

he advocated during the time that he ran for President of the United States had work requirements, had elements in it that were precisely the elements of the welfare reform package that passed the House of Representatives and then passed the Senate by a vote of 87 to 12. It was a shock to everyone, even on his own side of the aisle where 60 percent of the Democrats voted to support this, when he came out and vetoed it. I would like to think that America woke up during the demagoguery of the Medicare reform. I know that many—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notifies the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY. One minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me just comment that many editorial writers around the country that normally are more of a liberal persuasion came out and editorialized in favor of the Republicans and the fact that we recognized that we have a system that was going into bankruptcy. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the RECORD, the two editorials from the Washington Post that made this very clear. The names of the editorials are "Medagogues" and "Medagogues, Cont'd."

The last sentence of the second editorial reads, "The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong." And America thinks it is wrong.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1995]

#### MEDAGOGUES

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear to block the cuts in projected Medicare spending that are the core of the Republican effort to balance the budget in the next seven years. They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's crummy stuff.

There's plenty to be said about the proposals the Republicans are making; there's a legitimate debate to be had about what ought to be the future of Medicare and federal aid to the elderly generally. But that's not what the Democrats are engaged in. They're engaged in demagoguery, big time. And it's wrong—as wrong on their part now as it was a year ago when other people did it to them on some of the same health care issues. Then, they were the ones who indignantly complained.

Medicare and Medicaid costs have got to be controlled, as do health care costs in the economy generally. The federal programs represent a double whammy, because they, more than any other factor, account for the budget deficits projected for the years ahead.

They are therefore driving up interest costs even as they continue to rise powerfully themselves. But figuring out how to contain them is enormously difficult. More than a fourth of the population depends on the programs for health care; hospitals and other health care institutions depend on them for income; and you cut their costs with care. Politically, Medicare is especially hard to deal with because the elderly—and their children who must help care for them to the extent the government doesn't—are so potent a voting bloc.

The congressional Republicans have founded the skeptics who said they would never attack a program benefiting the broad middle class. They have come up with a plan to cut projected Medicare costs by (depending on whose estimates you believe) anywhere from \$190 billion to \$270 billion over the seven-year period. It's true that they're also proposing a large and indiscriminate tax cut that is a bad idea and that the Medicare cuts would indirectly help to finance. And it's true that their cost-cutting plan would do—in our judgment—some harm as well as good.

But they have a plan. Enough is known about it to say it's credible; it's gutsy and in some respects inventive—and it addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse. What the Democrats have instead is a lot of expostulation, TV ads and scare talk. The fight is about "what's going to happen to the senior citizens in the country," Dick Gephardt said yesterday. "The rural hospitals. The community health centers. The teaching hospitals. . . ." The Republicans "are going to decimate [Medicare] for a tax break for the wealthiest people, take it right out of the pockets of senior citizens. . . ." The American people "don't want to lose their Medicare. They don't want Medicare costs to be increased by \$1,000 a person. They don't want to lose the choice of their doctor."

But there isn't any evidence that they would "lose their Medicare" or lose their choice of doctor under the Republican plan. If the program isn't to become less generous over time, how do the Democrats propose to finance it and continue as well to finance the rest of the federal activities they espouse? That's the question. You listen in vain for a real response. It's irresponsible.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1995]

#### MEDAGOGUES, CONT'D

We print today a letter from House minority leader Richard Gephardt, taking exception to an editorial that accused the Democrats of demagoguing on Medicare. The letter itself seems to us to be more of the same. It tells you just about everything the Democrats think about Medicare except how to cut the cost. That aspect of the subject it puts largely out of bounds, on grounds that Medicare is "an insurance program, not a welfare program," and "to slash the program to balance the budget" or presumably for any purpose other than to shore up the trust fund is "not just a threat to . . . seniors, families, hospitals" etc. but "a violation of a sacred trust."

That's bullfeathers, and Mr. Gephardt knows it. Congress has been sticking the budget knife to Medicare on a regular basis for years. Billions of dollars have been cut from the program; both parties have voted for the cutting. Most years the cuts have had nothing to do with the trust funds, which, despite all the rhetoric, both parties understand to be little more than accounting devices and possible warning lights as to program costs. Rather, the goal has been to reduce the deficit. It made sense to turn to Medicare because Medicare is a major part of

the problem. It and Medicaid together are now a sixth of the budget and a fourth of all spending for other than interest and defense. If nothing is done those shares are going to rise, particularly as the baby-boomers begin to retire early in the next century.

There are only four choices, none of them pleasant. Congress can let the health care programs continue to drive up the deficit, or it can let them continue to crowd out other programs or it can pay for them with higher taxes. Or it can cut them back.

The Republicans want to cut Medicare. It is a gutsy step. This is not just a middle-class entitlement; the entire society looks to the program, and earlier in the year a lot of the smart money said the Republicans would never take it on. They have. Mr. Gephardt is right that a lot of their plan is still gauzy. It is not yet clear how tough it will finally be; on alternate days you hear it criticized on grounds that it seeks to cut too much from the program and on grounds that it won't cut all it seeks. Maybe both will turn out to be true; we have no doubt the plan will turn out to have our other flaws as well.

They have nonetheless—in our judgment—stepped up to the issue. They have taken a huge political risk just in calling for the cuts they have. What the Democrats have done in turn is confirm the risk. The Republicans are going to take away your Medicare. That's their only message. They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense; the Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. It's absolutely the case that there ought not to be a tax cut, and certainly not the indiscriminate cut the Republicans propose. But that has nothing to do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

#### PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I would like to, if I could, get a few housekeeping measures out of the way. First, so that the RECORD can clearly reflect who is doing what to the bills that are before us at this moment, this is a bill that contains 33 titles. Every Senator should know that the Senator from New Jersey would not oppose moving 30 of those titles now, pass them by voice vote. I do not oppose them. I do not have holds on them. They can be moved now. If they are not moved now, someone does have a hold on them. It is not me.

I also make the other point that the distinguished chairman alluded to saying that these bills in this package have been on the calendar for over a year. Well, maybe some of them have been, not all of them. Indeed, there are some bills in this package that have not even been reported from the Energy Committee. There was no vote in

the Energy Committee on at least 6 or 7 or 8 of these bills. They were added on the floor into this big package without them ever being reported out of the Energy Committee or having a hearing in this Congress. Some had a hearing in the last Congress, so that is not a big deal. They should be reported out of the committee, but they were not.

The other point is, the Senator from New Jersey has indeed not held all bills. The distinguished Senator from Alaska alluded to the fact that a bill that he was very interested in moved without any problem. So let us get that housekeeping matter out of the way first. We could move almost 30 titles by voice vote.

Let us get to the real issue here, which is the Utah wilderness bill, which is one of the titles, which is the title that I strongly oppose. Why do I oppose this? This is the most important public lands bill since the Alaska land bill of 1980. This is the most important public land bill since the Alaska bill over 15 years ago.

What are we talking about here? We are talking about declaring a part of Utah wilderness. There are two areas in question. One is the basin and range area. That is that vast area west of Salt Lake City, an area of salt flats and small mountain ranges. The writer John McPhee says that "Each range here" in the basin range "is like a warship standing on its own, and the Great Basin is an ocean of loose sediment with these mountain ranges standing in it as if they were members of a fleet without precedent." So one of the areas we are talking about is this unique area, basin and range.

The other area we are talking about is the great Colorado Plateau in southern Utah. The part of Utah that Harold Ickes, the first Secretary of the Interior during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, said almost the whole part of Utah should be a national park, that almost the whole part of that southern part of Utah should be a national park.

It is a vast plateau and canyonlands of incredible beauty, vast plateaus like the Kaiparowits Plateau or the Dirty Devil Wilderness, some of the most remote and rugged landscapes in the West. Yet some of the most interesting records of those who inhabited this land before America—before Europeans ever came to the United States—are also located in this section of Utah, and the remains of the great Anasazi, who were here long before the first European set foot on this continent. All of this vast beauty is in southern Utah.

It is a genuine wilderness: Remote, rugged, deep-cut canyons that are sandstone cut, with deep rivers. It is the place of Zion and Bryce and Canyonlands. It is unique. It deserves wilderness designation.

We now have before the Senate the Utah wilderness bill. What is the problem with the Utah wilderness bill? Well, too little land is protected as wilderness; and too few protections are

given to that land. In addition, the inventory process, the process by which the Bureau of Land Management determined which areas should qualify as wilderness, was flawed from the beginning.

In the State of Utah, there are 22 million acres under the control of the Bureau of Land Management. Under the bill before the Senate, 2 million of these acres—2 million of those acres—will be set aside as wilderness. That is all, 2 million acres.

Now, there are too few protections, as well. Just take the vast Kaiparowits Plateau, a plateau of juniper forests, trees that have been there long before the first European set his foot forth on the United States. It is a vast wilderness, one of the most vast wildernesses in the lower 48 States. Under this bill, about 50,000 acres of that plateau will be transferred to the State of Utah, an area for which a Dutch company is already negotiating to put a gigantic coal mine—a gigantic coal mine—in the heart of that wilderness.

What about Dirty Devil? There, of course, the area that is excluded will be set aside for tar sands development. The legislation also would allow new dams, called reservoirs, new dams. One thought that in the Colorado Plateau this issue was settled in the 1960's when the dams that were proposed at Dinosaur Monument were defeated because the people of this country realized that this incredible beauty, silence and time standing still needed to be protected, should not be blocked by a dam with another lake going up the Canyonlands and destroying both the record of human habitation and the possibility of walking in the Canyonlands.

What else? Well, roads and motor vehicles are allowed to an unprecedented extent in areas which are wilderness. Also, you give the State the right to designate which areas it wants without regard to environmental sensitivity, and with great concern that the lands that the Federal Government would exchange with the State will not be of equal value. In fact, in the Interior Department's comment on this bill, as embodied in the report, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Sylvia Baca, says the following:

"The tracts proposed to be obligated by the State have high economic value for mineral, residential, and industrial development. The fair market value of these lands may be 5 to 10 times more than the value of the lands that would be transferred to the Federal Government. Despite the imbalance in favor of State, the bill provides for increased compensation to the State if encumbrances on Federal lands being transferred result in an imbalance, but not the other way around. This would only add to the inequality of values in this proposed exchange.

Mr. President, if the coal mining development is not enough, if the tar sands development is not enough, if the oil exploration is not enough, the new dams are not enough, if the roads and motor vehicles are not enough, if the kind of unequal value trade between

State and Federal Government is not enough, what about this provision in the bill that sets aside the 2 million acres for wilderness, but attaches no water right to this wilderness land? These are areas that get 10 to 12 inches of rain a year—not much. What happens if that water is diverted, is used in another way, and does not get to the wilderness? Whatever fragile life is there dies, and it is over.

In Nevada, a State not totally dissimilar, not nearly as dramatic in some of its beauty as southern Utah, but still a remarkably beautiful State with a very similar topography, when the Nevada wilderness bill passed, the authors of that bill made sure that there was water attached to that wilderness so that you would not have a wilderness, essentially, destroyed.

Finally, in terms of objections to the bill, there is a so-called hard release language. Now, the release language, which basically means when you do a wilderness bill you release lands, lands that are not wilderness, but you do not release them forever and ever, because at some other point you might want to consider whether they are wilderness. The bill as originally drafted said that the land should be managed for nonwilderness multiple uses only—that was dropped—and a substitute was offered that said "the full range of uses."

However, the existing amendment, the existing section of the bill, also says that "lands released shall not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation." This is a kind of belt and suspenders approach. The previous version of the bill as reported out had both belt and suspenders, two protections against further wilderness designation. The current version got rid of the suspenders but leaves the belt. It is still unprecedented in wilderness bills.

Mr. President, these are all serious flaws with this bill that need to be addressed that might be able to be addressed. The flawed process is what makes me doubtful.

Just a brief recapitulation: in 1964 the wilderness bill passed. What was the definition of wilderness in a 1964 bill? "A wilderness, in contrast with areas where man in his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and the community of life are untrammelled by man and where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." That was the definition of wilderness.

In 1976, that was applied to Bureau of Land Management lands about 280 million acres nationwide. And in 1976, 1977, the Bureau of Land Management was given 15 years to identify which areas under its control would qualify for wilderness, possibly, to inventory possible wilderness areas. But do you know what happened in Utah? In Utah, they completed it in 1 year. They inventoried all 22 million acres controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. At the end of that year, they

eliminated 20 million acres for consideration as wilderness.

What was the basis upon which they eliminated these 20 million acres? It was that they lacked outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation. That is why they were eliminated. In the fall of 1980, a representative of the Sierra Club toured a section of the Kaiparowits Plateau with the Utah BLM Director, Gary Wicks. Their helicopter touched down on the southern tip of Four-Mile Bench, which is part of the plateau. She says:

We stood on the edge of as far as the eye can see. Incredibly beautiful, utterly wild land. And I would say, "Gary, why are you eliminating this from wilderness?" And he would say, "Because there are no outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation." And I would say, "And there are no outstanding opportunities for solitude either?" And Gary would say, "You are right. You can have solitude here, but it is not outstanding solitude." And the man kept a straight face while he said that.

She concludes by saying, "If the helicopter left us there, we would have known what outstanding solitude was all about," because she would have been left in this vast wilderness, one of the most rugged areas of America. But it was on the basis that these lands did not provide sufficient solitude that they were eliminated from wilderness designation. That flies in the face of virtually everything.

Well, when only 2.6 million acres were set aside out of the 22.5 million acres, under the control of BLM, and only 2.6 were set aside, a lot of Utah people got very upset. They filed petitions and they filed briefs; they had 30 days in which to do that. And because of their efforts, it included 3.2 acres for wilderness. And since then, that is the amount of land in Utah today that had been managed as wilderness; 3.2 million acres are now being protected as if they were wilderness.

In 1991, BLM came up with its final suggestion—1.9 million acres. The Utah congressional delegation introduced its bill, which was 1.8 million. Two days ago on the floor, they modified it to 2 million acres. Well, there was another group of Utah residents that said this was kind of a hurried process, with helicopter flyovers, and only cutting out 2.6 million. So they said, "Let us do this scientifically," and they did that and came up with 5.7 million acres of Utah that should be wilderness. I do not know if it is 5.7. I am sure that there is some number lower than that which could preserve the wilderness areas. But I certainly know that 2 million is not enough and, particularly, with the language that is in this bill.

The real irony is that this is an attempt, while the protections for mining, coal, tar sands, oil exploration, dams, et cetera, in a State where only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the jobs are in mining, in a State where only 2 percent of the State economic product is in mining. The future is not there. The future is in this beauty that is self-evi-

dent to anybody that comes to southern Utah or to the basin and range. The real irony is the Senator from New Jersey, who comes from a State that is 89 percent urban, is making this argument in a State that is 87 percent urban—one of the best kept secrets of the West, the most urbanized area of America. People from this country are coming into the cities.

So I believe that this would even be in the long-term interest of the State. But that is not what this is about. The Utah economy is really not my province. It is my observation, as somebody who has looked at these issues. But what I want to preserve is the possibility for silence and the possibility for time that exists only in a wilderness.

I would like to read, in closing, just two things from a book prepared by several writers about the Utah wilderness. One is by John McPhee, who wrote in "Basin and Range" the following, talking about that basin and range area west of Salt Lake City, that geologic formation that has been stretching for several million years. Reno and Salt Lake City, 7 million years ago, were 60 miles closer together. They are 60 miles further apart today because the geological structure is moving. When it moves, the crust cracks, and up pops mountain ranges. These are the mountain ranges that we are trying to protect in the broader wilderness bill.

McPhee writes:

Supreme over all is silence. Discounting the cry of the occasional bird, the wailing of a pack of coyotes, silence—a great spatial silence—is pure in the Basin and Range . . . "No rustling of leaves in the wind, no rumbling of distant traffic, no chatter of birds or insects or children. You are alone with God in that silence. There in the white flat silence, I began for the first time to feel a slight sense of shame for what we were proposing to do. Did we really intend to invade this silence with our trucks and bulldozers and after a few years leave it a radioactive junkyard?"

Another writer—this will be the final one, and I quoted him the other day—is Charles Wilkinson. He was talking about taking his son into the Colorado Plateau. He says:

One long hike took us down into a narrow canyon branching off the Escalante River. The sandstone walls, smoldering red, thrust straight up. Scattered pinyon and juniper, and ferns and grasses around the springs, accented the color embedded in the canyon sides.

The Wingate Sandstone had been the rock of surrounding mountain ranges. During the Triassic, some 200 million years ago, water worked the mountains, wearing them into sand. Winds lifted the grains and piled them up as dunes on the desert floor. The sands hardened back into rock. Then the whole Colorado Plateau rose. . . The creek in this now canyon would have none of it, resolutely holding its ground against the upthrusting Wingate and younger formations on top of it, cutting down 1,000 feet into rock and time. Much of the day we walked up to our calves in the creek.

Not long ago we scorned this land as remote, desolate. That thinking led to the postwar Big Build-up and the coal plants, dams, and uranium mines.

But today we know southern Utah, in the heart of the Colorado Plateau, for what it really is. The geologic events were so cataclysmic and so recent, and the frail soils so erodible, that the Colorado Plateau holds more graphic displays of exposed formation than anywhere on earth. The dry air has preserved the ancient people's durable and magical rock art, villages, kivas, pots, and baskets to a degree found nowhere else.

Yet our society seems to lack the will to care for the Canyon Country. The Utah congressional delegation . . . wants to declare some fragments of the backcountry wilderness and then throw the rest open to development.

That would be so short-sighted, so contemptuous of time. The old images on the walls were made so long ago, the walls themselves even longer. Time runs out to the future, too: give our grandchildren, and those far down the line from them, the blessing of taking a daughter or son into the weaving, rosy side canyons, of finding their own Dream Panels, and of being instructed by the young person on how to scramble out.

Time, oh, time . . . May we not forsake you now.

Mr. President, this is about time and silence, and the chance for future generations to explore and understand this vast and beautiful wilderness.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during the debate, the Senator from New Jersey provided us with his viewpoint on many subjects related to the proper management of our Nation's public lands. I respect him for his positions, for his contribution to ensuring that one of this country's many natural resources—our public lands—are properly and efficiently managed in an environmentally sensitive manner.

However, to be perfectly frank about it, he is just plain wrong when it comes to our bill to designate wilderness in Utah. I do not believe he has a full appreciation for the difficulty these small communities in my State have with maintaining all of this land as wilderness.

The longer Congress postpones action on the Utah Public Lands Management Act, the more economically strapped our small towns become. It stands to reason that you cannot take a primary resource out of circulation within an economy and expect that economy to flourish. The land resources in rural Utah are of the utmost importance to an economy whose major industries include mining, farming, and ranching.

My friend from New Jersey says our rural Utah counties can live off tourism dollars. Certainly, the tourism industry is vital to our State and important to the general welfare of our economy. But, it is not a panacea for the ills that plagued small town U.S.A. as the Senator pointed out yesterday. To give two examples, since nearly one-half million acres of land have been designated wilderness study areas [WSA's] by the BLM in San Juan County, UT—in Utah's southwestern corner—tourism has only increased from 2

percent in 1985 to 5 percent in 1995. In Millard County, on the western half of Utah, BLM designated acres as WSA's. Guess what the impact to their tourism industry was? Good guess—zero.

In my opinion, these kinds of numbers are not going to save the local economy of any community no matter how much acreage is designated wilderness.

I do appreciate his sensitivity to the manner in which Utah's public lands are managed—I really do. But, I would like to set his mind at ease. We must be doing a fairly decent job; for, after all, we have placed every single acre in BLM's inventory in a position, at least as far as the Senator from New Jersey is concerned, that each of them meet the wilderness criteria. That is a pretty decent record.

However, Senator BRADLEY should worry about one matter, which was not discussed in any great detail yesterday, and that is the presence of State school trust lands now captured within these wilderness study areas. They are owned by the State of Utah on behalf of and for the benefit of Utah's school children—not New Jersey's school children, Utah's children.

These lands were endowed by the Federal Government to Utah's schools at the time Utah became a State—100 years ago. The Utah School Lands Trust is not a recent development.

But, given the selection of the WSA's, these trust lands have been unavailable for any major revenue producing activity since the WSA's were established due to the restrictions informally imposed on them by their neighboring lands.

The Utah State Legislature has made a commitment to improving the management of the trust lands. These trust lands must produce more revenue if the State of Utah is going to meet its challenges in education. Utah currently ranks 49th in the Nation in terms of per pupil education spending. While I happen to believe that Utah stretches its education dollar further than just about any State and does an exemplary job of educating our kids, there is just no question that education financing continues to be our major concern.

Two years ago, the legislature organized a new State body whose specific reason for being is to gain the greatest benefit from the school trust lands. This body, composed of private citizens, is serious about meeting the purpose for which they have been created, namely, to see that the trust lands produce. I remind my colleagues that wise investments are also part of good stewardship.

I'm sure my friend from New Jersey knows that the State has every legal right to access these lands and to utilize them for whatever purpose they can, consistent with Federal and State laws. But, as I stand here today, I am convinced that, at some point down the road, the State is going to become so frustrated with Congress and this process that it will either sell a trust land

section to a commercial entity or take steps to develop the land.

The fact that no one wants a disturbance of that kind in or around a wilderness area is precisely why the trust lands have not been fully developed to date.

Yet, the State cannot wait forever to develop the trust lands. The revenue from these lands is becoming increasingly important to our educational system. And, I am certain that these lands will be developed to benefit our schools if we don't pass this bill.

This is why our bill provides for an exchange of these lands. We want to get the trust lands out of the wilderness areas. We want to establish a unity of title so there is no commingling of management styles. We want to erase this threat forever. That can only happen with passage of our proposal.

By the way, the proposal my friend from New Jersey was championing yesterday that has been introduced in the House does not contain any reference at all to the school trust lands contained within the areas designated by that bill. It does not indicate how trust lands in H.R. 1500 will be dealt with under this measure. Are they just going to remain as enclaves within designated areas? Given his concern for pristine wilderness, he should worry about what could happen in the absence of a land exchange.

But, let me discuss several points the Senator from New Jersey raised in his opening comments yesterday that need to be addressed. They are out in the public forum and deserve a brief response.

First of all, he said that our release language, while an improvement over the original language, was "a backdoor attempt to do what the original bill had intended to do but do it in a slicker way."

Mr. President, I went into detail yesterday as to what the intent of our release is and is not. There is no funny business here, no tricks, no backdoor attempt. We are stating the full intent behind our language in the light of day.

It is simple and straightforward. Nondesignated lands will slip back into the pool of normal BLM lands for continued management under BLM's existing authorizes, special designations, and the host of Federal legislative authorities which apply to public land management. Subsequently, they will be managed by the local BLM consistent with multiple uses defined in section 103(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and consistent with land use plans developed through section 202 of the same act. This language will allow the local BLM land managers, the "on-the-ground professionals," to manage nondesignated lands for their wilderness values and characters utilizing existing BLM authorities. I trust they will do so.

Our language asks the Federal manager to do his job, which is to manage the Federal lands in the best way pos-

sible. It is not up to that manager to decide if an acre of land should be deposited in the National Wilderness Preservation System—it is up to us. The land manager can use an existing authority to protect and preserve the wilderness—small "w"—character of the land. That is expected when it's appropriate. But, he is not authorized, nor should he be, to use an existing authority to protect and preserve that pristine character to become future wilderness—big "W", or part of the wilderness system, at a future date.

And, if that concept bothers the Senator from New Jersey then he should go back and change FLPMA or introduce a bill that requires another round of studies and review by the BLM—that is, if he wants to spend another 17 years and another \$10 million of taxpayer funds.

The release language was suggested by the ranking minority member of the Energy Committee. He said himself that he found the practice of managing land for a future designation as offensive as the prohibition on the practice of not managing it for its characteristics.

If we go along with the Senator from New Jersey, then we should simply designate all 22 million acres in Utah as wilderness study areas and never derive any benefit from Utah's public lands. I do not understand why our language bothers the Senator from New Jersey so much. It is completely consistent with the scope and intent behind FLPMA.

Besides which, the BLM wilderness inventory had a beginning. It should also have an end, like this issue, and hopefully before Utah celebrates its 200-year birthday in 2096.

Second, the Senator indicated that "four million acres of Utah's red rock wilderness will be left open for development." He then went on to list several areas that fall into this category.

Several times yesterday it was asserted that the passage of our bill will lead to a massive immediate destruction of nondesignated lands. I do not know how many times I need to say this, but that statement is simply not true. In fact, it is offensive to me not only as one of the principal authors of this bill but as a Senator from Utah.

Our critics continue to conjure up images of bulldozers lined up to advance on these BLM lands. Those who rely upon such images to advance their cause purposely ignore our sincere desire—not to mention our entire State government—to protect these lands from inappropriate and destructive activities.

In addition, I mentioned the plethora of environmental laws and conservation regulations passed since 1964 that provide layer upon layer upon layer of protection for these lands. I will not go through the list again, but they are listed on the displayed chart.

This argument should not even be a part of this debate. Yet, it continues to be used in the propaganda and rhetoric of the elite special interest groups.

Unlike some, we have confidence in BLM's professional land managers to continue making objective decisions on the future uses of these lands in accordance with the law.

By the way, I would like to remind the Senator from New Jersey that we include in our proposal more than 16,000 acres in Fish and Owl Creek Canyon, more than 220,000 acres of the Kaiparowits Plateau, and more than 75,000 acres of the Dirty Devil area.

Also, it might surprise the Senator to know that more than 80 percent of the acreage in our proposal is located near or below Interstate 70, the highway that divides Utah in half. John Sieberling, the former representative, once said that if he had it his way, he would make a national park of all the land south of Interstate 70, and if the Senator from New Jersey had his way he make the entire area wilderness. Let us be clear about this: our proposal protects Utah's red rock wilderness.

Third, Senator BRADLEY referenced the possible development of coal leases within the Kaiparowits Plateau by the State of Utah.

Yes, it is true that the State of Utah has identified these BLM lands—which are not contained in a wilderness study area—let us be clear about that: they are not being managed as wilderness—as one of 25 tracts of land it desires to exchange with the Federal Government.

But, what the Senator did not say is that these leases are currently under suspension by the Department of Interior pending completion of an environmental impact statement that will determine if mining is ever going to be allowed in that area.

Once again, as he did yesterday, the Senator is second guessing the activities of BLM's own personnel, only this time it deals with this EIS. He also accuses the State of Utah for mismanaging this acreage when there has been no determination that mining will ever occur there. While the coal is there, the ability to access it is still questionable.

If mining ever occurs in the manner described yesterday by Senator BENNETT, the leases will be subject to every pertinent Federal environmental law, whether the leases become State or not. No matter what happens to the ownership of the land, the Federal permitting process will continue.

And, since the lease holder will need to construct an access road to the site, build a power line to the site, and construct certain facilities all on BLM land, Federal permits for each of these items will be required. So, the big environmental special interest groups will have plenty of opportunities to appeal this project every step of the way.

Also, it is important to note that the site where the mine is projected to be located was rejected by the BLM during its initial statewide review process. The area was rejected because it did not meet wilderness criteria. Let me tell the Senator from New Jersey why.

Because located within a 2-mile radius of the proposed site are 80 drill sites, 36 miles of roads, an airstrip, and several other surface disturbances symbolic of mining activity. Do not forget—this same site was initially mined in the late 1970's. Of the 40 acres required for the mine site within the lease holders total leased area, half of it—more than 20 acres—has already been disturbed by mining activity. This site does not meet wilderness quality, but after seeing what is in some of the areas recommended by the special interest groups, I can see why they were confused with this site.

This is not an issue about protecting wilderness value; this is an issue about preventing the responsible development of Utah's largest coal reserves. But, nevertheless, this bill has nothing to do with whether or not this area will ever be mined.

Fourth, the Senator indicated our bill "denies a Federal water right to wilderness areas designated by this bill."

The Senator from New Jersey has evidently not read the language carefully. It is true that our bill does not create a Federal reserved water right for areas designated by this act. That is because we do not want to preempt State water law or to go around the State water appropriation system. But, it does not mean that the Federal Government cannot acquire a water right for designated wilderness areas.

Utah water law follows the concept of the prior appropriation doctrine. It has been the basis for more than 90 years of State administration of surface waters. All major rivers and stream systems in Utah have water rights established under this principle. The result is a fine tuned system relying on diversions, return flow, rediversions, mingled with some storage reservoirs. Any new filing or alteration of the existing pattern of water use literally sends ripples throughout the total system.

Unlike my colleague, we do not want to follow the typical Washington attitude that says we should preempt State law every time the Federal Government wants something from our States. Why can't we have the Federal Government abide by State laws once in a while when performing a Federal task? The Federal Government can obtain a water right in the State of Utah, and here is how it is done.

Under Utah State water law, one must put a water right to "beneficial" use. That is, it must be applied to the land, to home use, or to other consumptive uses in order to maintain the right.

However, there is an exception to the "beneficial" use requirement.

Two divisions within the Utah Department of Natural Resources—the Division of State Parks and the Division of Wildlife Resources—can legally acquire a water right and leave a determined quantity of water in a stream—an "instream" flow, as it were—that

then becomes that particular water right's "beneficial" use.

Under our bill, the BLM is provided the ability to work cooperatively with these two State divisions to create an "instream" flow to avoid the potential dewatering of a wilderness area, in the unlikely event this occurs.

The process would be:

First, BLM acquires a water right from an upstream owner anywhere in the State—a rancher, an old mine site, a municipality, a private company, etc.

Second, the right is assigned or deeded—transferred—to one of the two State divisions previously mentioned.

Third, an instream flow is created.

In the fall of 1994, this occurred. The Division of Wildlife Resources acquired a water right from a private corporation and created an instream flow for wildlife purposes on 82 miles of the San Rafael River in central Utah.

The alternative to this language—an unqualified Federal reserve water right—would leave an ominous cloud over every existing water right in the State of Utah.

There is no expressed or implied Federal reserve water right in our language, but that does not in any way prevent the Federal Government from acquiring a water right following the proper State procedures.

Fifth, our language "permits the State of Utah to exchange State lands for Federal lands of approximate equal value." The Senator from New Jersey then indicated that the value of the Federal lands involved may be greater in value than the State lands.

Last December, the committee adopted our proposal to establish an exchange process whereby the value of the lands involved in the exchange would be determined based on national appraisal standards. While the BLM thinks the Federal lands are 5 to 10 times greater in value than the State lands, the State of Utah thinks the State lands, again captured within wilderness areas, are greater in value than the Federal lands. That is why the notion of a value, determined by recognized appraisers, and negotiated between the two parties, appears the soundest methodology to reconcile these differences. It does not matter, really, what either side is saying right now on the value question—it will be determined at a later time.

The universe of lands to be exchanged has been determined. Since the State of Utah has no choice at all to determine which lands it would trade to the Federal Government, it only makes sense to allow the State to determine which Federal lands it desires. It has identified 25 different parcels, ranging from speculative coal deposits to speculative natural gas to potential real estate development, and all in the name of benefiting Utah's school children.

The Senator is not correct. The Federal Government does not have to approve the transaction. Once the State makes an offer of lands to be exchanged, the two parties will sit down

and conduct "good faith" negotiations on the various aspects of the trade. If a mutual decision is not reached, then the matter can be pursued in the courts.

Concern was expressed regarding our earlier language about the lack of involvement by the Secretary in crafting each exchange. I believe the language we have included in the substitute amendment remedies that situation and makes the Secretary a full player in this exchange should he desire to be involved.

And finally, the Senator indicated that our proposal contains "broad exceptions to the Wilderness Act of 1964," meaning he believes we are rewriting the definition of wilderness by allowing certain activities and facilities to be undertaken within designated wilderness areas.

This criticism goes to the so-called special management directives contained in our proposal.

These special provisions really are not that special after all. There are plenty of examples of previous public lands legislation containing such provisions.

A Congressional Research Service report, completed last July, concluded that the directives in S. 884 are comparable or related to similar language in 20 existing public laws and over 40 separate statutes adopted by Congress since 1978.

What do these special management directives do? They allow those activities, based on valid existing rights and consistent with the Wilderness Act of 1964, to continue in areas designated as wilderness. They are included to address the potential "on-the-ground" conflicts that are unique to Utah's BLM lands, such as livestock grazing, the gathering of wood by Native Americans, and the presence of water facilities used for agricultural, municipal, and wildlife purposes, to name a few.

The critical point here is that these rights predate the designation of land as wilderness.

We are not rewriting the definition of wilderness. On the contrary, we are merely adhering to the principles of the 1964 Wilderness Act and the history of wilderness legislation in the past two decades. The Wilderness Act of 1964 does not abandon or ignore rights that predate wilderness designation, and practically every wilderness bill passed since the late 1970's contains special language to protect these rights and to address any site specific conflicts that might arise in the exercise of these rights.

This language enables us to designate certain lands as wilderness that might be otherwise excluded under the 1964 act due to the conflict with valid existing rights.

But I would ask the Senator the following questions regarding his concerns for our special management directives.

Where was he when we passed the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge

Wilderness Act, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act, and the Florida Wilderness Act of 1984 that provided for the continued use of motorized boats or other watercraft in designated areas?

Where was he when we passed the already mentioned Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act that provided for the continuation of snowmobile use in designated areas?

Where was he when we passed the Central Idaho Wilderness Act of 1980 that allowed the continued landing of aircraft and the future construction and maintenance of small hydroelectric generators, domestic water facilities, and related facilities in designated areas?

Where was he when we passed the Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1978 and our own Utah Wilderness Act of 1984 providing for sanitary facilities in designated areas?

Where was he when we passed the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980 allowing motorized access for periodic maintenance and repair of a transmission line ditch in a designated area?

And, where was he when we passed the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 providing for the use, operation, maintenance, repair, modification, or replacement of existing water resources facilities located in designated areas?

The point is not to single out any of these laws for they did or did not do, but to merely demonstrate that special management directives are designed to address the on-the-ground conflicts unique to the areas designated by these laws. That is what we are providing for in our bill—those situations that are unique to Utah's lands. It is, as my colleagues will note, typical of the way we have developed public land policy in this body.

I would also state for the record two other items.

One, the Senator continues to mention the provision in our bill that provides for the continued use of motorboat activities in designated areas. First, these activities are only allowed if they predate the designation. And, second, and most importantly, our language was modified in the committee to ensure that it was consistent with the 1964 act.

Also, he spoke of the language in our bill permitting low-level military overflights. Let me remind the Senator that this language was provided to us by the Pentagon, and is nearly identical to similar language included in the California Desert Act. We have added language requested by the Air Force that recognizes Hill Air Force Base as the gateway to the Utah Test and Training Range, located in Utah's west desert area, that is the only training facility in the United States on which every aircraft in the Air Force inventory trains.

In closing, let me also say that our bill has been characterized as lacking large blocks of designated wilderness through which a traveler could wander

from one time zone to another. Well, in our bill we may not extend any wilderness area beyond the mountain time zone, but it does have several large contiguous areas of spectacular wilderness all linked together in huge blocks of land. A visitor could never see another human being for days in these areas.

These areas include:

Desolation Canyon in central eastern Utah, through which the Green River flows—a total of 291,130 acres. This area may not cross any time zones, but it is located in three different counties.

Fiftymile Mountain in south central Utah—as mentioned, this is on the Kaiparowits Plateau and consists of 125,823 acres.

North Escalante Canyons—this area, once pursued to become a national park, totals 101,896 total acres.

Book Cliffs—this area so appropriately named is a showcase of topography and wildlife, and consists of 132,714 acres, all of which is located in Grand County, UT.

And, last but certainly not least is the San Rafael Complex—located in the heart of central eastern Utah and a topographer's dreamland, this area consists of 193,384 acres.

If one looks at where some of the other areas designated by or bill are located, you will note that many of them are located near some of Utah's national parks to form blankets of pristine wilderness, such as the area near Canyonlands National Park, Capitol Reef National Park, and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.

Our legislation truly captures Utah's crown jewels of BLM lands, including high mountain ranges, deep river canyons, and red rock deserts. These are all reflective of Utah's premier scenic landscapes, and why we in Utah are not shy in stating that it took God 6 days to create Utah before he made the rest of the world with leftover parts.

Again, I urge the Senator from New Jersey to take another careful look at the facts and at the specific language in the substitute amendment. I think he will find reassurances there that this is a good bill for Utah and a good bill for the environment.

Mr. President, I have listened to this now for the past 3 days. I admire my friend from New Jersey. He is a fine person. He represents his State well.

But, he does not know anything about Utah. However, I happen to think that the Governor of Utah, both Senators, all three Congress people, virtually everybody in the State legislature, everybody in the PTA, school districts across the State, and 300 Democrat and Republican leaders, political leaders, know just a little bit better, just a little bit more, about Utah than the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

I have heard about all I can bear to hear about silence and time, and having respect for them. We understand that. In Utah, we know what silence and time is because we have experienced them throughout our entire

State. However, you do not get much silence and time in all of that low-lying sagebrush land along the highways which the other side has tried to put into this bill. They do not even know what wilderness is. We do. We have plenty of it in Utah. We put through the 800,000-acre Forest Service bill in 1984. I was a major mover on that bill. It has been a very good bill. We did it because Utahns agreed on what should be done. We love our State.

To hear this, you would think that 20 million acres is going to be ripped up for shopping centers. The fact is that every one of those 20 million acres will be subject to all environmental laws, and rightly so, as far as we are concerned. But on this 20 million acres, you might be able to ride a bicycle, if you want to, which you cannot do in wilderness.

Let me just say this. I have gone all over Little Grand Canyon. I have been all over the Black Box; Dirty Devil, and Sam's Mesa; North Escalante Canyons; San Rafael Swell; Book Cliff; Sid's Canyon; Desolation Canyon—beautiful areas that we put into this wilderness bill. Without this wilderness bill, they will not be wilderness. We think they ought to be.

This business that we allow dams in this bill is misleading—they are not there.

The polling data show that the majority of Utahns are for this bill, and once you explain to people in the polls that wilderness means no mechanization whatsoever, the support for those on the other side who are for 5.7 million acres drops off dramatically. But the majority are for our bill.

With regard to the value of lands to be exchanged, that is going to be negotiated under this bill. Nobody is going to rip off the Federal Government. But our school kids are dependent upon this bill, which is why we will negotiate the value of these school trust lands.

With regard to water, the Secretary can acquire water rights in the State through the State appropriation process. Can he not do that?

With regard to the release language, there is no binding of a future Congress whatsoever in this bill. If they want to do wilderness, they can do wilderness in Utah again. But they are going to have an uphill battle because people in Utah are tired of being pushed around.

With regard to the special management directives, I would say to my colleague that every major wilderness bill since 1978 has contained similar directives to take care of conflicts. We provide for that as well. On-the-ground conflicts have to be resolved, and over 20 separate bills passed by this body in the past two decades have done that. This is not something new.

We have used the public process here. This matter has gone through two decades, hundreds of meetings, \$10 million, and brought people together all over the State. The affected counties did

not want any wilderness—zero. Then they agreed to 1 million acres. We brought them up to 2 million acres. The other side wants 5.7 million. One group wants 16 million acres in wilderness. The fact is we have 100 percent more acreage in this bill than the affected counties want, and about 60 percent less than what these people on the other extreme want. That is what compromise is all about.

The fact of the matter is that this process has not been politicized. The Clinton administration came in and suddenly their BLM people started to decry all of the work that had been done through the years by other BLM people, and which was done in a reasonable and good way. They have politicized this process. There are volumes and volumes of data. The environmentalists have a 400-page book. We put the volumes and volumes of data here—two huge stacks this high—to show what we have gone through.

Have most of these people who are criticizing this bill even been to these places? The fact is most of them have not been there.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we have put the crown jewels of Utah wilderness in this bill. I happen to believe that when you have the whole congressional delegation, the Governor, the legislature, the schools, the farmers, and virtually every organization except these environmental extreme organizations, all for this bill in a State that has protected its beauty itself, we do not need to be told by some Senator from New Jersey how to protect our State—or from any other State. We know how to do it. We know it is beautiful, and we are going to keep it that way, even while it is subject to these environmental laws.

It is almost offensive what has been going on here. If you look at what they are recommending—these low-lying sagebrush lands along highways—where is the silence and solitude there? It is crazy.

When we start ignoring our colleagues who have gone through a process in this manner in a reasonable, decent, honorable way, having had to bring the one side along and having had to bring the other side along—and, now we are going to ignore all this because we want to do some national environmental agenda? That is when this particular body is going to have a lot of troubles in the future. That is all I can say. I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the hour of 10:36 a.m. having arrived, the motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion to invoke cloture on the Murkowski substitute amendment to H.R. 1296.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Murkowski substitute amendment to Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1296, providing for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer:

Bob Dole, Frank H. Murkowski, Rick Santorum, Slade Gorton, Trent Lott, Jim Inhofe, Hank Brown, Ted Stevens, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Conrad Burns, Don Nickles, Larry E. Craig, Jim Jeffords, Judd Gregg, R.F. Bennett, Orrin G. Hatch.

#### VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Murkowski substitute amendment to H.R. 1296 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are ordered under rule XXII. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

#### YEAS—51

Abraham	Gorton	Lugar
Ashcroft	Gramm	Mack
Bennett	Grams	McCain
Bond	Grassley	McConnell
Brown	Gregg	Murkowski
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Campbell	Hatfield	Pressler
Coats	Heflin	Santorum
Cochran	Helms	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchison	Simpson
Craig	Inhofe	Smith
D'Amato	Jeffords	Snowe
DeWine	Johnston	Stevens
Dole	Kassebaum	Thomas
Domenici	Kempthorne	Thompson
Faircloth	Kyl	Thurmond
Frist	Lott	Warner

#### NAYS—49

Akaka	Feingold	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Feinstein	Moynihan
Biden	Ford	Murray
Bingaman	Glenn	Nunn
Boxer	Graham	Pell
Bradley	Harkin	Pryor
Breaux	Hollings	Reid
Bryan	Inouye	Robb
Bumpers	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Roth
Chafee	Kerry	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kohl	Simon
Conrad	Lautenberg	Specter
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	Wyden
Dorgan	Lieberman	
Exon	Mikulski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader is recognized.



UNANIMOUS-CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—S. 4

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 4, the line-item veto bill, and that the reading be waived.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object. There does not appear to be any disagreement with regard to the Presidio bill itself. That bill has broad-based, virtually unanimous support, so it is my hope that we can pass at least that bill by unanimous consent.

So I ask unanimous consent to strip all amendments and motions and to pass the Presidio bill in its own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. I hope we can resolve that matter. In light of the fact we need to continue to find ways in which to move the legislative agenda, I do not object to the majority leader's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO  
ACT OF 1995—CONFERENCE RE-  
PORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4), a bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of March 21, 1996.)

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

PRESIDIO LEGISLATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in response to the minority leader's unanimous-consent request, obviously we are all sensitive to the merits of the Presidio. The California delegation has worked very, very hard on this. But as everyone in this body knows, this was a package that was put together with great commitment and great understanding that, indeed, in order for it to pass the Congress, it had to stay as a package.

Everybody knew that when we went in, and to suggest action by the U.S. Senate would be acceptable to the House everyone knows is unrealistic. So we are set with the reality here.

It is the intention of myself, as chairman of the Energy and Natural Re-

sources Committee, to again pursue the package. It is the largest single environmental package that has come before the 104th Congress. We are all disappointed at the action that was taken by adding on the minimum wage amendment, but that was something seen fit by the minority to do, and we are left with this reality today, which is, indeed, unfortunate.

It is my intention to continue to pursue working with the Members who objected to the various aspects of the package, to try to continue to pursue it, in this legislative year. That is the pledge I want to make to the minority and the minority leader as well.

I want everybody to understand the rationale behind the objection. This would not have gone in the House as a freestanding Presidio bill. Everybody is aware of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me just say, the vote just cast had nothing to do with minimum wage. It had everything to do with simply one provision dealing with Utah wilderness. There was no understanding with regard to this package, as the distinguished Senator from Alaska has called it.

Obviously, each one of these bills merits consideration in and of its own right. There is no objection to the package were we to remove the Utah wilderness bill. That is the issue. That is what this vote was all about. But there is no disagreement whatsoever with regard to the Presidio bill on either side of the aisle, as I understand it, and to hold the Presidio hostage to all the other issues seems to me to be unfair.

I yield to the Senator from California for a brief comment and a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I do have a question. I have a comment as well. To my friend, Senator MURKOWSKI, who has worked hard, along with Members on both sides of the aisle here, the fact is the House has passed the Presidio as a freestanding bill.

Indeed, that is the bill we have marked up. So there is not any reason not to pass the Presidio as a freestanding bill. I would ask my leader on the Democratic side, since he is a cosponsor of the Presidio bill which Senator FEINSTEIN and I have worked so hard on, and as well as Senator DOLE, he is a sponsor of the Presidio bill, will my leader give us his word that he will do all that he can to make this bill a reality? Because I would say to my friends on both sides, the Presidio is deteriorating? We need to get in there and make sure that that land is kept up. It is a priceless jewel. And we have such broad agreement. It just seems a pity that we would catch it up in these other debates.

Mr. DASCHLE. I answer to my friend from California in the affirmative. It is our desire to work with the delegation of California and others who are interested in maintaining the historic nature of this remarkable facility, that

we pass the legislation this year. In has been a long, long effort, a tireless effort on the part of my two colleagues from California.

I hope we can successfully complete our work this year. It ought not be held hostage to very controversial legislation that has nothing to do with the Presidio itself. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Let me yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues of a fact that in the package there were about 53 individual items. The package was held up almost a year by a Member on the other side who refused to allow the individual issues to come up for action. That is a fact, and the RECORD will reflect that. Now we are faced with the reality of who is to blame for the failure of the package. I think the RECORD will reflect the reality that this was well on its way to successful consideration of cloture prior to the decision by the other side to put the minimum wage on it, which changed the complexion and the interpretation of the last vote. Many Members looked upon the last vote in actuality as a reference to support for the minimum wage and that it did not belong there. We all know it.

So the responsibility has to be with the minority that chose to allow and support inclusion of the minimum wage on the largest environmental package of this session, the 104th Congress. That is, indeed, unfortunate. Let us be realistic and recognize where the responsibility lay. It lay in holding that package hostage for a year and it lay with the responsibility of putting the minimum wage on it. I thank the Chair and thank the leader.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand it is all right with the Democratic leader if I obtain a consent agreement on the farm bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Let me do that while we also work out a time agreement on the line-item veto.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT  
AGREEMENTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, may proceed to the consideration of a concurrent resolution to be submitted by Senator LUGAR, further, the resolution be considered agreed to, and the motion to table be laid upon the table, the Senate then proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2854, the Agriculture Reform and Improvement Act, that the reading be waived, and there be 6 hours