attached Map #30, Desert Map #D24 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—1):

Virgin Spring Road, 48 Acres, Cherrystem, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 54,600 – 48=54,552, 8 Miles.

Hunter Mountain, WSA 123, Attached Map #30.5, Desert Map #D25 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—2):

Dodd Springs Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 26,400 – 48=26,352, 8 Miles.

Ibex, WSA 149, Attached Map #31, Desert Map #40 & D21 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—21):

American Mine Road, 18 Acres, Cherrystem, 3 Miles;

Confidence Road, 18 Acres, Boundary, 3 Miles;

Rusty Pick Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Sheephead Pass Road, 60 Acres, Corridor, 10 Miles.

Inyo Mountains, WSA 120/122, Attached Map #33, Desert Map #42-44, D6 & 7 (now Inyo Mountains and Death Valley National Park Proposed—6 & 7):

Blue Monster Mine Road, 66 Acres, Cherrystem 11 Miles;

Pat Keyes Canyon road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem 4 Miles.

Last Chance Range, WSA 112, Attached Map #39, Desert Map #D4:

Cottonwood Creek Road, 24 Acres, Boundary, 4 Miles;

Last Chance Road, 42 Acres, Boundary, 7 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 44,900−66=4,834, 11.

Manly Peak, WSA 124, Attached Map #42, Desert Map #D16, (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—16):

Redlands Canyon Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem, 3 Miles;

WSA Acreage (16,105), 20700−24=20,676, 3 Miles;, Originally 27,100, 4,595 went to DVNP and 6,400 deleted on map.

North Death Valley, WSA 118/119, Attached Map #47, Desert Map #D5 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—5):

Oriental Road, 24 Acres, Boundary, 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 50,200−24=50,176, 4 Miles.

Owlshead Mountains, WSA 156, Attached Map #53, Desert Map #D17 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—17):

Lost Lake Road, 48 Acres, Cherrystem, 8 Miles;

Owl Lake Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem, 5 Miles;

Owlshead Mountain Road, 78 Acres, Corridor, 13 Miles;

Quail Spring Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem, 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 136,100−192=135,908, 32 Miles.

Saline Valley, WSA 117/117A, Attached Map #65, Desert Map #D8-10 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—8):

Eureka Dunes to Saline Valley via Marble Bath, 180 Acres, Corridor, 30 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 486,300−180=486,120, 30 Miles.

Surprise Canyon, WSA 136, Attached Map #76, Desert Map #101 & D15 (now Surprise Canyon and Death Valley National Park Proposed—15):

Hall/Jail Canyon High Road, 36 Acres, Cherrystem 6 Miles;

Tuber Canyon Road, 30 Acres, Cherrystem 5 Miles;

WSA Acreage (29,180), 29,180−66=29,114, 11 Miles; Originally 66,200, 37,020 now in DVNP.

Slate Range/So. Panamint, WSA 137/142, Attached Map #71, Desert Map #D16 (now Death Valley National Park Proposed—16):

North Windgate Pass Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na), 86,420−48=86,372, 8 Miles; Originally 106,900, 20,480 deleted on map.

—Page 43, after line 12, add the following:

ACCESS ROADS

SEC. 308. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are hereby designated access routes on existing roads, trails, and ways, as mapped by the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, and the Automobile Club of Southern California, as follows:

Eagle Mountain, WSA 334, Attached Map #22, Desert Map #J3, (now Joshua Tree National Park Proposed—2):

Big Wash Road, 72 Acres, Corridor, 12 Miles;

Storm Jade Mine Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 67,500−120=67,380—20 Miles.

—Page 54, after line 4, add the following:

ACCESS ROADS

SEC. 416. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there are hereby designated access routes on existing roads, trails, and ways, as mapped by the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, and the Automobile Club of Southern California, as follows:

Castle Peaks, WSA 266, Attached Map #13, Desert Map #M2, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—1):

Coats Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Crescent Peak Road, 36 Acres, Boundary, 6 Miles;

Dove Spring Road, 90 Acres, Corridor, 15 Miles;

Indian Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Juniper Spring Loop, 48 Acres, Cherrystem, 8 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 49,700−186=49,514—31 Miles.

Cima Dome, WSA 237/238, Attached Map #17, Desert Map #M3, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—2):

Deer Spring Loop, 48, Corridor, 8;

WSA Acreage (na) 28,600−48=28,552—8 Miles.

Cinder Cones, WSA 239, Attached Map #18, Desert Map #M4, now MNP—3):

Cane Spring Road, 24 Acres, Corridor, 4 Miles;

Club Peak Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

Granite Spring Road, 78 Acres, Corridor, 13 Miles;

Indian Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 63,300−162=63,138—27 Miles.

Fort Piute, WSA 267, Attached Map #23, Desert Map #M6, (now Mojave National Park proposed—5):

Piute Mountains Road, 36 Acres, Boundary, 6 Miles, (Use road as Boundary, loss of 2,480 acres):

WSA Acreage (na) 72,400−36=72,364—6 Miles, Or 72,400−2,480=69,920−0=69,920—0 Miles.

Kelso Mountains, WSA 249, Attached Map #36, Desert Map #M9, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—8):

Kelso Mine Road, 24 Acres, Cherrystem, 4 Miles;

Old Baker to Kelso, Road, 72 Acres, Corridor, 12 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 80,500−96=80,404—16 Miles.

Granite Mountains, WSA 256, Attached Map #27, Desert Map #35, 36 & M7, (now Bristol Mountains & Mojave National Park Proposed-7):

Heritage Trail, 60 Acres, Corridor—10 Miles;

Midhills, WSA 264, Attached Map #45, Desert Map #M13, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—2):

Wildcat Springs Road, 36 Acres, Corridor—6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 22,900−36=22,864—6 Miles.

Old Dad Mountains, WSA 243, Attached Map #49, Desert Map #M10, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—9):

Mojave Road Wet Weather Loop Road, 54 Acres, Corridor—9 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 100,560−54=100,506—9 Miles.

Providence Mountains: WSA 263, Attached Map #60, Desert Map #M15:

Barber Well Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Beecher Canyon Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Summit Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

Tough Nut Spring Road, 36 Acres, Corridor, 6 Miles;

Whiskey Spring Road, 12 Acres, Cherrystem, 2 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 64,400−84=64,316, 14 Miles.

South Providence:

Mountains, WSA 262, Attached Map #74, Desert Map #M8, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—7)

Quail Spring Road, 36 Acres, Corridor, 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 25,700−36=25,664—6 Miles.

Table Mountain, WSA 270, Attached Map #77, Desert Map #M17, (now Mojave National Park Proposed—6):

Woods Wash Road, 24 Acres, Corridor 4 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 10,000−24=9,976, 4 Miles.

Woods Mountain, WSA 271, Attached Map #81, Desert Map #M18, (now Mojave National Park proposed—7):

Black Canyon Connection Road, 18 Acres, Corridor, 3 Miles;

Hackberry Mountain Loop Road, 48 Acres, Corridor, 8 Miles;

Watson Wash Road, 24 Acres, Corridor, 4 Miles;

Woods Wash Road, 36 Acres, Corridor, 6 Miles;

WSA Acreage (na) 79,400−126=79,274—21 Miles.

Mr. POMBO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I want to take some time to correct some of the misinformation circulating around about this amendment. This is not an off-road vehicle amendment. We are not trying to open up the desert to people who want to abuse the land. On the contrary, we are merely trying to maintain the rights of everyday people to use the roads that have been in existence for decades.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my friends who have never visited the California desert that this is a magnificent country, but nothing like the mountains of the East. We are not talking about a wilderness area with a scenic trail running along a mountain stream.

□ 1320

The desert is unforgiving and can be deadly without adequate water and transportation.

Without this amendment, rock collecting, hiking, picnicking, camping, and exploring are all activities that would be much more difficult if not impossible to enjoy in the desert.

Mr. Chairman, let me cite some examples. As the bill now stands, prime

rock collecting areas usually in the mountains will be miles from the nearest roads.

Furthermore, many rock collectors are older Americans who will be unable to walk great distances to pursue their hobby. This is also true for the most scenic hiking, camping, and picnicking areas. The Cady Mountains, a very popular place for day hikers, will no longer be accessible without this amendment. The interior is 6 miles from the nearest road, 6 in and 6 out, an impossible distance without a reliable source of water and vehicle transportation.

Mr. Chairman, another popular pastime, exploring historic trails and ghost towns, will no longer be possible in many wilderness areas. For example, the old Spanish trail through the Kingston Mountains, the main route from Salt Lake City to Los Angeles during the last century, will be closed. The bottom line is common sense. In the desert, when access is cut off, the real losers are the people. The desert is hot and dry and not a good place unless one is in excellent physical condition. Closing roads that have been in use for years is bad policy.

Mr. Chairman, the bill's sponsors say that the valid existing rights and privileges are protected in H.R. 518. While this is true, access to the existing claims and permitted allotments will be denied. For example, Russ Sparrow has a valid existing mining claim in an active mine over 100 years old. Under this bill, the Porter Mine Road which leads to the mine will be off limits. The Pombo amendment simply would permit Mr. Sparrow to drive to his existing claim.

Another example is that on the Onyx Mine Road which leads to a privately owned, valid mining claim in the Bristol Mountains, it would be off limits under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to guarantee that ordinary citizens will be able to reach their valid, existing mining claims.

This bill would also negate existing privileges, specifically existing grazing allotments. For example, the bill closes Steamwell Road and Golden Valley Road. These routes provide the only access to the region. Without access to his federally permitted grazing allotment, Billy Mitchell will not be able to maintain the land upon which his cattle graze.

Similarly, Dave Fisher's grazing allotment in the Rodman and Newbury Mountains will be useless unless he is able to maintain and develop the water resources there.

Mr. Chairman, there are examples too numerous to mention of access to mining and grazing claims which would not be permitted under the current use of this bill. Desert wildlife, especially the larger mammals such as deer and bighorn sheep are supported by watering developments placed in remote areas over the years by volunteers. Maintenance to these wildlife guzzlers will be impossible without this amendment.

The roads left open by this amendment are not new. The vast majority have been used for most of this century. They just do not meet the strict definition of a road used in the wilderness inventory. Desert roads are not regularly scraped or otherwise maintained because they become more prone to washout during a rainstorm. All of the roads are clearly marked, all of the roads that I am proposing to leave open are clearly marked in USGS topographical maps and many appear in the Auto Club of Southern California's maps.

Mr. Chairman, now to one of the most important reasons why I feel that we should leave these roads open, and, that is, private property. Property owners are likely to see their land values decrease as a result of being designated within this protected area. To add insult to injury, many private property owners will not be able to reach their property because under H.R. 518, the existing roads will be closed to vehicle traffic. Wilderness areas designated by the bill are approximately 50 percent private property. For example, the townships of Nipton and Goffs, both made up of 100 percent privately owned property, will fall within the boundaries of a national park.

Simply put, many people who own private property in the desert will not be able to reach it under this bill. The weekend cabin of many will be unreachable by car. Property owners who had planned to build a retirement home will lose their chance to do so without vehicle access. There just will not be a way to get to the property located in the wilderness area.

June Southcot will not be able to drive to her property in the Table mountain wilderness. She has been building a cabin there. While the owners of Panamint Springs Store will still be able to reach their property, access to the store's water supply will be cut off. The store will have to close. Even if the property owner wants his property to be included in the national park designation, he should be guaranteed access to it. This amendment will provide that guarantee. Without it, this bill will prohibit many desert property owners access to that property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I have here on a map the Cady mountain wilderness area, the proposed area. If Members will see where the bright spots are, they represent 640 acres of privately owned property. In between these borders, there are no roads currently existing within the bill. What my amendment would propose to do is leave open these existing roads through the middle of this proposed wilderness area so that these private property owners will have access to their property. It does no good to tell the property owners that they are going to be able to maintain their private property and maintain ownership, continue to pay taxes, continue to pay their mortgage if we do not allow them to have access to it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the same thing that we have seen over and over again in many bills that have been put before this House and before these committees, is that they put up the false hope that someone is going to be able to maintain ownership of their private property but in reality it is a taking by the Federal Government of the private property rights of these owners, because we are, No. 1, diminishing the value without just compensation of their property, and, No. 2, we are refusing to allow them to have access to property that in many instances has been in a family for generations just in an effort to lock off this property from the valid private property owners who exist there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield only because the map the gentleman has before us is so important and makes such an important point.

Members can see if they will look at existing roadways through a very, very significantly and vast territory of open land that deserves access, in this case along with the roads, and in many areas just like this, it will be put in park and wilderness. For goodness sakes, there are power lines and high lines that go through it. In this bill they are proposing designations like this that has no sense in terms of what we traditionally think of as park or wilderness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. POMBO. If Members will look at these valid private property areas that are included in this one map, and I have many others if anybody would like to see the others, they will see that without this guaranteed access, without leaving these roads out of the wilderness area and the road only out of the wilderness area, these property owners would have no access to those properties.

As an example, this person right here would be 6 miles from the nearest road

in order to reach his private property. How would that person possibly have access to what he pays taxes on, to what he pays the mortgage on without leaving open just these roads? To put it in perspective, each one of these dots on the map represents a square mile. We are not talking about lots in the city. We are not talking about a subdivision here.

□ 1330

We are talking about every one of these represents a square mile, and you can see that in this region here where many people, many older Americans from my district, go to gather rocks for their hobby of rock collecting and mineral shows, they would have to walk several miles in the desert in order to maintain their private property and maintain their habit of collection.

The other thing that I would like to point out on this map, since I have it up, is these two white dots here represent wildlife guzzlers that were manufactured and are maintained by volunteers in order to supply water in the desert for the abundant wildlife which currently exists and will continue to exist in this area. Without access to carrying supplies and equipment to maintain these guzzlers for the wildlife in this region, those will fall into disrepair and no longer exist, because the volunteers who currently maintain those, without access to these roads, would not be able to maintain that.

So I think that that is another extremely important reason for us to maintain the current and existing roads, not all of them, just the ones that I have outlined in my amendment, so that we can have reasonable access to private property, to valid mining claims, to valid grazing permits that exist in the area, as well as allowing the amount of recreation that currently exists in the California desert to continue and flourish.

Because it makes no sense to set aside this area as a park, as a wildlife preserve, and try to tell people that you are going to increase recreational opportunities in the area at the same time that you are limiting their access to the area. Because if the people who are interested in recreating in the California desert do not have access, you are cutting them off from that opportunity.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to tell a friend that he has got an ugly kid, but many of us have had to do that, and I am not telling any of my friends across the way that they have ugly kids, but this mother of all ugly bills is ugly, and the kids of it are ugly, and this is a chance to make one of those kids not quite so ugly.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] does just that. First of all, not all off-roaders' vehicles, and this is not an off-road-vehicle amendment, but I would like to correct my friend at least by perception that all off-road-vehicle drivers are not destructive to the desert.

As a matter of fact, many of those fees and registration fees go to protect the deserts, and many individual groups actually repair a lot of the desert that has been damaged from natural causes as well.

But 85 percent of the roads in the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from California, 85 percent of those roads access private property, and most of us are concerned about private-property rights. That affects every single State of the Union, not just California, as well.

One classic example: In this bill there is one Member, not in my district, but it was brought to my attention by a phone call from the gentleman, who owns a salt lake that he harvests the salt out of that lake. Of course, there is a road that accesses that lake, and under this bill, that gentleman still has the rights to keep his lake, he can still harvest the salt, but, "Oh, by the way, he cannot use the road to get it out."

This is a private-property matter. And we need to address this. Eighty-five percent of these roads access private property.

Most of the time that bills come on the House floor we take a look and say, "Well, does this really affect my constituents, or does it not?" In many cases, bills like this, other Members will say, "Well, it is a green vote. I will vote for it, because it does not affect me." Let me clarify some of these issues. First of all, private-property rights affect every single American, I do not care what State you are from. The cost-shifting and managing of nearly 8 million acres will affect every park in every State, and when your constituents come forward and find that their property and their parks have depreciated because of the cost-shifting required to maintain nearly 8 million acres, which is recommended by this, or give the Interior Department, nearly $6 billion to do that, those costs are going to be taken out of your parks and your recreation and your State.

In addition, the purchase of 336,000 acres of private land, which by the way the gentlewoman from the other body worked a sweetheart deal with one of her big supporters to exclude that group, and under a private and separate authorization will pay for that land, but yet when we have already millions of acres that have been authorized but we cannot purchase today because there are budgetary shortfalls, these additional acres will be added to that.

And guess who pays for it? The taxpayers in all of the States of this country.

Do we want to lock people out of the parks when they are forced to shut down because they do not have the dollars? Just think of what the billions of dollars of adding 8 million acres which, by the way, covers, if you would add many of the Eastern States together, they do not encompass 8 million acres.

California today, Mr. Chairman, over 48 percent of all of California is owned by the Federal Government, and now they want to add 8 million acres to that 48 percent.

And then who has to take care of it? Again, the Federal Government.

But I do not guess that is any problem for this body, because we write blank checks, and quite often those checks bounce.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the discussion surrounding this amendment is an incredible mischaracterization of the bill, the suggestion that somehow the bill would deny access to private-property owners when, in fact, the law demands that they be given access to their property would continue.

The notion here is the suggestion that somehow that if we provide a road to private property for their access that somehow that has got to become a public road. We can provide access to private property and not make that a public road for everyone to use.

The fact is in this legislation, is it currently stands before us, there are over some 33,000 roads that can be used. This goes far beyond what the off-road-vehicle users have asked for. It opens up areas the previous administration, the Bush administration, had recommended be closed. There is no prohibition on hiking, as the gentlemen would lead you to believe. There is no prohibition on access to grazing permits, as the gentlemen would lead you to believe. There is no prohibition, in fact, the law denies a prohibition on access to private property within these inholdings.

We have all experienced that in wilderness areas throughout the country.

Se they are trying to mix apples and oranges here, when in fact what they want to do is open a whole series of roads that the BLM has recommended because of management, because of habitat, because of endangered species, because there are other roads that provide parallel access or access to the same areas, that those roads be closed, and people use those other ones.

So we have opened up hundreds of thousands of acres to continue to be used for motorcyclists, for off-the-road vehicles, for Jeeps, based upon historical use in this area. And I think the Pombo amendment goes far beyond what the Senate agreed to do, what the

agreements over there were about the access for public use of these roads, recognizing that there are serious management and habitat problems within this area for various wildlife that has to do with endangered species.

This bill in no way, in no way denies dramatic access to roads for those individuals who enjoy using the desert with off-the-road vehicles or motorcycles or, in some cases, their family car, that people come out and enjoy this, too.

One of the things we did in the committee was to open up the Algodones area that was originally in the bill that was restricted for use, but was actually between two areas where usage was allowed. It just looked like a management headache. People had historically used that area, and I think in some cases they are mainly for motorcycles, and we opened that up also.

So I think that this amendment was rejected in the committee, and far exceeds what anybody has suggested would be necessary or even desired in terms of public access to some of these roads that simply must be closed for the sake of management, and where they are redundant to other roads in that area.

□ 1340

I would hope we would reject the amendment.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POMBO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in my statement I did not say that we were not allowing the grazing, the mining, the private property owners, the hiking, the rock collecting and such to continue, because the bill does specifically allow those activities to continue. But what I was trying to point out in my statement is that it is a false promise to tell people that these activities are going to continue if the access to those activities to no longer allowed. That is the reason for my amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Reclaiming my time, at one point the gentleman suggested you could not get to your grazing permit, and the fact is that the bill and the law allow you and do provide for access to that. That was my point. The notion—and obviously what we are doing here and what the Senate did was to create a wilderness area, is not the exact experience that you have in your city park where you can simply drive, get out of the car and do something alongside of the road. That is the purpose of designating this area.

But the suggestion here is that somehow or other hikers, rock collectors will not be able to collect rocks because they will not have access. They are going to have access to millions of acres of land as the bill is currently proposed. They can do that from roads, and as I said, in excess of 33,000 miles of road that continue to remain open for the pursuit of those activities.

Mr. POMBO. If the gentleman will further yield, the gentleman is probably more aware than anybody on this floor that 33,000 miles of road are predominantly in agricultural regions, not the urban areas surrounding the area.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is not correct. In fact, it runs through many of these areas.

Mr. POMBO. There are those that do run through the area.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to ask the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from California: These red shiny dots here are all privately held lands?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, they are. All of the shiny dots currently represent a section of property which is privately owned; a section of property being 640 acres, or 1 square mile.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The areas that look like roads it allows those roads to continue to be used without——

Mr. POMBO. Yes. Those are current roads, currently being used for access by those property owners. This bill would prohibit the use of those roads.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The gentleman's amendment allows that.

Mr. POMBO. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Now if I may ask the chairman, the gentleman from California, is he telling this body that this bill closes these roads off?

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman would yield, it may close those roads off for public use, but not necessarily for access to go to those lands.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The question is: What is necessary? Well, why do you not accept an amendment that says these roads, which are identifiable, already mapped, shall remain open for those private landholders?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is what the law provides, that access.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. That law means nothing, because the Park Service does not do as they have been told to do. I know of which I speak because the gentleman from Minnesota told me, as Mr. Seiberling told me, that there would be no problem with access to mining claims in the McKinley Park or Denali Park. There would be no problems in Glacier Park with the existing mining claims that are there, that you would have access. And that is not true. You can no longer go to those areas without getting permission from the Park Service, and they do not issue that permission.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the problem here is principally with regard to BLM wilderness lands.

Mr. YOUNG. of Alaska. Well, wait a minute. It is under the Department of the Interior, is it not? I am saying if you want to solve this problem where we have existing valid rights here, where people own their lands, retirement homes, mining claims and grazing areas, they have existing roads—we are not talking about building any new roads to accommodate the gentleman from California. These people, who happen to be American citizens, they want to say in the bill that these roads shall be available for those who have valid existing rights in this area. Now, what is wrong with that?

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield further, I would point out some of the concerns with regard to Glacier Bay, I am informed that the claims are under the glacier.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It makes no difference. You have no access to it. You cannot mine. You know that, Mr. Sloss, they cannot start in the mining area.

Now, wait a minute, it's my time, my time.

They denied the right to that area. We were told in committee, "Don't worry about it, your claims will be protected." But the Park Service says, "No, no," they have a huge deposit, and it cannot be used, and they lost the value of that. I was on this floor when they did it. You talk about this great California wilderness bill; try 147 million acres in one fell swoop. Try that for size.

Then we go to Denali Park or Glacier Park, if you wish to call it that, we have miners in there. Now the solution is, may I remind my good friend, the solution is we are going to take tax dollars from the American citizens and buy those claims out not because they want to sell them but because they have to because they cannot operate in there with the Park's restrictions. They are no longer compatible. But we were told, "Don't worry about it, existing rights shall remain with those that have them. Don't worry about it. We will take care of you." The check is in the mail.

Now, I am just asking one little simple amendment to have Mr. POMBO's amendment accepted or say any roads in this area shall be available, shall be available for those private landholders. Now, what is wrong with that? I listened to this debate over in my office, I watched what was going on here, and it is absolutely true. We have too many

acres today in parks that are not being taken care of. This is not a wilderness, by the way. We have power lines, roads, and access here, and we are making a wilderness out of it. As the gentleman from Missouri said, the Irish wilderness was not a wilderness until they found lead. It was an area that had roads and farms and everything in it, but when they found lead, it became a wilderness.

It is the same case with this so-called California wilderness bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. of Alaska. I would gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and the gentleman who is in the well who is the ranking Member and has had to deal with this committee and the issue for many years——

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Twenty-two years.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We have similar frustrations, that which we have experienced. I must say in this discussion the question the gentleman is asking about individual property owners, a section of land, access to their land. Why not a bill that says, "You shall have access"? I wonder if you could ask that question not of the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee but the author of the bill, Mr. LEHMAN, who has yet to speak to this issue. I would like to know what he thinks about individual property owners having access.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Well, he will have his own time.

I want to suggest the key to this body has been representing the private landholder, and I said——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The private landholder, I am not asking to change the definition of the bill here. I am saying let us give them some consideration. What right does this body have to impose our will on those people who have done no wrong, that have this land under present law? For some reason we have forgotten what the Constitution says and what our role in Congress is.

Yes, we want to protect the environment, but do we want to lose the rights of individuals to protect the environment? We are not asking much. I am just asking Mr. POMBO's amendment be accepted, giving access over existing roads, no new roads, no new trails, existing roads to be left intact. That is all he is asking. If we take that away, this body has lost sight of the American way. Regardless of what you may say and all these interest groups—the Sierra Clubs, the friends of yours, all 57 of these leeches around this area of Washington, DC, dictating to the Members of this body as to what they should do with their lands, and not the people in the area. That is what upsets me about all this legislation. This is not driven by the people at home, it is driven by the people out of L.A., San Francisco, it is driven by the people belonging to these organizations.

If you are doing this right, make this a recreational area and protect those people who have those rights given to them under law. Protect them. Don't say protect them and then not do it. That is wrong. That is what we have been doing in the past, time after time.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman knows what the Wilderness Act, under which this is a proposal for wilderness, provides for that access. Section 5(a) in fact does. What it does not provide is what Mr. POMBO wants, which is general public access on those roads. That is not necessary to protect those individual's rights to their property. In fact, what the gentleman——

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows, Mr. Chairman, as I do, never has that right been used by the agency—it has not, it has not, it has not—I am saying, accept Mr. POMBO's amendment that they shall have that right, no question. Not at the discretion of BLM, not at the discretion of the Park Service or a Secretary of Interior. No Government agency should have that right over the private landholder. That is a simple way to go. Let those people have their rights under our Constitution. Do not say to the agency that we have a law that protects them. Sure, you can go to court, some agencies can file suit and say you cannot do it. Some interest groups will file suit that say you cannot do it. There will be some who say you can do it.

I am saying let us protect these little people. That is what America is about, the little people. It is not these huge organizations.

I hear people condemn the mining interests and the timber industry. But the biggest organization in the United States today is the so-called elite environmental community that is driving this Congress to taking land out of the productive role.

□ 1350

That is the group we should be fighting. Let us think about the American worker and the little person, not the large group of environmental groups.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], and let me first make very clear that this amendment really does not have anything to do with private property rights. Those rights are protected. Those rights are protected for the people who own their property, and access to the property is protected. It is protected under common law, and it is protected under the various aspects of this bill.

What is attempting to be done here is, first of all, exactly as the chairman described, an attempt to open these roads up for general public use. But what concerns me more here is the eleventh hour attempt to undo the lengthy, careful and deliberative process I and others have undergone for 4 years now to try to make incremental, piece-by-piece, road-by-road determinations as to what ought to be left totally open for all use, what ought to be left simply for the use for which the road was probably created in the first place, and what is needed to ensure access to property. It does not make any sense to have certain roads out there, because many cause nuisances, because many are counter to the provisions of this act, or because in many cases, there are other ways of getting to the same place, and we do not need to police that many areas at the same time.

I would point out that the amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will offer as a substitute, contained 62 wilderness areas in it, and will close many roads off to public use itself. So, the issue here is not pro-private property rights versus anti-private property rights. What we are talking about with the substitute of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and with the proposal before the House is how many wilderness areas there are going to be. These bills treat those areas the same way with respect to the same wilderness areas.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. When I finish, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman. I have not interrupted anyone here today.

We have in this bill probably the most permissive language regarding grazing in a national park ever to come before the House. It allows grazing in perpetuity under this law and, indeed, is opposed by some members of the Natural Resources Committee, and they may try to take that out later in this bill but the language in this bill totally allows everyone with a grazing right today to maintain that right in perpetuity into the future.

We have looked at every one of these areas time and time again and will continue to look at them from now through the conference. As recently as the full committee meeting, Mr. Chairman, this Member authorized a successful amendment that took 59,000 acres of private land out of the bill. At my request, and at the request of the

gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] over here, the chairman took language into the bill that took 62,000 acres of high quality recreation area in the South Algodones Dunes out of the bill. Two years ago, when this bill was on the floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] in fighting for that language at that time said that a hundred thousand people would be closed out unless we deleted it.

Well, in the bill that is before the House today, Mr. Chairman, we have made that adjustment. We have been making adjustments as the bill goes on where the case is substantial and where we are certain about what we were doing, and we will continue to do so.

I lost on one amendment in the committee myself. Talk about an open process. I offered an amendment that I thought made a reasonable extension of some roads going to about a third of what is in the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] here that I thought was reasonable. I lost that in committee. The sponsors asked me not to bring that amendment back up on the floor today, thinking, we will discuss it in conference, which we will. But to go about it in this fashion today, to indiscriminately open these wilderness areas up without knowing what we are doing is not smart, when the fact is, which was pointed out in a recent McClatchy newspaper editorial, we have 500,000 miles of these roads in California. So this is certainly not going to destroy any industry or anybody's recreation.

If the case can be made that this is necessary, Mr. Chairman, then let us look at it on a case-by-case basis, and I would be happy to work with the gentleman to try to do it, just as there are additions other than this that I would like to see made in the bill as well.

The industry with the most stake in this issue frankly is the utilities in California because they have rights-of-way all over the State. They have gas lines; they have electricity transmission lines. Where are they on this bill? None of them are opposed to this bill. In fact, Mr. Chairman, most of them are actively supporting the bill that is on the floor before us today because they are certain that their access to those areas is already guaranteed under the provisions of this act. And believe me, they have got the lawyers to tell them otherwise if that were the case.

We have gone about this deliberatively, carefully, cautiously, and where we thought there was a doubt, frankly we tried to err on the side that the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] is coming from. But the bill, as it is written, now makes sense. Yes, it can probably go somewhat further in my opinion, but this is not a private property issue.

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

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I want to just point out that we have private inholdings on the wilderness on a regular basis. I mean it is not very common in this area as almost all of it is public land, but somebody has some claim or maybe even a patented area. But the point is that in terms of national consistency should we treat the question here as from a national wilderness system? Are we going to have a national wilderness system? Are we going to treat the California desert in a different way, in a way that is absolutely unique? That is really what the question is here with regard before the body. If we are going to treat this in a way that is completely different, it is not the case today, and I thank the gentleman for having yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] makes an important point.

First of all, I just visited a wilderness area where people had access in those inholdings by airplane, by boat, by motor vehicle, to mining claims, to hunting lodges, to resorts, to private residences all throughout one of the largest wilderness areas in this country, in Idaho, in the Frank Church. And the fact is that all over the country we have wilderness in national parks with inholdings that have access to those private properties because the Congress has never had the desire to deny those individuals access to that.

That is not what the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] is about. The Pombo amendment is about a lot of people who would not agree with the American Motorcycle Association, would not agree with the bipartisan agreement on the Senate side on the roads that they thought were necessary to continue that and wanted just to open up all of the existing roads for whatever purposes available, and that simply is incompatible with the purposes of this bill, and the intent and the support the Californians have for this bill. So, as my colleagues know, to suggest that somehow this is to change the scale and people are not going to get access is simply to deny history and to deny the law that says, "You shall be." "You shall be," section 5(a), "You shall be given access."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to have the author of the bill have as much time as he would like. I appreciate my colleague for yielding.

My colleague is, I believe, very sensitive to the problems of grazers, et cetera. I know he comes from a farming district. I do know he also knows that these environmental groups from the urban centers, often go to excess, and I gather from the gentleman's statement that it is his intent this grazing be provided in perpetuity in his bill.

Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what the bill before the House does.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I beg to differ with the author, for I would refer to page 46 in the bill under section 409 that deals with grazing. The language specifically says the privilege of raising domestic livestock on lands within the park shall continue to be exercised at no more than the current levels subject to applicable laws and National Park Service regulations.

The gentleman knows full well the Park Service does everything it can to cut the throat of the grazers who might want to use that land. Clearly the grazing community is unhappy with the language that is involved here.

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I object to the gentleman's characterization of the Park Service, and this land is in the park. Previous language in the bill originally did not allow any grazing. We amended that in the bill 3 years ago to make it 25 years that they could graze. Now we have taken the further step of permitting it, at my request I would point out, in perpetuity in the park area.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If that is the gentleman's intent, it would not be difficult to simply design a minor amendment that would allow for grazing in perpetuity in this territory. Would the gentleman be willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. This is what is in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would just say that the gentleman is quite correct. That is what the legislation allows. Those people who have those permits will be allowed to continue them, as they currently do under existing

law, and the designations of these areas will not impair that, and they will have to comply with the laws of the United States of America like every other citizen.

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

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

□ 1400

Mr. VENTO. I would just point out that existing permittees today, people permitted to graze, only have assurances from 5 to 10 years for the option for a permittee under present law. The issue here, of course, is one I disagree with in terms of the "in perpetuity."

In essence, what you are saying is that the Park Service would not have the discretion that the BLM has today. Your zeal to help and satisfy some of these sort of questions that are being raised, which I think are really off the wall, I think we have gone too far. I intend to address that.

The truth is, of course, that these are hot desert areas, they are sensitive areas. These cows get more miles than your old Chevrolet. They are running around competing with the desert tortoise, and so forth. I want to assure my friend from California, you are going to have a debate on grazing in the parks here today. But the issue of that in perpetuity is not long enough, that 25 years is too short. The truth of the matter is you are taking away the power and discretion that the BLM and Park Service would have today under the normal course of things. These are just per my test. There is no intransigent right to graze.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the chairman has indicated his purpose is to eliminate grazing from this language.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this particular amendment. I have been on that committee for 14 years now and I have passed a wilderness bill in my home State of Utah. I still remember the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Seiberling, making some comments on how certain roads would be. Unfortunately, that has not come about.

I am always astounded as we stand here upon this particular floor and talk about wilderness bills, because we fly in the face of the 1964 Wilderness Act. I took it upon myself to go back and read all of the information that happened in the Wilderness Act. Like a court would say, the dicta. What was said on the floor, what was said in committee.

It came down to when it said untrammeled by man, pristine, as if man had never been there, we talked about cattle ponds, we talked about roads, we talked about power lines. And even one person said that roads meant two tracks. I do not know if that is correct, but that is what some people said.

Now, we come in with bills like this, and the Pombo amendment goes right to the heart of it, flies in the face of the 1964 Wilderness Act. The question Members should be asking is why are we even looking at an area that has homes in it, that has roads in it, that has cattle ponds, that has all of these things in it. It should not be in wilderness to started with.

The gentleman is trying his very best to do what he can to take care of a situation. I do not know which chairman, said that this is already taken care of in existing law. Let us read the existing law and see if it is taken care of.

Here is what the existing law says regarding this issue. In any case where State-owned or privately owned land is completely surrounded by national forest lands—let me repeat, national forest lands—within areas designated by the act as wilderness, such State or private owner shall be given such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned or privately owned land.

But it does not say BLM, it does not say park. The law is silent on that point. Because the law is silent on that point, it is necessary, and I think it was very intelligent for the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] to take it upon himself to say we are lacking somewhere in this bill. We have not covered our bases, in order to take care of access for these people who have a perfect right to go to their ground. We have to come up with some way to do it.

So the gentleman has done this by putting that in there.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not want to interrupt the gentleman's presentation, but if he looks at page 28 of the bill, I realize I was saying the bill was 200 pages long, it is only 69 pages long, but nevertheless, page 68, section 103, the general powers of the Secretary of Agriculture requirements are also deemed to be exercised by the Secretary of Interior for the purpose of administration of wilderness areas.

So the gentleman is correct in terms of his observation with regards to national forest lands and the Secretary of Agriculture. But the same rules apply. This is apparently a general instruction that is used and has been used in wilderness bills. As far as I know, they have the discretion in those circumstances.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment. Let me respectfully say, I remember the days that James Watt walked in as the Secretary of Interior and the gas position that some of our colleagues had regarding that. Some folks did not think he lived up to it.

I remember when our current Secretary of Interior came in. Frankly, I am having a very difficult time feeling comfortable with our current Secretary of Interior when it comes up to leaving it up to the discretion he may have. I do not want to put that kind of power in any secretary that comes along, because the difference between these two individuals is as night and day. If we have to wait for a personality clash with the Secretary of Interior, to me it would be much more intelligent to have it in the law and lay it to rest at this particular point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HANSEN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just would point out this is not a discretion. It says it shall be administered in the same manner as the secretary. So it is a mandated requirement on page 28 of the bill, section 103.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that comment. I also have those reservations because of practically seeing how it happened in the States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana. I think we can put it in the law.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It has been mentioned several times that the South Algodones has been removed from the area. I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the chairman, for doing that, because a lot of people came. There are still a lot of folks upset. I think to provide access to these things, you know, even the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] mentioned that he had in the bill, though the process was not served, of only about one-third of the roads. So there evidently is a problem that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN] wants to clarify one third of the roads. Then we need to support the gentleman amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think it is important for us to realize one fact the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] made earlier. There are a lot of folks that cannot put a backpack on their backs and walk 10 miles out to enjoy the paloverde tree or the ironwood tree or campsite they have been going to for 20

to 30 years. In my district you have people who have visited the same campsite for two or three generations.

You have to have vehicles to enjoy the desert. The point is we are not taking vehicles off road. The Pombo amendment allows people to access the same roads they have been using. So we have got roads in strategic places where a person like Ida Little can conduct the wild flower tours she has been conducting for the last 20 years or so. She cannot put a backpack on at over 70 years of age and stride off into the sands to do that.

The desert is a great resource, not just for the young, strong people who have subscriptions to Backpacker magazine, but also senior citizens and people that have been going there for generations. If you take away their right to those roads and their vehicles, then you have taken them out of the desert.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say that the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], the roads he has put in there, 1,000 miles of this is designated on AAA maps. Golly, that is just like putting I-15 or Route 66 on it. To say we are going to close these roads that have been used for years, I personally think this is ludicrous. We are taking away access for so many people. Southern California, southern Nevada, all of those people have used these roads.

I think the gentleman has come up with an excellent amendment. I would hope the Members listening to this in their offices would take into consideration, this may be California, but it may be your State next. I would hate to see you throttle down this access.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to these definitions of roads. I would like to share with my colleagues a little truth and fact relative to access to private property. The Santa Rosa Mountains are the backdrop for the valleys and areas of the Cahuilla Valley and the cities therein.

□ 1410

The BLM, ever since I can remember, has denied access to private property, access to private property, in those areas.

Let us get back to the desert bill. If this desert bill goes through in its present form, there are a number of popular destinations for family or community activities between the communities of Indio and Blythe, south of I-10, that would no longer be available or accessible because of the wilderness designation. The fact is that these people will no longer be able to go through roads they can now, to get to in-holdings where people actually own property.

For example, in the district that I represent, we have a number of clubs, and let me give you one in particular, the El Jamel four-wheel-drive club, a family and community-based organization. They do not have enough money to go out fly fishing in New Zealand. They use the desert for recreational purposes.

They collectively over the years, and it has been so long I cannot even remember, purchased 40 acres of land, which under this bill will no longer be accessible to them. I repeat that, it will no longer be accessible to them, because they have to get to where they are going through what we are designating as a wilderness area.

The BLM has not let people in the same area, up in the Orocopias, go to their private property, so I must take exception with the analysis given, unless there is something here that I have missed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point about these people. They are fine, community people. They are not a bunch of wild, beer-drinking bikers, tearing the desert apart. They take a great deal of pride in their activities, and actually clean up the desert in many of the projects.

These people are going to be denied, by the definitions that we have looked at specific to this property, to their 40 acres, and the large number of people within the community of Indio who belong to this one club, will be denied access to their desert by the Bureau of Land Management.

How much more can we talk about, that disputes what it is that the gentleman is bringing forward as being an idea that, well, if we have a piece of property, the Federal Government must give us access? What about these sections of property in the Orocopias that people have not been able to get to by vehicle?

One fellow says, "I will build a road on BLM property, on the alignment of the section. I will not go across it." He is told: "Sorry, you cannot build on the line of property there or anywhere else."

This is the problem we are having. This is why, without the Pombo amendment, we are going to deprive people such as I have referred to, who look at the desert as a recreational outlet for their families, who do not have the money to do other things, access to the property they and their parents and their grandparents have had for years.

Let me give the kicker here. There were two main routes east and west into California during the 1800's. There was the Butterfield Stage Route that connected Yuma and went through the Imperial Valley and ultimately ended up on the coast. You had the Bradshaw Trail, which parallels I-10 south of Blythe and goes into the Salton Sea area. In both cases, those roads have been there since the 1800's, and in both cases, we will no longer be able to traverse those roads as a recreational activity.

Herein lies the problem, and this is why the Pombo amendment to me is an answer to this. We are not going to build a freeway through pristine areas. We are trying to give people an opportunity to enjoy what they have enjoyed for years, and those that follow.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, might I make an inquiry as to how many Members want to speak? We are getting questions on both sides of the aisle as to intent on time.

My understanding is that the intent was originally that the committee would rise by 3 o'clock. I know the gentleman has Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VENTO has not spoken, and Mr. DOOLITTLE has not spoken.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is fine, and we can go to a vote and they can have their 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, without this amendment, will cut off long-established access routes. This is the old Spanish Trail, this route that goes up along here from west to east. That has been available for use for over 100 years.

Under this bill, without this amendment, the people will not have access to that any longer. This is just one example, of how detrimental this piece of legislation is going to be, cutting off something that has been in continuous use for over 100 years.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the reality is that the bill is going to cut off access basically to these publicly owned lands, and the response is no, if you are within 3 miles, which the bill guarantees, we deem that to be adequate access.

Mr. Chairman, if we stop and think about it, when is the last time we took our family, say, up to a piece of undeveloped property, and it does not have water so you have to carry water. If I remember correctly that is about six pounds a gallon or more, and you have to have or you usually want to bring a cooler with food and so forth in it which weighs a certain amount.

If there are very small children, they are not going to be able to walk themselves the 3 miles, so, of course, sure, you can strap them on your back if you can find room alongside the water and alongside the food and stuff you have in your pack to maybe take them along, but 3 miles out in the desert sun at about 110 degrees in the sand is not going to be too appealing. It might tend to suggest that you will in effect restrict access, even while proclaiming to guarantee access.

Yes, there is a type of people that have been mentioned; DUNCAN HUNTER

mentioned one lady in her seventies who conducts a wildflower tour. Older people are going to have difficulty going in those conditions for 3 miles in order to have what this bill claims will be adequate access.

Mr. Chairman, I would just represent that this is really an effective denial of access. That is what the Pombo amendment is intended to address, so that we can really enjoy the land our tax money is paying for, instead of having it roped off to us, and cutting off established public access routes, like the old Spanish Trail, which have been in effect for over 100 years.

Talk about an extreme piece of legislation, this is it. This Pombo amendment is a very reasonable remedy to make these provisions work so we protect what is desired to be protected, and we continue to ensure the public the use.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about access to private lands. That is guaranteed by language in here. Let me ask, how many of the Members would like to go hat in hand to the Park Service or the BLM begging for access to your own land? How many of the Members would like to hire an attorney at x number of thousands of dollars and x number of months or years, in order to secure that right? Oh, yes, there is language in here that supposedly allows it, but the reality is it is going to cost thousands of dollars for the private property owner and months if not years in order to lay claim to that right. So it is not right at all.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we should all vote to support the Pombo amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pombo amendment. What this amendment is all about is whether or not we are going to have a national wilderness system or not, and whether or not it is going to apply to these lands in California, these substantial lands that are being designated both as wilderness and nonwilderness in this area.

Mr. Chairman, clearly the Federal Government in this case stands in the place of the American public. They, in fact, represent the public ownership and the rights of the public in general to stewardship and to a legacy of natural heritage that exists in this Mojave Desert and other areas in this vast California desert area.

The fact is that there apparently is a school of thought here that one cannot trust the Federal Government, one cannot trust the land managers; that the Federal Government cannot do anything right, and therefore, we are not satisfied with what rights a private individual may have with regard to the Constitution, we are satisfied with the rights that exist with the Wilderness Act that apply to all the other 49 States, and obviously there are differences.

The question is, it is going to be the lowest common denominator. if someone does not agree with what a land manager is doing, whether it is the Department of Agriculture, Park Service, BLM, or some other wilderness area, the Fish and Wildlife Service, therefore we are going to come in here with a bulldozer type of attitude with regard to public policy, not one that is rooted in the Constitution, other than by the definition of those that are trying to define that, because if that were the case, that would be established and that would be a court case and they would win.

□ 1420

They cannot apparently prevail in that particular instance. No, we are going to come in here with this amendment that provides another thousand miles of roads in this area to these sites over public land. The issue here, of course, is what the type of access is gong to be. Under the aegis of private property rights, of course, we are not just going to have the individual access, we are going to have the off-road vehicles that are going to be in there, that are going to be going down those roads, the various motorcycles, a whole host of various things that are going to obviously cause a significant impact in these sensitive desert areas that we are trying to preserve as wilderness. The wilderness, I might say, which is the legacy of not just the people in California but of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, these laws and rules apply, the Constitution and the rules of wilderness apply in all the other States and in some cases, apparently unhappily, it is not the type of fit that Members want, it is not the lowest common denominator. They cannot always take their four-wheel-drive vehicle down there, they cannot pave it, they cannot do a variety of other things they would like to do. The fact is that this bill provides access to almost any private property that is no more than 3 miles away from a road.

Mr. Chairman, there are in this bill in this desert area, vast area, some 35,000 miles of road, not 33,000 as we are reporting, there is at least 35,000. Plus, through the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], the work of Senator FEINSTEIN, the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in making agreements, they have expanded that area even more in the committee, so there has been a conscientious effort here to be sensitive to this, to deal with it. But we are not going to, and I would ask to reject the issue here, provide access to all of these irrespective and to make it a public access so it will not just be used by the private landowner but by all these recreation vehicles. That will really cause the demise and the degradation of these wilderness areas that are trying to be protected.

I ask the Members of this House to vote no on Pombo and to stand up for these areas and to stand up to keep the California wilderness in as good a condition as we can, as the other areas in this country, to vote no on the Pombo amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, frankly I was a little disconcerted there a moment ago, for throughout this debate I have been wanting to mention the name of California's senior Senator, Mrs. FEINSTEIN from California, but I did not think our rules allowed it, but since our chairman used it, the senior Senator has been very much involved in this catastrophe we are talking about today, and I wanted to make sure the House was aware of that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it very clear to Members of the House that none of the four Members who were elected to represent the desert communities of California is opposed to desert wilderness or to desert planning or to adequate park availability or to supporting our monuments. Indeed, we have been involved in that very work for our careers.

Mr. Chairman, I was the author of the first legislation in California to attempt to do something about people who abused the land and the vegetation of the desert. We increased law enforcement access to many an area that prevented people from across State lines coming in to steal much of the flora and fauna of the desert. I was the chairman of a standing environmental quality committee that dealt with air quality in the region as well as southern California while in the legislature. I have carried amendments here to increase the numbers of employees available to protect the desert lands.

Mr. Chairman, the four Members who represent the desert are complaining today only because this bill does not reflect appropriate public policy process. It is an arbitrary action on the part of this committee that overrode the public process. It is very important for the membership to know that this House some years ago created a public commission that held almost endless hearings, years of hearings, some 40,000 individual comments, to make sure that the grazers were listened to, the environmentalists were listened to, that miners were listened to, that people who had recreational interests had an adequate voice, and that entire process led to a plan that indeed we have introduced on more than one occasion and strongly support.

That legislation itself will involve over 2.3 million acres of land with some 62 areas that are wilderness.

Mr. Chairman, we are not opposed to protecting the desert. But excess action on the part of a few members of

the committee who represent what I describe as the urban leeches in the environmental movement, who do not understand the desert, are what we are opposed to, and they have no explanation as to how we are going to pay for this.

Currently, Mr. Chairman, we all know that our National Park System is in desperate shape. Yellowstone, for example, cannot even begin to service the needs that are there. My constituents during the last recess, yours, too, complained and complained about lack of access to parks because of inadequate funding. We are not able to take care of the parks that are absolutely unnecessary with no funding mechanism whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, remember that this bill has gone forward with no consultation of any nature, of any significance with the Members who are elected to represent the desert and that is where we begin and our fundamental complaint. The desert is our territory, we care about it and our people understand it and love it the most.

I think before going any further regarding the general debate, Mr. Chairman, it is important that we address for a moment in a little different way the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], before us, for while the gentleman does not specifically represent the desert territory, the gentleman is clearly a man of the West and understands the importance of access. The significance of his amendment in terms of improving this bill should not be underestimated. I would hope it would receive overwhelming support in the House.

Mr. Chairman, let me just discuss with Members why access is important. If one is an outdoor enthusiast who enjoys hiking, camping and taking in wilderness experience, access is important. If one is a rock hound who enjoys climbing up into the hills and mountains of our desert, they need access.

There are territories that are bigger than an eastern State, and we cannot walk there, so we need access.

If one's job is to maintain guzzlers and ample water sources for bighorn sheep or other animals in the desert, access is important to maintaining those species.

The list, my friends, goes on and on. Access is critical to maintaining and preserving the desert.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take Members for a walk in the desert for just a moment. It is largely my territory. If one has never visited the California desert, he will find that it is nothing like the wilderness experience one would have in the Appalachians or in the Rockies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the outdoor experience in the desert is a far cry from taking a walk through a wilderness area along a scenic trail or a mountain stream. The desert environment is often very unforgiving. Indeed, it can be deadly without an adequate water source and transportation. It is very important for the Members to know that those involved in the desert will find their access almost entirely cut off unless this amendment is adopted.

Just take rock collecting, for example. H.R. 518 as it now stands, the best rock collecting areas that are usually in the mountains will be miles from the nearest road. Many rock collectors, including older Americans, constituents of mine who live in the desert, will be unable to have access they need if they need to walk additional distances to pursue that hobby. This also holds true for the most scenic hiking, camping and picnicking areas in the desert.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most popular hiking areas known as the Cady Mountains will be off limits without the passage of this amendment.

The interior of this wilderness area is 6 miles from the nearest road each way. Is the average senior citizen or disabled person going to be able to traverse some way those 6 miles?

Exploring many of California's historic trails and ghost towns will be no longer possible without this amendment.

The old Spanish trail has been mentioned, which brought pioneers from Salt Lake City to Los Angeles in the 19th century, would be lost forever, and perhaps forgotten to those who live in the urban center.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct for my colleagues some of the misinformation that is being fed by the opponents of the Pombo amendment. This is not in any way an off-road vehicle amendment. I repeat, this is not in any way an off-road vehicle amendment. Frankly, I have had problems with motorcycles between Barstow and Las Vegas and they would suggest that is what this bill is about. It is not what this bill is about. The Pombo amendment does not open up areas of the desert to be misused or abused. On the contrary, this amendment is to maintain the rights of average citizens to use 1,037 miles of roads, largely in my district, that have been in existence for decades.

□ 1430

These roads are spread over five counties in an area the size of the State of Virginia. In my own district, you can put four Eastern States, as I have said, in easily. In fact, many of the roads included within this amendment, as has been suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], are on all of the AAA maps. Craziness is involved in this legislation.

While it is true access to the existing claims and allotments would be denied by H.R. 518, it is important for us to know that foremost in our mind's eye are the rights and privileges of individual citizens to travel over roads whether they own land there or not that they traveled over for years.

Hundreds of individuals with small mining claims would be prohibited access to their claims. One such constituent of mine who currently uses the Porter Mine Road, which leads to a 100-year-old active mine, would be denied use of the road he has used for years. Likewise, without this amendment, access to federally permitted zigzag allotments would be eliminated.

David Fisher, whose family has raised cattle on the desert range for five generations, would be essentially out of business without access to maintain water sources for his livestock and other desert species.

California's senior Senator, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, promised Mr. Fisher he would be able to continue cattle ranching into perpetuity. However, as this bill is presently written without access, he will be regulated out of business.

The proponents of this legislation have claimed that no location in wilderness under H.R. 518 is more than 3 miles from a road. That is simply not the case. Mr. Chairman, for instance, the Saline-Eureka Valley area in the proposed Death Valley National Park is at least 24 miles across. Only the most elite endurance athlete could survive this type of hiking wilderness experience, on horseback, or while carrying any significant amount of water.

One of the most disturbing elements of H.R. 518, as presently written, is that it will restrict private-property owners' access to their own property. This dramatically impacts, Mr. Chairman and Members, hundreds of families of my own constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. The small landowners, the small miners, Mr. and Mrs. America of the West would be most dramatically affected by this bill without this amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] points to many existing roads used by those average citizens, and full well he makes clear they will be closed to those citizens in terms of their use to access.

Property owners like June Southcaught, who has been building a cabin in the Table Mountain Wilderness, will not be able to complete her home. Others who had planned to build a retirement home will lose the chance to do so without access. Citizens would be guaranteed access to their private

property if it is to be included in a national park. We owe them that much at least.

My colleagues, we certainly owe them that much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has again expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am only asking, because we are getting besieged by Members who claim they have planes at 3 o'clock or whatever. Can the gentleman give us some indication?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield, I am asking for 3 additional minutes, and I am going to take 30 seconds and yield the balance to the gentleman so he may close.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say to you that I only take this extra time because there is a tendency for Members to easily vote for what is considered to be an environmental vote for urban city Members when it does not affect their district. This dramatically affects four Members' districts who have not been consulted about this matter.

It is important for you to know that essentially this legislation overwhelmingly impacts their ability to deal effectively with their district without that consultation.

The gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] is simply attempting to make sure many of my citizens have adequate access to their property.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, on closing, bring the debate back to where I started quite some time ago.

What we are talking about here is guaranteeing access for a number of recreational activities as well as access to private property. That is what my amendment is guaranteeing, now, regardless, whether or not off-road vehicles, whether they be four-wheel-drives or motorcycles or what, they are included in the ability to access.

What we are talking about on this map in specifics is about 15 to 20 miles across where the off-road vehicles would be allowed is on the part that is white. That is an existing road that is currently being used. That is where they would be allowed. They would not be allowed to enter into the wilderness area. They would be restricted to the areas which I am requesting be removed from the wilderness area which are the existing roads.

Going back to this map which shows a number of private-property owners which are included, it was mentioned in the debate that this does not directly affect my district. Well, it does directly affect my district, and I will tell you why, because what is happening to these private-property owners in my district and in your district.

The Federal Government comes in and puts restrictions like this on top of the property, and in effect is taking the private property away from those owners without just compensation. They are not being allowed to have the full use of their property because of legislation like this and other legislation which has been effected by this Congress this year and in past years. It does affect my district and it affects your district, whether you think it does or not.

There are four Members here today whom this directly affects now, because it is their district, because every one of you who sits on this floor and who will be coming down here to cast a vote on this motion know that this affects your districts directly, because these are the private-property rights that need to be protected.

Please, support the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 191, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—169

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fowler
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Regula
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Rowland
Sangmeister
Santorum
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Stark
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Underwood (GU)

Unsoeld	Waters	Woolsey
Velazquez	Watt	Wyden
Vento	Waxman	Wynn
Visclosky	Williams	Yates
Volkmer	Wise	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—79

Bacchus (FL)	Hamburg	Roberts
Baker (CA)	Hastings	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ballenger	Hilliard	Royce
Barton	Jefferson	Sanders
Bevill	Johnston	Sarpalius
Bilirakis	Laughlin	Schaefer
Bishop	Lloyd	Schumer
Blackwell	Machtley	Shuster
Boehlert	McCurdy	Sisisky
Clay	McNulty	Skelton
Coleman	Meehan	Slattery
Collins (MI)	Meek	Smith (IA)
Conyers	Meyers	Solomon
Cooper	Moakley	Spratt
Deal	Montgomery	Stokes
Dickey	Murphy	Sundquist
Faleomavaega (AS)	Murtha	Tanner
Fields (TX)	Obey	Tauzin
Flake	Orton	Taylor (NC)
Foglietta	Packard	Thompson
Frost	Parker	Tucker
Gejdenson	Penny	Walsh
Gephardt	Pickett	Washington
Grams	Pickle	Weldon
Grandy	Quillen	Wheat
Hall (OH)	Rangel	Whitten
	Ridge	

□ 1457

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Orton for, with Miss Collins of Michigan against.

Mr. Tanner for, with Mr. Deal against.

Mr. Baker of California for, with Mr. Jefferson against.

Mr. Barton for, with Mrs. Meek against.

Mr. Bilirakis for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Mr. Taylor of North Carolina for, with Mr. Slattery against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Tucker against.

Mr. FARR, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. FIELDS of Louisiana, NADLER, and MARTINEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. OXLEY and Mr. TORRES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 518, the California Desert Protection Act. I want to commend Representative LEHMAN, Chairman VENTO and Chairman MILLER for all their hard work on this issue.

The California Desert is one of this Nation's most spectacular, and fragile, natural resources. I believe it is also among one of our most threatened due to its close proximity to millions of people in southern California. The desert provides valuable habitat to more than 600 species of animals and nearly 2,000 species of plants. Some species, including the bighorn sheep and the desert tortoise, are protected under the Endangered Species Act. The desert, especially the area which will be designated as the East Mojave National Park, contains a special combination of high and low altitude areas, lava beds and an incredible sand dune system. In the Mojave area alone, three desert ecosystems—the Sonoran, Mojave and Great Basin—converge creating a unique habitat.

H.R. 518 would designate approximately 3.9 million acres currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management [BLM] as wilderness. It would expand the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments and make them national parks. It would create the East Mojave National Park on approximately 1.5 million acres. Furthermore, the legislation designates about 4 million acres within the new parks as wilderness, which will ensure their pristine character will be protected for generations to come.

Representative LEHMAN and Chairman MILLER have gone the extra mile to ensure this is a balanced bill. Grazing at current levels will be protected in Death Valley and Joshua Tree and valid, existing mining claims will be honored. Hundreds of miles of roads are exempt from the bill and nearly 400,000 acres were carved out to provide a free play area for offroad vehicle enthusiasts. Numerous acres were also exempt to accommodate several companies. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will offer an amendment which will provide the military with a 15-year extension for land withdrawals for China Lake Naval Weapons Center and Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range. Mr. VENTO's amendment will also make it clear that nothing in this bill in any way affects or restricts low-level military flights over the parks and wilderness areas established by this bill. Furthermore. Mr. LEHMAN will offer amendments which will make it clear that Federal law enforcement and State wildlife officials have broad access to the wilderness areas to carry out their official duties. I believe this amendment goes above and beyond the call of duty because the Wilderness Act in no way precludes these activities.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on one amendment which I strongly believe would undermine the entire bill if accepted by the House. The amendment I am concerned about will be offered by Representative LAROCCO and would designate the East Mojave as a national preserve rather than a national park. While I have great respect for Representative LAROCCO, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. As Chairman MILLER, Chairman VENTO, and Representative LEHMAN made clear during markup in the Natural Resources Committee, the entire purpose of this bill would be undermined if the East Mojave was designated as a preserve because it would not be afforded the degree of protection it deserves. As I mentioned above, the East Mojave contains a special mix of resources which definitely make it eligible for national park status. National Park Service Director Roger Kennedy and Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt have expressed their strong support for an East Mojave Park. Nearly every major environmental group supports park designation. More importantly, polls show that a majority of residents in the desert area support making East Mojave a national park.

One of the reasons for designating East Mojave as a preserve is to allow hunting to continue in the area. I do not believe hunters will be adversely affected by the bill as reported by the Natural Resources Committee. Hunting in the area has been sparse at best for the last several years with hunters taking an average of 20 to 30 deer and 5 sheep in the region each year. Moreover, about 10 million acres of desert will remain open to hunting. In addition, hunting is incompatible with units of the park system due to heavy use by the public. While hunting is allowed in several preserves, the majority are in Alaska where I do not believe the number of visitors can compare with those in southern California. According to NPS Director Kennedy, it would cost $500,000 more to administer the East Mojave as a preserve than as a park due to law enforcement concerns. Furthermore, a poll conducted by the Field Institute in early 1993 found that 66 percent of households with hunters supported making East Mojave a national park even though hunting would not be allowed there. This amendment would defeat the purpose of this legislation and should be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, by passing H.R. 518 the House can join the Senate in protecting some of our country's most impressive and varied natural resources. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill and oppose any weakening amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the California desert legislation, before us today, has come to fruition after years of debate and negotiation spanning the life of several Congresses. This final product will bring millions of acres of desert land into the protection of wilderness and national park designation, ensuring that these areas will continue to exist as they do today for the enjoyment of generations to come.

It is a tribute to Senator FEINSTEIN that this measure has now been transported on its long journey through the Senate and to the House. Representatives MILLER, VENTO, and LEHMAN are to be commended for their successful efforts in bringing H.R. 518 before us today. Their work on this initiative will long be remembered by the many who will find beauty and refuge in the open lands that will be preserved forever through this legislation.

The California desert possesses a unique and varied ecosystem that spans over 25 million acres. H.R. 518 will guarantee the protection of endangered species and other rare plant and animal habitats in the key areas of this acreage while also allowing livestock grazing and multiple-use recreation.

The Mojave meets all the important criteria for a national park and deserves this greater level of protection. National park status would also provide greater protection for the Mojave's visitors through the prohibition on hunting in national parks. Seventy-five percent of the people in California support protection of the Mojave as a national park without hunting.

This landmark legislation is the greatest effort to preserve our public domain in almost 15 years since the celebrated Alaska lands bill in 1980. It will protect almost 4 million acres as wilderness as well as designating over 3 million acres as national park land. H.R. 518 is an essential investment in the future that will preserve these exceptional lands for all time, for all people.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 518) to designate certain lands in the California Desert as wilderness, to establish the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Parks and the Mojave National Monument, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 10, I was absent from the House to sponsor a trade conference in my district with Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown, Export-Import Bank Chairman Kenneth Brody, and Trade and Development Agency Director Joseph Grandmaison. As a result, I missed three rollcall votes on amendments to H.R. 518, the California Desert Protection Act. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 229—Aye, rollcall No. 230—Aye, rollcall No. 231—No.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Friday, June 10, I missed a vote on Representative POMBO's amendment to the California Desert Protection Act. This amendment would continue public access to 200 roads and trails in designated wilderness areas.

I was in the middle of a teleconference with members of the Citizens Jury in my district; 18 of my constituents were brought together in Winona, MN to study welfare reform. Friday afternoon was the culmination of 6 days of in-depth study with nationally recognized experts. The jurors were presenting to me their specific recommendations for reform of the welfare system. I regret that I had to miss a vote, but the jurors' observations were invaluable. I only wish that every Member of Congress was given the opportunity to hear from his or her constituents utilizing this truly democratic process.

I would have voted "yea" on the Pombo amendment, as I feel it is important for private property owners to maintain easy access to their property.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTON. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 10, 1994, I was away on official business and missed rollcall votes 229, 230, and 231.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on vote 229, and aye on vote 230. I was paired on vote 231.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall votes 229, 230, and 231. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" in support of the Thomas amendment, "yea" in support of the Hunter amendment, and "yea" in support of the Pombo amendment to the California Desert Protection Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I have asked for this 1-minute for the purpose that I might inquire of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the program for next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1500

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader, for yielding.

The schedule for next week is as follows. On Monday, June 13, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business, and then will meet officially at noon. There will be four bills for suspension that afternoon, H.R. 3013, to establish a center for Women's Veterans in the Department of Veterans Affairs; S. 1904, Board Of Veterans' Appeals Administration Procedures and Improvement Act; H.R. 1015, Fair Credit Reporting Act; and H.R. 4246, Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act.

Then we plan to go back to the California Desert Protection Act, the bill which we have just been working on. We do not expect votes until after 5, and we do expect to finish our work at around 7 o'clock on Monday.

On Tuesday we meet at 10:30 for morning business, and then meet at noon for a session.

For Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, we will begin at 10 a.m. The legislation to be considered Tuesday through the rest of the week is the energy and water development appropriations bill, the Treasury authorizations bill, the Transportation appropriations bill, the Agriculture appropriations bill, and we also hope to complete work on the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act.

On Tuesday we would like to finish by 6 because of a dinner that we understand will be attended by a large number of our colleagues. On Wednesday and Thursday, we can expect late nights, late, late nights on Wednesday and Thursday. On Friday we will be out by 3.

Mr. MICHEL. Will there definitely be a session on Friday?

Mr. BONIOR. There certainly will be on Friday, and we will be going until 3 o'clock.

Mr. MICHEL. Monday's votes on the suspensions will be delayed until 5 o'clock?

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct. Let me correct myself, if the gentleman will yield further. The suspensions, I misspoke, will be rolled until Tuesday. We will go back to the California Desert Protection Act at 5 o'clock.

Mr. MICHEL. Assuming we get through with the suspensions before 5, will there be an interval there?

Mr. BONIOR. We anticipate a hiatus, a recess, yes.

Mr. MICHEL. I see. How long would we go on Monday?

Mr. BONIOR. Until about 7.

Mr. MICHEL. So there could be rollcall votes between 5 and 7, if we are taking up the controversial bill we have just handled.

Mr. BONIOR. We may start the debate on the California desert amendments at four, but Members should understand that we will not have any votes prior to 5 o'clock.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican leader for yielding to me. I would simply like to inquire of my very good friend and fellow Committee on Rules Member what the schedule could be on the issue of congressional reform. As the gentleman knows, last year we put into place the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress charged specifically with bringing about a wide range of recommendations.

We were told last fall that the measure would be brought to the floor. We were told early this year that because we did not get it to the floor before the end of calendar year 1993 we could see it on the floor in the spring. We have been told we will have it the early summer. Now there is rumor it will be broken up and we will not have H.R. 3801, the measure reported out just before Thanksgiving of last year, charged with bringing about the reorganization of this Congress which Members in a bipartisan way wanted to address.

I wonder if my friend could tell me as to when we could expect to see that on the floor?

Mr. BONIOR. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Rules on which we both serve is deliberating on this bill. It is a very important piece of legislation. We expect to take this bill up some time after the Fourth of July recess. That is the intention as of today.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would continue to yield, I would just like to state that yesterday, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee began its markup on this issue. Next week I understand the Committee on House Administration is scheduled to begin its markup simply on the issue of congressional compliance, beginning this process of breaking up congressional reform. We have had some hearings up in the Committee on Rules on this, but, unfortunately, we have not really seen any action. I understand this is going to be brought up after the Fourth of July break?

Mr. BONIOR. That is the intention right now, that is correct.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1994

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TRIAL PERIOD

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the trial period established on February 11, 1994, for recognition for special order speeches be continued for the duration of the 103d Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Speaker's policy for recognition for special order speeches announced on February 11, 1994, will be extended for the duration of the 103d Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, June 8, 1994, and today and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, June 10, 1994 just over 2 weeks ago, I had a very successful surgery for prostate cancer. My surgery was performed by Doctors David G. McLeod and Stephen Sihelnik and their highly skilled staff at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. I thank them all for their dedication.

This experience taught me just how important it is for all men over the age of 40 to be tested for prostate cancer. It is the most common cancer in American men. One out of every ten men will develop it at some time in his life. According to the American Cancer Society 200,000 men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in 1994; 38,000 will die. I am now one of those 200,000.

I was lucky. Though I had no symptoms indicating a problem, a simple, inexpensive test known as the prostate-specific antigen or PSA test showed that I needed additional testing. My prostate cancer was discovered early and successfully removed. I strongly urge other men to make the PSA part of their annual physical examinations.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I submit the following Ann Landers column of June 7, 1994, on the need for annual prostate cancer testing.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1994]

ANN LANDERS

Dear Ann Landers: Please print something again about the importance of having a PSA (prostate-specific antigen) blood test to detect prostate cancer. One of my dearest friends recently died from this terrible disease, and a relative is now bravely fighting it.

Every year 35,000 men in the United States die from prostate cancer. If it is detected early enough, it can be cured. Every man 40 and older should have an annual physical examination. After 50, men should also have a simple PSA blood test to detect prostate cancer that the doctor cannot feel during a digital exam. The PSA test can be done in a doctor's office. Please tell your readers, Ann. It could save lives.—Your Faithful Reader in Fort Worth.

Dear Fort Worth:

We spoke with Jerome Richie, surgeon in chief in the division of urology at the Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston. He said your information is correct. The PSA is the most accurate and predictive prostate cancer test. Richie cautioned, however, that the PSA can produce false negatives and false positives, and he recommended follow-up testing. In other words, don't rely on a single test.

Richie also emphasized that men with a family history of prostate cancer should have an annual digital examination and PSA starting at age 40 instead of 50.

Remember, early detection will increase the chances for survival. To my women readers, I say, if you love the man in your life, nag him until he makes an appointment.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING CLASS OF PAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the occasion on which we say good-bye to the current class of pages who have served us so ably and well throughout the duration of this school year. When we return on Monday, we will have another group of pages in their place.

I wanted in particular to pay tribute to the fine group who has been here to service us in the 1993–94 school year. A number of Members have asked to have a word here, and I would like, first of all, to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Page Board, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the pages who have served us so well, some for the full year, some for the last semester, will be leaving back for their homes tomorrow or Sunday, and they will be missed. They have served us well. I have been chairman of the Page Board for a number of years, and I cannot recall a group of pages better than the group we have had this semester and this year.

Each and every one of you have my admiration, and you have my thanks. Some of you may return here some day as Members of this body, as Mr. EMERSON did, a former page. Some will return in other capacities in government. But all of you, I am sure, will be better citizens for having served here. You have seen Congress close up. You have seen us with our good points and our bad points, our weak points.

□ 1510

However, you have seen democracy in action here. I myself am a better person for having come in contact with the pages, because I see America and I see America's future in them. I wish God's blessing upon all of you.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Young people, this has been a terrific experience for all of you, I know, and what DALE KILDEE, Congressman KILDEE from Michigan, the chairman of the Page Board, just said is true: You have had a great experience and you have learned a lot.

I tell the pages, I was president of the Maryland Senate for 4 years in the 1970's, and we had a page program. The seniors throughout our State got one week shorter time. We had a 10-week session, and they came, and sometimes we met late and they saw members with short tempers, and they saw members sometimes late at night who might have nodded off.

However, generally speaking, I think they saw members of both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, they saw conservatives and liberals and moderates. They saw people who had been selected by their neighbors to come to Annapolis, as you have seen those selected by your neighbors from all over the United States to come here to Washington.

I hope the lesson that you have learned is that those who have come here care very deeply about their responsibilities. There is only, as you know, one way to get here to the House of Representatives, and that is to be elected. It is unlike almost any other body in the United States.

You cannot be appointed to the House of Representatives. Our Founding Fathers said they wanted people to serve in this body one way only, and that is by democratic vote, to be selected by their neighbors to come and serve in this body. We swear an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution, of course, provides for the general welfare of our people.

I hope that you have concluded, as I have concluded throughout my years of service with people a lot different than me, from constituencies a lot different than mine, that you have concluded that irrespective of party, irrespective of ideology, that almost to a person—are there exceptions, yes, there are—but almost to a person they are here with a deep commitment to that oath and a deep commitment to their country and a deep commitment to the welfare of their Nation.

You have been given an opportunity, pages, that few young Americans ever get. That is at a young age, when you are deeply immersed in education, to come here and to learn firsthand, to see for yourselves, not filtered by the media, not filtered by candidates who run against this institution, some of whom are Members of this institution and some of whom are not, not filtered by rumor, not filtered by a third party hearsay, but you have seen firsthand.

I hope you have concluded that the Founding Fathers established a body in a democracy that works as they planned; not that it solves every problem in a timely fashion, but it works mightily to do so in the framework of a crucible of democracy that brings different ideas and different interests into conflict for resolution.

Because you have been given this special opportunity, I suggest to you young people that you also have a special responsibility. Because you have seen firsthand, I hope that every one of you will go back to your schools, your high schools, and then into your work place or your college or your technical school or your job, wherever you may go in the future, and talk to your fellow citizens, talk to your generation, talk to them about democracy working, and talk to them about participating in their democracy.

Congressman EMERSON went back and he was elected to the Congress, but there are millions and millions and millions of people who participate intimately in democracy, never running for elected office. They do so by supporting, by working on behalf of issues, by making sure that their democracy works through the exercise of that vigilance which freedom requires.

You have been given a special opportunity and a special responsibility. The Page program is very good for you individually, but it is much, much bigger than that. It is good for our country. It is good for our country because it hopefully, and I believe does, energizes young people, bright, able, energetic young people, to continue to nurture democracy. Godspeed. Thank you.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent statement, an inspiration to all of us. Thank you, STENY.

I yield to a very distinguished former page, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for yielding.

Like my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, I got my start here as a page. That may be good news or bad news to those of you who are here as pages, in terms of your own ambitions and hopes and dreams.

I want to say thank you to each and every one of you for the wonderful job that you have done for us. You have served us extraordinarily well during this last year, some of you for a semester and many of you for the whole year.

It is very easy for us, I think, here to take for granted the job that the pages do. They play such an important role in helping to make this place run smoothly.

We really could not do the job, and we certainly could not do it as well or as easily, if it were not for the outstanding job that you do cheerfully, day in and day out, sometimes long hours, sometimes some pretty tough things going on around here. Yet you do it and you do it well for us.

At a time when I think that a lot of us in America despair for the future of our country and a lot of us despair for the future of the generation of young Americans that we see, it is good to have this group of young Americans here today as role models for other young Americans, as role models, really, for all of us. I just wish every American that is listening and hearing us here today could be looking at you as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to the page I have been able to have this last year, Kristen Brandon, who will be a senior at Saguaro High School in Tucson, AZ, this next year; but to each of you, and I mean this very sincerely, how grateful we are for what you have done.

I know, I can say this with some certainty because of my own experience here, I know that you will look back on this experience through the course of your lives as being one of the most important experiences you will have had. No matter what you do, whether you are ever involved in government, whether you ever serve in Congress, whether you ever serve in any elected office, this will be one of those defining moments for your life in terms of shaping how you think and what you do the rest of your life. I know you will come to see it that way.

You have seen this institution, as my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said, you have seen this institution sometimes at its best, sometimes at its worst. You have seen the people in this institution in their good moments and in their bad moments.

I hope that you go away from this with a sense of the strength of American democracy and what this House of Representatives means for that democracy. Really, I see it as the central institution in our American democracy.

I hope you will go home with that better understanding, as my friend, STENY HOYER, said; that you will take as your responsibility an obligation to communicate with your families, with your friends, with your fellow students in your schools and the lives that you are all going to be going through for so many years, I hope you will take an opportunity to communicate something of what you have learned and an appreciation for that democracy.

Obviously, this is not the time, really, for a long civics lesson. You have had those and you will get many more of them. I just want to say thank you so much for what you have done. God bless each and every one of you, and Godspeed.

Mr. Emerson, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

I yield to my dear friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Cape Girardeau for yielding me this time. I am going to be very brief, to simply echo the remarks by my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], who very clearly pointed to the fact that we get a great deal of news on a regular basis about the problems that exist among young people.

As we think about the future of this country, it obviously lies with many of the people who are here in this Chamber right now, who will be future leaders of this country, because while we do have very serious problems that exist among young Americans, there is not doubt in my mind that like these fine people here today, there are great, capable, hardworking, diligent, thoughtful young people out there. I think it is very important for our colleagues to know that, but obviously, among those who are out there, we have, I believe, some of the best and most capable here who have served, worked very hard, as was said earlier, in a very cheerful manner. I know that this has been a great opportunity for them to serve here, just as it is for my friend, the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, Mr. EMERSON, and me to serve in the greatest deliberative body known to man.

□ 1520

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] had advised me that he wished to be here. It so happens that Mr. KANJORSKI and I were pages together in the 83d Congress, and he wanted to be here to extend his own best wishes.

Also I see on the floor at this time the distinguished Clerk of the House of Representatives to whom I cannot yield, because he is not an elected Member, but certainly Mr. Anderson is a devoted member of the Page Board and himself a former page, one who cares a great deal about the system, always trying to make it better and more meaningful for our pages. Mr. Anderson has penned a brief tribute to the pages which I will include in the RECORD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the pages a hearty thank you for all that you have done in the course of this semester and this past year. I think you have been an outstanding group of pages. On behalf of all of our colleagues, I wish you a lifetime filled with happiness and success and achievement. I know that my own experience as a page now so many years ago remains to me the premier educational experience of my life. It was an opportunity to learn by absorption, by seeing and participating and listening, to learn things that one cannot learn from textbooks. I hope that this has been your experience and that you will put to very good use the lessons that you have learned here.

As you go forward, I want to extend to you my own best wishes, the best wishes of the entire House, and wish you Godspeed in all of your endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the tribute by Donnald Anderson, Clerk of the House, as follows:

FAREWELL TO THE HOUSE PAGE CLASS OF 1994

(Remarks of the Honorable Donnald K. Anderson, Clerk of the House)

I am grateful to Congressman Bill Emerson for the opportunity to add to his tribute to the House Page Class of 1994.

As a fellow alumnus of the House Page Program, I share Mr. Emerson's deep regard for the program and gratitude to this class of Pages for their commitment and devotion to their duties.

The House Page Program provides our American youth with an unsurpassed experience in citizenship. Once the blue uniform is donned for the first time, a young person ceases to be a passive observer of a seemingly faraway and unknown process. The teenager is transformed into a Page, and with it, becomes immersed in the American legislative process—a system by which two hundred and sixty million Americans govern themselves through elected representation.

Everybody is a lesson for the Page. Governing ceases to be just a textbook notation, but comes alive as a daily drama. The Page quickly learns that with the responsibility of self-governance comes the responsibility of reconciling the ideal with the practical.

Our pages have learned their lessons well. They will return to their schools and communities across American prepared to share their knowledge and talents for the common good.

I have come to know each Page personally, through daily conversations on the House Floor, chaperoning their social events, and participating in their school seminars and field trips. They are the ideal and future of our great Nation.

I wish to extend my heartfelt thanks for the excellence of their service and kindness to me in so many thoughtful expressions. I wish them lives filled with constancy, purpose, contentment and peace. Thanks for the memories, God Bless you, young Americans, and farewell.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE BATTLE OF NORMANDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks on what I will call the Battle of Normandy, not just D-day which was only the first day, before the pages leave the floor, I would also want to add to the remarks of my colleagues how much we have enjoyed this class of pages. It almost seems like they just get better with each passing year, which is almost impossible because the pages when I was first here in 1977 when I represented a totally different district, I met some fine young men and women that are now already through law school, out practicing, practicing medicine, some of them have already attained the rank of captain, men and women in our military. You tend to think except when you run to catch a bus that you are ageless once you hit that plateau of about 25 and when you meet somebody, you say, "Don't I know you?"

"Yes, I was your intern in 1978 or 1979."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is like for our Members who have been here for 52 years like our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], but you certainly feel a sense of the passing of time when you meet pages who are out there in the world. I have yet to meet the first page who has attained State office, although I understand it has happened, from those that I met here as a serving Member, and I look forward to the day when I come back and I see one of you sitting here in the chairs as a Member of Congress and I am back here for a former members day.

If you are not rushing off to something, let me teach you a little something about the history of your country here on the Battle of Normandy, and I appreciate some of you pages remaining.

Mr. Speaker, 13 days ago I took the well to talk about the coming 50th anniversary of D-day and I remarked with some sadness that there were no celebrations on this floor with, not my participation, but the senior Members like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], all of them officers, many Members here who were enlisted men in various parts of the world in World War II. On the 60th anniversary, probably they will have all retired by then, with the exception of one or two, and certainly by the 75th anniversary, none of them will be here.

There was no memorial service on this House floor or I understand in the other body, in the Senate, and it is a tragedy. I spent 7 days over there, I have mixed feelings about whether it was a celebration, which it certainly was not, a memorial, a celebration for victory, but a memory for those young men who gave everything.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining 3 or 4 minutes here, I can only tell my colleagues that I would like to come back for an hour next week and give just a stream of consciousness on some of the key memories and some of the key conversations I had with vets.

I was there outside of Sur-Mer-Eglese when 41 veterans, all 50 years on top of whatever their age was when they bailed out, the youngest was an 18-year-old, so he was 68 when he bailed out again, of a C-47 and another adjoining smaller Canadian twin Otter, the oldest had been a 33-year-old officer when he jumped out, so he was 83 years of age when I watched him parachute out in those same fields on the afternoon of June 5 where he had been flying that night of June 5th 50 years ago to bail out just after 1 o'clock in the morning.

It was incredible to go up and shake the hands of these 41 veterans who had for the short moment, one of them suffering a severe back injury doing it, recaptured their youth.

At the end of the week, I broke away from the codel and went out into Colleville-Sur-Mer, the cemetery, which is 172 acres of American territory, given to us by the French Government forever. I was looking for the graves of the 33 pairs of brothers who are buried side by side, particularly for the graves of the sons of Theodore Roosevelt, our President in 1901 through 1908. I finally found the Roosevelt brothers' graves, looking for the gilded lettering on Teddy Roosevelt, Jr. because he received the Medal of Honor as the highest ranking officer on the Utah Beach, a brigadier general. He died D-day plus 36 days in the chow line with his men, without knowing he

was going to get the Medal of Honor. He died of a heart attack from the stress of 36 days of combat.

He was the one who said on the beach, "Let the war begin here, we are going through that small V-shaped gap in the sand dunes."

Mr. Speaker, when I looked at his grave, there were three wreaths of flowers around it given by the Fourth Division veterans that had come back, and I looked at the grave of his younger brother, Quinton, who had died 26 years earlier in his fighter plane over the trenches of France. My dad, Harry Joseph Dornan, was in those trenches as a combatant captain and officer, and he crashed near our trenches, so they retrieved his body. He died on Bastille Day, which is the Fourth of July for France, that is July 14th, their Freedom Day, their national celebration, trying to liberate or keep France from being overrun, he died on Bastille Day. His older brother, Teddy Roosevelt, Jr., 26 years later, short 2 days, July 12, he died this time liberating all of France. I thought of the words that a three-star general, Vernon Walters, our former Ambassador to Berlin, told me not a half hour before in the presence of another Medal of Honor winner, Adm. John Bulkeley, who took MacArthur off Corregidor. I was talking to Bulkeley about his job after the Solomon islands, commanding our PT boats off the beaches of Sicily in July 1943, a few months later off the beaches of Salerno, Italy, again Anzio, and brought up to command 67 PT boats off the coast of Normandy.

Keep in mind here John F. Kennedy lost his PT boat on his first mission, not his fault, but his first mission. Here was Bulkeley, hundreds of combat missions and PT boats, and in his esteemed presence General Walters tells me the following story:

When former President Roosevelt was told one of his young boys, Quinton, had died for his country and for France, Teddy Roosevelt looked down, his eyes filled up with tears, and he looked up and said, "When you have raised your sons to be eagles, you can't expect them to be doves."

The word "dove" had as much resonance then as I guess it did during the Vietnam war when some people let high school graduates go in their place so they could continue their higher education in a foreign land demonstrating against their country's objectives to keep half of Vietnam free and to prevent the killing fields and give aid and comfort to a vicious Communist worldwide effort to crush liberte, equalite, fraternite.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I will be back to tell you about the other 32 pairs of brothers and the colonel father and his lieutenant son who died in the battle for Normandy which was raging heavily today outside the little town of Carentan 50 years ago.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 8, 1994, and because there is no designee of the majority leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on this beautiful Friday afternoon in Washington, as many of our colleagues have taken off for their districts and we honor the pages who are the future of this country, I am taking this time out to talk about one of the most challenging years of my life, and that was calendar year 1993.

In August 1992, in the wake of the many problems that existed, and I hesitate to use the word "scandals," because that is really a pejorative, but quite frankly, there were scandals that surrounded the House Bank, the Post Office, the restaurant, and a wide range of other areas, we, in a bipartisan way, reported out a resolution that called for the establishment of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, now, it was the first time in nearly half a century, since 1947, when what was known as the Monroney-LaFollette Committee brought about major reforms of the institution in a bipartisan, bicameral way that a committee such as this was put together.

Mr. Speaker, this committee, one of the exciting things about it, was it was in place for 1 year and 1 year only. It went into effect on January 1 of 1993. It went out of existence on December 31 of 1993.

We had a very distinguished panel of Republicans and Democrats, an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. The only other committee where that is the case is the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the ethics committee. We had an equal number of Republicans and an equal number of Democrats, so we could, in a bipartisan way, bring about reform of this institution. We had an equal number of Senators, an equal number of House Members, making it challenging, but a real opportunity to come together and deal with the difficulties that often exist between the House and the Senate.

During the calendar year of 1993, we had the chance to put together the largest compilation of information on this body that has ever been gleaned. In fact, we had 37 hearings, over 240 witnesses, and a wide range of our colleagues, former Members of Congress, outside people, former Vice President Walter Mondale, Ross Perot, people from interest groups all over Washington, and across the country came to testify before this committee, and they did so because they were very encouraged at the fact that we were going to finally bring about the kinds of reforms that the American people want.

I believe that they want a greater degree of accountability here. I believe truly, as I said during the special order of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], honoring the pages, they want this truly to be the greatest deliberative body known to man.

We went through a very frustrating markup following all of these hearings. We had a 2-day meeting in Annapolis last summer, almost a year ago now, and then just before we adjourned after having a conflict that existed between the House and the Senate, the Senators wanted to proceed, and unfortunately Members here in the House on the majority side did not want us to proceed, but finally, unfortunately, taking separate paths between the House and Senate, we here in the House had our markup.

My colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], was a very important part of that markup. He and I were the only two Republicans who, at the very end of a very unsatisfactory procedure, voted to report out this measure. I did so believing that it was an extraordinarily weak package, one that I could not support, but I did so based on the fact that from commitments I had from people in the majority leadership we would move ahead, that we would move ahead and, in fact, consider this measure under what has been described by my cochairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], as a very generous rule.

Now, I and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] joined in doing that, because when we looked at 25 amendments that had been offered on our side, 25 amendments that were offered, we unfortunately lost those amendments on a 6–6 tie vote. As I said earlier, an equal number of Republicans and an equal number of Democrats, but because I was not able to have enough input in what we called the chairman's mark that came about, it really was designed by the majority, we had to get at least one member of the majority to vote with us in support of an amendment that we had.

Well, it was an interesting process, because throughout the markup we had just before Thanksgiving and before our adjournment, we had a wide range of Members who would say privately to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], to me, to the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that "We are not going to support you here, but these are amendments that we will support when they get to the floor." So it was based on that indication that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and I voted to move the process along so that we could, in fact, bring the issue of congressional reform to the floor of this House.

We were told that it would first be considered on the floor of the House, and actually this was our markup, was supposed to have first taken place right in early September of last year. We were told we would have the reform package on the floor of the House in October of 1993, 3 months before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was scheduled to go out of existence, and then when we had that markup, the weekend before Thanksgiving, we were told by many of our colleagues that we would have this considered shortly after the first of the year, and then in January or February, we had this delay, and all kinds of issues that had to be addressed here, and so we were told it would be addressed in the spring, and we had been told then, because of other conflicting items and the fact there is some disagreement here, that it would be considered in the early summer.

Just a few weeks ago we got an indication that there is, in fact, a plan brewing that would separate out one particular issue, the issue which Members on both sides of the aisle know is a hot button, that being congressional compliance, the fact that we in Congress regularly exempt ourselves from the laws that are imposed on the American people. We were told that that would be separated out and that the other recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, including those 25 amendments which I stated that were defeated on a tie party-line vote and would, if we would have a generous rule, be able to be offered here on the House floor, and Members would go on record casting their votes for or against these, that all of that would be put aside, and we would simply bring up the proposal that was reported out in our measure on congressional compliance.

Unfortunately, the congressional compliance provision that was reported out of our committee is extraordinarily weak. Now, I know that Members on both sides of the aisle, when they go home, they hear from their constituents that, unfortunately, Congress has had this pattern of being above the law, and I have yet to meet anyone who believes that Congress should continue to exempt itself from the laws that we impose on the American people.

So Democrats and Republicans hear that, and the majority leadership knows that that is the one issue, the one issue that is a real hot button out there and potentially could be a real hot button as this coming November election approaches.

So they want to bring out a package which would basically do the following, and this is what we reported out of our committee. H.R. 3801 calls, in dealing with the issue of congressional compliance, for the establishment of a commission, a panel which would make recommendations back to us as to what regulations we might consider complying with ourselves.

□ 1540

I was talking about this Office of Compliance, which would be set up under the proposal that would move forward. The Office of Compliance, this commission would basically make these recommendations, they would look at what regulations we should consider complying with, then they would send those recommendations to us here in the Congress, and we would then make a determination as to what laws we might consider complying with.

Obviously, that is an extraordinarily weak proposal. It is nothing more than a fig leaf and provides a tremendous loophole for this institution to continue to place itself above the law on such things as OSHA and a wide range of other items. My colleagues, Messrs. SHAYS and SWETT, have been working diligently to move forward on this issue of compliance. My colleague on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, Mr. ALLARD, has spent a great deal of time working on the issue of compliance. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] has also worked hard on that issue. Unfortunately, the package coming forward is very, very weak.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration began its markup on the congressional reform issue, and they will continue their markup until next Thursday and yet, as I said there really was no indication—I had an exchange earlier with the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], on this issue, and he said the plan is to now have this issue come up sometime after the 4th of July district work period. We have been told this before, and I will believe it when I see it. I hope very much we have the real bill, if it does come up at that point. Next Tuesday the House Administration Committee, chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], is scheduled to have a hearing on one issue, the issue of congressional compliance, again demonstrating that the majority leadership wanted to move in the direction of dealing with nothing more than the question of congressional compliance.

So as we look at the commitments that have been made to me and other on our committee, if we look at the desire of the American people which I believe is out there to create a more accountable and deliberative body, we need to do everything that we possibly can to encourage that.

One of the hardest-working and most diligent members of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress who, as I said earlier, got his start as a page right here in this body in the early 1950's, is the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, Mr. EMERSON. I am pleased to yield to him at this time.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank my good friend and colleague, a very valuable colleague, for his very kind remarks about me. I want to reciprocate by commending him for the outstanding leadership that he demonstrated as cochairman, House cochairman of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, together with Mr. LEE HAMILTON, of Indiana, who was the other cochairman. The two of them did indeed conduct the business of the committee in a statesmanlike manner.

I think both of them deserve an enormous amount of credit for moving us along as far as we have got.

I share the gentleman's frustration in our not having had our recommendations seriously considered by the House before this date. However, I have some optimism based on knowledge of the gentleman's persistence and the assurance of Mr. HAMILTON, who is a statesman, a fair gentleman, that he would lend his efforts to seeing our recommendations come to the floor under a very generous rule.

I am an optimist because I believe that the gentleman from California will, and the gentleman from Indiana will be persistent, will see this package come to the floor under a generous rule that would permit some additions to what our committee has recommended and consideration also of some other ideas for reform that could be very beneficial to this House.

The gentleman from California heard me say many times in the course of our deliberations in the committee that one of the problems here in Congress is we are always dealing with perceptions, and we know that in politics perception has a way of becoming reality. But I believe that if we would in fact deal with reality, the perceptions would take care of themselves.

There are some things about this place that are not all that complicated, that would be simple, I believe, to fix. Congressional compliance, to which the gentleman has referred, is a rather sticky wicket in a constitutional sense, but I believe there are ways we can address the constitutional problems. We do have to regard the doctrine of separation of powers, we cannot be frivolous, we do have to have the means of executing the law unto ourselves that

for the rest of the population would be executed by the executive branch. We have got to find the means here to have enforcement of ourselves by the legislative branch because frankly the doctrine of separation of powers is very important and we would not want that doctrine to be seriously tampered with.

I thank that is the biggest impediment really: How do we proceed without violating the doctrine of separation of powers?

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, in the hearings that we had on this issue, this question was always at the forefront. I happen to believe there are ways in which we could comply with more of the laws imposed on the American people and not violate that very important constitutional separation of powers.

Mr. EMERSON. I agree with the gentleman that is doable. That is always raised when someone wants to tell us it cannot be done. But I believe it can be done.

As the gentleman and I noted throughout the process of our deliberations last year, there were never-ending efforts to derail and to thwart the general reform thrust of what we were trying to accomplish. Since we made our report to the House, these efforts have been continued.

There are some false starts toward reform from time to time that I personally believe are efforts to derail and confuse and obfuscate the fundamental issues at stake here. I believe that is, unfortunately, a practice being rather highly engaged in at the moment, else we would have seen our recommendations on the floor prior to this time.

But what else are we talking about? There are a lot of things. It does not have to be complicated. A lot of things, in my view, that we could do that would help restore the confidence of the American public in this institution, relating to the committee structure and so forth. It could stand some revision. We could reduce the number of subcommittees. A lot of reform could be made in the budget process.

I personally think we should go to a 2-year budget cycle. I think Congress needs to exercise far more diligently than it has in recent years its oversight function. And we have made recommendations in that regard.

Mr. DREIER. If we could expand briefly on a couple of those items: My friend mentions the need to reduce the number of committees and subcommittees that exist here. I do not think there are too many Americans that are aware of the fact that there are, between the House and Senate, 266 committees and subcommittees for the 535 of us. In fact, I have said it a million times before, when you walk down the hallway and those of us in the minority who see a member of the majority and who may not remember the name, we say, "How are you, Mr. Chairman," because chances are he chairs some committee or subcommittee here. What we have witnessed with the proliferation of committees in this process of building fiefdoms and jurisdictional overlap which has made it virtually impossible for people to move ahead with many very important items which should be addressed. Through the committee structure here, we play a role in exacerbating gridlock, which is a term we hear time and time again. It seems to me as we look at the need to bring about the reduction of committees, it would allow members to be more deliberative and focus their attention on more issues.

□ 1550

Mr. Speaker, I was on a television program with my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who, as the gentleman said, was cochairman of the committee, and one of the things that he said was that early on in his career here, about 30 years ago, there was not a committee in existence to deal with environmental issues, for example, and he listed several other issues and said we have seen committees established to deal with all of those, and yet there has been no commensurate cut in other committees, no reduction, and interestingly enough, in the first several decades of the existence of the Republic, when each census was taken every 10 years, Mr. Speaker, there would be a rearrangement and a restructuring of the committee procedure here in the House. The last time that was really done was, as I said, nearly five decades ago.

Now I am one who does not believe that reform itself is going to, by any stretch of the imagination, be a panacea for all the ailments that exist out there, but I believe that there are some institutional reforms that we could make here that would create a great benefit, and this issue of the number of committees and restructuring committees is, I believe, one of the most important ones, and I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, adding to that, and what the gentleman said is absolutely correct, but adding to that is the need for scheduling reforms to complement the committee reforms. We need to establish deadlines, particularly as it relates to the budget and to the authorizing and appropriations process, that are met, that are kept, and we need to make the system here more family friendly in terms of when we meet, and how late in the evening we meet, and we also need, I think, a master schedule to prevent avoidable conflicts.

Mr. Speaker, I am on two major standing committees of the House. Between those two standing committees I am on 6 subcommittees. And it has occurred that they have all met at the same time. Now, as hard as I may try, I can only be at one place at one time, and I believe that these are simple problems that with the use of modern technology that we could work out, and the end result would be that we would be more deliberative.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, Members are diverted and distracted. How many times have we been in committee, to have the bells ring, which summons us to the floor of the House for a vote? We have to unfocus on what we are doing in committee, come to focus here on the floor on what is going on here, unfocus here, go back to the committee, and we do that 4 or 5 times, or 5 or 10 times in the course of a day. What we have really done is spend half our time running back and forth across the street.

Now that just does not make sense. There is a better way than that to be organized around here so that our time can be spent more productively.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for that very helpful contribution, and I totally concur with him.

I should take time here to echo one of the statements that my friend made throughout the hearing process, and I think it would be very timely to mention it now. It was a statement that was made at our first hearing by our Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], that, as we address the issue of reform, it was his hope that members of the majority would proceed as if they were members of the minority, and members of the minority would proceed as if they were members of the majority, and one of the reasons that it is very timely to mention it today is that with the victory in two special elections which took place within the past few weeks, and all kinds of rumors about a possible change in the makeup of this House and what the three of us certainly hope will be a change for the first time in four decades of the majority status of Republicans in this House, it is our quest, as we proceed with this, to deal with the issue of reform as if we are members of the majority party because unfortunately, the way the structure is today, Mr. Speaker, it really proves that Lord Acton was right on target when he said, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely," demonstrating that there is, more often than not, little regard for the minority and minority rights.

And I say that from my perspective of spending a large part of my life just upstairs on the third floor as a member of the Rules Committee, and I think one of the most important things we should also do is work towards a greater degree of democratization within the Rules Committee.

We have been joined by a very hard-working Member who is working diligently to ensure that the issue of congressional compliance is addressed. I spoke before he came about this as an item which the majority at this point seems to want to move ahead on, and frankly in a very weak manner, but I know that my colleague, along with his Democrat colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT], have worked very diligently to ensure that we can move forward with congressional compliance, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] at this time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I first want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. I was in my office, and I noticed that the gentleman asked the majority whip when we would be taking up the bipartisan bill, done by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and I was just struck by the fact that the majority whip's response to the gentleman really provides some doubt in my mind as to when we will——

Mr. DREIER. I am sorry. Would the gentleman repeat that? I was talking.

Mr. SHAYS. I just was making the point that I was grateful that the gentleman asked the majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], when the committees, the Joint Committee, on the organization of Congress' bill, H.R. 3801, is going to come to the floor of the House, and his basic response was that it will hopefully, or it is our intention, that it come after the July break, sometime this summer basically, or before, I think, maybe he said. I am not quite sure. Maybe the gentleman can tell me what he said.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, what he said was it is his intention at this point to bring it up following the Independence Day district work period, which means following the Fourth of July up until we are scheduled to adjourn for the month of August, and I know the scheduled adjournment is somewhere around the second week in August, and then we know that during this time one of the big challenges we have is to deal with all the appropriation bills.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, if I could ask the gentleman to yield, the reason why I am on the floor is, one, to thank the gentleman for asking the question and just to express for the RECORD my concern because this is legislation that has been worked on for over a year on a bipartisan basis. We were told that it would come up sometime in the late wintertime. Then we were told it was the intention to come up during the springtime. We were told that it would come up before the Memorial break. Now we are told it is going to come up—and then we were told that at least then it would come up by the July break, and now we are told that hopefully our intention is for it to come up before the August break.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting to the point now where we are going to have to work very hard, I think, to have a full and open debate on this legislation. I think part of the challenge is there is a disagreement on how extensive this bill should be. I know the gentleman worked very hard with other Members to have it be an extensive bill. It has some strengths to it, but it is not strong. It is not the kind of reform that I thought we would see.

We do see a number of committees, maybe, dealing with seniorities in committee and making sure they do not have one chairman for so long that they act in such an autocratic way. It was my hope that we would have more open rules on the floor of the House and also that we would deal with congressional accountability, getting Congress to address——

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time on that point, I simply say on the issue of open rules that it is fascinating to observe that every time there has been any kind of reform proposal dealing with this institution brought to the floor over the past several decades, it has come up under an open amendment process, and while the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has said to me that he would not request that our Rules Committee grant a completely open rule that would be my first choice.

He did indicate that it is his hope that our Rules Committee will allow at least all of the items which were brought up in the 25 amendments that have been defeated on party lines, 66 titles, to be considered here on the House floor, and I think that is the real point that my friend is making, that the bill itself, H.R. 3801, is very weak. Some things in it, and I have congratulated my colleagues in support of those good things in it, but it is still very weak and not what the American people want, and not, of course, including the issue where my friend has worked so diligently in congressional compliance, but unfortunately it is so weak we have to allow the Members of this body to work their will and cast the votes that they believe are right on the issue of congressional reform on an overall basis.

I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. What concerns me is that not only may we not have an open rule, but then they are talking about dividing up what is in this bill, and taking it piecemeal, and maybe, for instance, taking up an issue that I feel very important about, concerned about, congressional accountability, getting Congress to live by the same laws that the private sector and the executive branch have to live by, which makes sense.

□ 1600

I am concerned that there might be an attempt to separate that from a total reform bill. This is just one part. As concerned as I am about congressional attainability, I want the record to show it has to be part of a whole. The part of the whole are so many other reforms to this House.

Mr. DREIER. The real fear, of course, is if it is broken up, the majority leadership would clearly have the ability to then say we have addressed the issue of congressional reform, ignoring all of these very important items that were referred to by Mr. EMERSON earlier, in which he mentioned the fact of reality versus perception, that if we take care of the real things, we will take care of the perception. Some of these items, which all of the people cannot necessarily relate to, are key to the issue of congressional reform. And if they do agree to take out congressional compliance and simply utilize that as an issue, ignoring those other very important, very real things that should be addressed, we would allow the majority to have cover, if you will, basically stating that they have dealt with the issue of congressional reform. And that is one of the reasons I feel so strongly, and I appreciate the support of my friend, in working as hard as we can to keep this package together and consider all of these items together.

Mr. SHAYS. One challenge is to keep the package together. The other challenge is to actually have a vote on it. The next challenge is to make sure we are allowed to work our will and provide meaningful amendments to this bill. Because as the bill is now, I have a hard time imagining that I could support it and vote for it, because it simply does not do enough. It is not significant enough.

Let us just take one part of the bill. Let us just take one part of this important legislation dealing with reform, that part that is called congressional attainability. Just in congressional accountability, it does not include all the laws of Congress. So we are going to say the Congress is going to comply with the laws the private sector has to live with, but a number of them have been left out, like OSHA, Freedom of Information, and so on, a number of other parts of it. It has also left out some of the parts of Congress. The Library of Congress would not be part of it. It leaves out the Architect's Office.

So just within one segment of reform, congressional accountability, there is need to upgrade it and improve it.

Then, as the gentleman has pointed out in the work he has done in other parts, there is the need to strengthen and make sure we deal with proxy voting and openness and so on.

My hope was, and maybe it was a bit unrealistic, that we would establish a principle that we would not have as

many closed rules come to the floor of the House. Obviously we want this particular issue to be dealt with in an open way, but we want other issues to be dealt with in an open way as well.

If I could continue, I am struck by the fact that one of the healthy parts about this is, and I think it is healthy for people to make an assumption that Republicans or Democrats may win or lose elections, that they may end up controlling this House and the possibility that Republicans will gain control of this Chamber, if Republicans gain control of this Chamber, by the mere process the gentleman has been involved in, you have set the record pretty straight on what we would do if we were in the majority.

It is very clear if we were in the majority, that we would allow for far more open votes in committee; that we would get rid of proxy voting; that we would reduce the number of committees. And I think it is a healthy thing we have been part of this debate, because we are on record, and we would have to be pretty hypocritical if we did not live up to that if we were in the majority. But hopefully it will not come to that.

Mr. DREIER. Hopefully we will be in the majority.

Mr. SHAYS. But hopefully it does not come to the fact it will take us to have this kind of reform take place.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very helpful contribution. I appreciate the fact that he wants to keep this issue together, recognizing that having spent 1 entire year with I think a couple of hearings where my friend testified, at least two occasions, we have received the very helpful input that has been provided.

As I said before the gentleman came over, there were 240 witnesses who testified before this committee, and we have put together the largest compilation of information on the Congress ever assembled. And it seems to me that we have gotten to the point where it is very tragic that this issue has been, unfortunately, cast to the side, and is getting very little attention.

There are some who believe that gosh, if we can have lobbying reform and campaign finance reform, that all of a sudden takes care of the problems that exist right here in the Congress. But, unfortunately, as we look at the low level of esteem with which the American people hold this institution, I believe that enhancing the level of accountability, dealing with reality, as Mr. EMERSON said, and creating a greater degree of deliberation through complying with the laws, reducing the number of committees. There are 38,000 staff members at all levels here in the legislative branch. I recognize that includes the Capitol Police and the support agencies. But I think that 38,000 as a level of staffing is still probably a little higher than the Founding Fathers had envisaged in establishment of this, the first branch of government.

I do believe very strongly that changes need to be made here. The power of incumbency itself is something else which is very great. One of the reasons we see such a high reelection rate among incumbents is we have these humongous staffs and tremendous budgets here, and a lot of attention has been focused on that in the past several weeks because of problems some of our colleagues are having. If we could have a greater degree of accountability there, it would also be very beneficial.

More open meetings. You mentioned proxy voting. The issue of proxy voting is very important, because what we frankly see on a regular basis is a committee hearing that could have——

Mr. SHAYS. Maybe the gentleman would define proxy voting. There are some people that use the term, and I am not sure everybody knows it.

Mr. DREIER. What proxy voting consists of, we frequently have a committee hearing where a markup is taking place, legislation is being prepared to report out, and every member of the minority could be sitting in the room offering very thoughtful amendments, and there could be one majority member of the committee there, the chairman. And when amendments are offered by a minority member, thoughtful amendments designed to reduce the size and scope of government, to try and bring about a greater degree of fiscal responsibility, those amendments can be offered, the vote taken, and even though every minority member of the committee is there and only one majority member, the chairman can reach into his desk and pull out the proxy votes, casting the votes for members who have not even shown up to the committee to listen to the debate, to hear about the idea. Those proxies basically allow for voting without members being present.

We cannot vote here on the House floor without being present. Members regularly say, gosh, I have so many committees and subcommittees that I can't possibly attend every markup. But that is why we need to reduce the number of subcommittees, the number of full committees, so that we can bring about a greater degree of deliberation.

Mr. SHAYS. I would like to focus a second on that, as you mentioned proxy voting. When I was elected in 1974 to the State house in Connecticut, we eliminated proxy voting, in 1974, 20 years ago, in committees, because previous to that we were allowed to vote. And it was done on a bipartisan basis. Republicans and Democrats alike, agreed this was the wrong process.

While I am on the subject of Connecticut, and I am struck by the whole issue of committees, Bill Simon, the Secretary of Treasury, pointed out that when he had to testify, he had to testify before eight committees on one subject, and he would spend days saying the same thing to different committees. In some cases it would be the same committee members who just served on different committees, the same individuals serving on different committees, that he would go before.

In Connecticut, we do something unique to the country. House and Senate Members meet jointly. We have joint committees. One of the advantages is we do not have these conference reports at the end where the House passed the bill in the Senate and then you come into conference. Not only do we have so many committees in the House and Senate, but a lot of the work in Congress is decided behind closed doors when the House and Senate have to get their two bills to agree.

If I could, before I leave, I just want to reiterate again the fact that I am pleased that you asked the question of the majority leader about this legislation. I think it is important that we make it very clear that it must come up. I am disappointed that he said it would not come up before the break in July. There is no need to keep postponing this issue. I would have liked him to say it will, you have my word on it, come up after.

By the way, was it the majority leader or the whip?

Mr. DREIER. It was the majority whip, Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. BONIOR, making the point it would come up sometime after the break.

□ 1610

I want to express concern about that, and just to thank the gentleman again for the work he has done on this committee, and to say that today a number of Republicans and Democrats, because we do think this is a bipartisan concern, and one that should be addressed on a bipartisan basis, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT], and I, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], wrote to the Speaker and said, "We want this bill to come up. We want to know when your reform package is going to come up done by the committee, this bipartisan committee."

We have asked him within the next 2 weeks to give us a date, or we are going to be forced to petition out one part of that legislation. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clearly understood that it is our hope and expectation that we will

get a date certain from the Speaker, and that we can continue to work to hold this bill together, and then amend it to improve it, which is clearly in the advantage of Republicans and Democrats alike. It is the right thing to do for our country to bring forward these reforms. It is the right thing politically for Democrats to do, the right thing for Republicans. I see no negative at all in moving forward.

I am puzzled that we are seeing people drag their feet, and I just pledge that I am going to continue to work with the gentleman, as are Republicans and Democrats alike, to move this forward.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his very helpful contribution, and let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that as I said at the outset, we are honoring the pages today. Their graduation is this evening, and they are the future of this country, the young people who are going to be the future leaders of the United States.

It seems to be a very sad commentary that there are so many Members here who thrive on the status quo that they are unfortunately blocking the attempt to bring about the kind of reform that will make this institution better and more accountable and more deliberative, not only for the people of today, but for future generations.

It seems to me that as we look toward that challenge, this is the opportunity. After all, we sit here today with 117 new Members of this institution, the two most recent having been elected within the past few weeks. There are indications we will have another large group of new Members coming in.

Now is the time to bring out major change and reform of this institution. It is for these young people, Mr. Speaker, that we do this, because unfortunately, many of the problems that lie here and continue to be reported in the news are due to the fact that we will not bring this institution into the 20th and then the 21st century.

We are sitting here just 6 years away from the millennium. It seems to me that now is the most important time to do it. Let us do it now. We have put it off way too long. I believe this truly can once again, be reaffirmed as the greatest deliberative body known to man.

NOTIFICATION OF ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12920, PROHIBITING ADDITIONAL TRANSACTIONS WITH HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-271)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

On October 4, 1991, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act ("NEA") (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12775 of October 4, 1991, declaring a national emergency and blocking Haitian government property.

On October 28, 1991, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12779 of October 28, 1991, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with Haiti.

On June 30, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, as well as the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended ("UNPA") (22 U.S.C. 287c), I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12853 of June 30, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. This latter action was taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 of June 16, 1993.

On October 18, 1993, pursuant to the IEEPA and the NEA, I again exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12872 of October 18, 1993, blocking property of various persons with respect to Haiti.

On May 6, 1994, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 917, calling on Member States to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against Haiti. On May 7, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12914 of May 7, 1994, to impose additional economic measures with respect to Haiti. On May 21, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12917 of May 21, 1994, to impose economic measures required by Resolution 917. These latter actions were taken, in part, to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to Haiti would fulfill its obligations under the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 917.

On June 10, 1994, pursuant to the above authorities, I exercised my statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12920 of June 10, 1994, prohibiting additional transactions with Haiti.

This new Executive order:

—prohibits payment or transfer of funds or other assets to Haiti from or through the United States or to or through the United States from Haiti, with exceptions for activities of the United States Government, the United Nations, the Organization of American States, or foreign diplomatic missions, certain payments related to humanitarian assistance in Haiti, limited family remittances, funds for travel-related expenses, and payments incidental to exempt shipments of food, medicine, medical supplies, and informational materials;

—prohibits the sale, supply, or exportation by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of any goods, technology, or services to Haiti or in connection with Haitian businesses, or activities by United States persons or in the United States that promote such sale, supply, or exportation, except for the sale, supply, or exportation of informational materials, certain foodstuffs, and medicines and medical supplies;

—prohibits any transaction that evades or avoids or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions of this order; and

—authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to issue regulations implementing the provisions of the Executive order.

The new Executive order is necessary to tighten the embargo against Haiti with the goal of the restoration of democracy in that nation and the prompt return of the legitimately elected President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, under the framework of the Governors Island Agreement.

I am providing this notice to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of the IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631). I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1994.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BALLENGER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 12 noon on account of official business.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 1 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.

Mr. EWING.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mrs. MORELLA in two instances.

Mr. TALENT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SANGMEISTER.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. BONIOR in three instances.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. SWETT.

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HORN in two instances.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. STARK.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 965. An act to provide for toy safety and for other purposes.

H.R. 1632. An act to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, and Part C of title IV of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to remove gender-specific references.

H.R. 3863. An act to designate the Post Office building located at 401 E. South Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "Medgar Wiley Evers Post Office."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3360. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require meat and poultry slaughter and processing establishments to pay the cost of Federal inspection for extra shifts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3361. A letter from the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's Annual Enforcement Report covering the period of January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1833; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3362. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3363. A letter from the Director, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1994"; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWETT:

H.R. 4564. A bill to reorient the Department of Energy's fusion energy research program toward development of commercially visable fusion power systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona:

H.R. 4565. A bill to provide for the establishment of business accounts for air travel by Federal employees to maximize costs savings, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and House Administration.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 4566. A bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, and reduce welfare dependence; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Government Operations, Rules, Natural Resources, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona (for herself, Mr. FINGERHUT, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BECERRA):

H. Res. 451. Resolution requiring that travel awards that accrue by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only with respect to official travel; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 452. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that United States should resume support of operations for the interdiction of illegal drug trafficking in Andean and other foreign nations; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

422. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, relative to the physical desecration of the U.S. flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the California State University; to the Committee on Armed Services and Education and Labor.

424. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the Free Trade Agreement; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. GILCHREST introduced a bill (H.R. 4567) to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 702: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 1016: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BAESLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1099: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1627: Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 1883: Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MCHALE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2447: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2623: Mr. THOMAS OF WYOMING.

H.R. 2672: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 2720: Mr. EMERSON and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2826: Mr. CARR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2866: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 3087: Ms. LAMBERT and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3392: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3507: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 3523: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 3561: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3658: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 3705: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3835: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 3838: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 3906: Mr. UPTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 4015: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4036: Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 4057: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CANADY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 4095: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 4135: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 4136: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 4142: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4161: Mr. PETRI, Mr. MICA, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 4206: Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. QUINN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RIDGE, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 4280: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 4291: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 4343: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 4365: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 4400: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4404: Mr. WYNN and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 4466: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 4507: Mr. DORNAN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4542: Mr. BROWDER.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. GOODLING.

H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. KLECZKA.

H. Con. Res. 210: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Res. 234: Mr. GALLO and Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Res. 446: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DEAL.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. McCOLLUM on H.J. Res. 38: Ron Lewis.

Petition 5 by Mr. STEARNS on House Resolution 156: Jack Fields.

Petition 10 by Mr. McCOLLUM on House Resolution 295: Jack Fields.

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Jack Fields and Bob Livingston.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Y. Tim Hutchinson, Tom Lewis and Peter Blute.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: Jack Fields, Peter A. DeFazio, Ken Calvert and Bill Baker.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Jack Fields.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Tom Lewis, Joe Knollenberg, Stephen Horn, Bob Livingston, Dan Burton, Scott McInnis and David Dreier.

Petition 19 by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415: Jack Fields, Bob Inglis, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon and John Linder.

Petition 20 by Mr. SANGMEISTER on H.J. Res. 131: Tom Lewis.

Petition 21 by Mr. HANSEN on House Resolution 405: Harold Rogers, Jay Dickey, Jack Fields, Bud Shuster, Bill K. Brewster, Pete Geren, Wally Herger, Michael N. Castle, Joseph M. McDade, George E. Brown, Jr., Ron Packard, Jim Saxton, John M. McHugh, Robert K. Dornan, Stephen Horn, Sherwood L. Boehlert, Herbert H. Bateman, Floyd Spence, Helen Delich Bentley, Amo Houghton, Henry J. Hyde, Ron Lewis, Y. Tim Hutchinson, Frank R. Wolf, Dan Schaefer, C. W. Bill Young, David A. Levy, George W. Gekas and Spencer Bachus.