

uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources on public lands." Section 811(b) of ANILCA provides further that "the Secretary shall permit on the public lands appropriate use for subsistence purposes of snowmobiles, motorboats, and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents, subject to reasonable regulation." The National Park Service and the Native landowners disagree about whether ATV's are other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for subsistence purposes in Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. But there is no dispute that ATV's are necessary for the summertime subsistence activities of the residents of Anaktuvuk Pass.

Following several years of discussions, the Native landowners and the National Park Service have reached an agreement which will finally resolve the ATV controversy on the public lands surrounding Anaktuvuk Pass. In April 1992, the Park Service issued a final legislative environmental impact statement embracing the proposed agreement, and in November 1992, the Secretary of the Interior endorsed the agreement in a Record of Decision. The parties executed the agreement on December 17, 1992.

The parties have since executed two technical amendments to the original agreement.

The agreement involves an exchange of land and interests in lands between the Native landowners and the Park Service. Specifically, the Federal Government will convey in fee approximately 30,642 acres of park land to Arctic Slope Regional Corp. and Nunamuit Corp. On the Federal land conveyed to the Native corporations, the National Park Service will reserve surface and subsurface access and development rights as well as broad public access easements. In addition, certain non-wilderness areas of federally owned park land will be opened to dispersed ATV use. In return, the Native landowners will convey to the Federal Government approximately 38,840 acres in fee for inclusion in both the national park and national wilderness systems. Native landowners will also convey to the Park Service additional surface and subsurface development rights on 86,307 acres as well as a series of conservation, scenic, and public access easements on other Native-owned lands within the boundaries of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. Finally, the city of Anaktuvuk Pass will convey a city lot to the National Park Service for administrative purposes.

Congressional ratification of this agreement will be required in order to remove 73,993 acres of Federal land from the National Wilderness Preservation System, as well as to designate approximately 56,825 acres of other park and presently Native-owned lands as new national wilderness. If ratified by Congress, the agreement will expressly authorize dispersed ATV use on certain lands within the park boundary. Without congressional approval, the agreement will become null and void, and none of the conveyances or creation of easements proposed by the agreement will occur.

It is intended that this agreement will resolve the longstanding dispute over subsistence use of ATV's only on public lands in and around Anaktuvuk Pass. It is important to note that neither this agreement nor the accompanying Federal legislation will diminish, or

otherwise affect in any way, anyone's rights and privileges to access public lands in Alaska for subsistence purposes. This agreement does not conform or deny that ATV access to public lands for subsistence use is a statutorily protected traditional access right under ANILCA, and consequently, this agreement does not purport to resolve this issue.

As discussed previously, this legislation would remove 73,993 acres of wilderness from the park and designate 56,825 acres of new wilderness. Consistent with agreements reached during the 103d session, 13,168 acres of wilderness will be designated along the Nigu River, adjacent to the park, hence, a no-net-loss, no-net-gain of wilderness in the area.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT AND LINE-ITEM VETO

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today to amend the Constitution to provide some budgetary common sense—one will require a balanced Federal budget; the other will provide line-item veto power for the President.

I have long been a staunch supporter of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I have cosponsored the balanced budget amendment since I came to Congress, but until recently, the amendment was blocked by its opponents.

In 1992, the balanced budget amendment fell just nine votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for passage. In the 103d Congress, I was disappointed to see that both the House and the Senate rejected the balanced budget amendment. Some Members of the Congress continue to oppose the balanced budget amendment, claiming that Congress needs fiscal discipline now instead of in the future. I agree with part of that statement wholeheartedly: Congress does need fiscal discipline now. It should be obvious to all, however, that with deficits for 30 of the last 31 years, Congress simply has not had that discipline.

I will continue to push for passage of the balanced budget amendment. A constitutional amendment is no substitute for direct action on the part of Congress. However, we have seen time and time again that Congress does not have the ability to provide that action, and we need this enforcement mechanism. While I share individuals' concerns about social security and other vital programs, I believe Congress needs this fiscal tool to ensure budget discipline. It is time to just say no—and mean it—to the tax-and-spend policies that have gotten the Federal Government into this mess to begin with.

My rationale for introducing a line-item veto resolution is similar. As long as Congress continues to send the President jam-packed, all-encompassing spending bills, the President must often choose between signing unnecessary spending into law on one hand and shutting down the Federal Government on the other. A General Accounting Office [GAO] report estimated that if the President had line-item veto authority from 1984 through 1989,

the savings would have ranged anywhere from \$7 billion to \$17 billion per year.

In the 103d Congress, the House passed an expedited rescission bill which would force an up-or-down vote on a presidential rescissions package. I voted for this bill—it's a far cry from the true line-item veto, but it is a step in the right direction. We need to encourage fiscal responsibility in the Congress.

I urge support and passage of both of these important fiscal accountability bills early in the 104th Congress. The time is right for this legislation to finally come to fruition.

LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, last November, citizens across the country sent a strong message to the Congress that they will no longer tolerate business-as-usual on Capitol Hill. This resulted in a new Congress that has already begun to demonstrate that it will deliver the reforms Americans have asked for and justly deserve. I am proud to be a part of this new, reform-minded body.

One of the reforms that is foremost on the minds of Americans is congressional term limits. They are tired, and rightly so, of career politicians who are more concerned with their reelection campaigns than advancing a legislative agenda that is in the Nation's best interests.

Under the current system of unlimited 2-year terms, no sooner are lawmakers elected to office before they are gearing up for the next campaign. This is no way to promote good government, and only contributes to the malfunctioning legislative process. Moreover, it is fiscally unsound. There is compelling evidence that the longer Congressmen stay in Washington, the more likely they are to support big spending programs, regardless of the public desire for budget cuts.

In an effort to reverse this damaging trend, I am today introducing a resolution proposing that our Constitution be amended to limit Members of Congress to three 4-year terms. Under the system of limited terms I am offering, we would have a body of noncareer legislators who know that their stay in Washington is temporary. They would not be constantly dogged by reelection concerns and would be able to devote more time and attention to their legislative responsibilities and make the tough budget-cutting decisions that are desperately needed. This would go a long way toward restoring integrity and fiscal responsibility to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when the Constitution was drafted, the Framers did not contemplate people making a career of politics, and history shows that they anticipated a good deal of turnover in Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to return the House to the body of citizen legislators that our Founding Fathers envisioned.