Congress to specifically authorize any refuges established using the land and water conservation fund. Only 16 of our more than 500 refuges have been specifically established by legislation, and this new requirement could delay and complicate the process of protecting imperiled wildlife. Fortunately, the House will have the opportunity to change this provision by adopting the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Another drawback of the bill is that it would allow up to 15 years to elapse between reviews of the compatibility of fish-dependent and wildlife-dependent recreational uses, whereas other uses would be required to be reviewed at least every 4 years. The long interval for reviewing hunting and fishing could result in the continuation of activities for many years that are detrimental to the conservation of wildlife.

Finally, the bill would authorize expanded military activities and other potentially damaging Federal activities on wildlife refuges, allowing them to be exempted from the protective standards of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

For all of these reasons, all the major U.S. environmental protection organizations oppose this legislation. They believe that there should be one clear overriding purpose for our wildlife refuges, and that is the conservation of wildlife and natural habitat.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: We support this rule, which is an open rule. But we urge Members to oppose the legislation itself.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say in response to my esteemed colleague and friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], that many of the concerns he has raised on the subject, in fact, will be dealt with in the amendment process, and I, too, am hopeful that we can make some further improvements in this bill through the amendment process and am prepared to do that.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the able.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2:30 p.m.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCRERY) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 410 and rule XXIII, the Chair Declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1675.

□ 1431

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, as the author of H.R. 1675, I am pleased that the House is considering this important legislation, which would be the first comprehensive reform of our refuge law since the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

I am also grateful that the author of that historic law, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, and a number of other distinguished Members including the co-chairman of the House Sportsmen's Caucus, PETE GEREN, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, JIM SAXTON, have joined with me in this bipartisan effort. Their contributions and input into this legislation have been invaluable.

Our Nation's Wildlife Refuge System, which was created by President Theodore Roosevelt more than 90 years ago, provides both essential habitat for hundreds of species and recreational opportunities for millions of Americans. At present, the system is comprised of 508 refuges, which are located in all 50 States and the 5 U.S. Territories. These units, which cover some 91 million acres of Federal lands, range in size from the smallest of less than 1 acre to the largest, the 19.3-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Regrettably, in recent years the public's confidence in our refuge system has been shaken by arbitrary decisions made by refuge managers; the diversion of funds to other higher profile issues; the elimination of all existing uses on newly acquired lands; lawsuits designed to prohibit certain secondary uses on a refuge; and the lack of either a vision or a comprehensive plan on how our refuge system will be managed in the future.

H.R. 1675 is the product of several years of hard work, countless meetings with various interest groups, and extended negotiations with the Departments of Interior and Defense. The bill was the subject of an extensive public hearing and was favorably reported by voice vote by both the subcommittee and the full Resources Committee, with only 5 Members filing dissenting views.

This legislation is a modest, proactive conservation measure that has been carefully refined to address most of the concerns raised by the Clinton administration.

While I will later discuss the substitute proposal in detail, it is time we had a statutory list of purposes; a definition of what is a compatible use; allow existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses to continue on new refuge lands unless they are found to be incompatible; a conservation plan for each refuge; and clarification that fishing and hunting should be permitted unless a finding is made that these activities are inconsistent with sound fish and wildlife management, the purpose of the refuge, or public safety.

Furthermore, it will strengthen the management of the refuge system and it implements a better, more uniform system-wide planning and compatibility review process. This had been a goal of the environmental community for some time.

While H.R. 1675 does not attempt to solve all of the problems facing our refuges, it will ensure that the system is effectively managed, that essential habitats are protected, and that the American people have an opportunity to fully utilize those Federal lands that are paid for with their tax dollars, their entrance fees, and from purchases of duck stamps.

This is a sound piece of legislation. It is supported by many groups, including the American Sportfishing Association, the California Waterfowl Association, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen, the National Rifle Association, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. This bill will ensure that our refuge system has the support of the American people into the 21st century.

Finally, a word of caution. I know there are Members who would like to see H.R. 1675 become a vehicle to solve a whole range of problems in individual