ranking Member, Mr. HINCHEY, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Resources, for their help in bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1865 will provide permanent protection for about 18,000 acres of the San Isabel National Forest, including the two volcanic peaks known as the Spanish Peaks.

There are many magnificent peaks in Colorado, of course, but these—the easternmost in the Rocky Mountains—are outstanding. The eastern peak rises to 12,683 feet above sea level, while the summit of the western peak reaches 13,626 feet. The peaks can be seen for more than 75 miles. They were well known to Native Americans and were important landmarks for other early settlers as well as for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

So, it's not surprising that the Spanish Peaks portion of the San Isabel National Forest was included in 1977 on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks.

The area our bill will protect also has other outstanding resources and values, including a spectacular system of over 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These volcanic dikes form remarkable free-standing walls, up to 100 feet thick and 100 feet high, some extending for 14 miles. The area also includes winter range for bighorn mountain sheep and deer, and important habitat for elk, pine marten, and other species.

In all, it is a beautiful and unspoiled part of our Centennial State.

In fact, the State of Colorado has designated the Spanish Peaks as a Natural Area, and the peaks are a popular destination for hunters, horseback riders, and hikers seeking an opportunity to enjoy an unmatched vista of Colorado's mountains and plains.

In the 1970's, the Spanish Peaks were reviewed by the Forest Service in its ''RARE II'' review of roadless areas, and the Colorado designation considered including a wilderness designation for the area in the statewide national forest wilderness bill that was enacted in 1980. However, at that time there were concerns about the manageability of the area because of a number of non-federal inholdings. So, the 1980 Colorado Wilderness Act instead provided for continued management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area.

That same pattern was followed again in the most recent Colorado wilderness bill, which included provisions for long-term management of all the other wilderness study areas in our state's national forests. But while the bill that passed the House in 1992 would have designated Spanish Peaks as wilderness, the Senators still had some lingering questions about the land-ownership pattern in the area. So, once again, the final version of that bill included a requirement for continued interim management of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness study area.

The 1993 bill also required the Forest Service to report about the non-federal inholdings and the likelihood of acquisition of those holdings by the United States with the owners' consent. We got that report in 1995. It indicated the wilderness study area included about 825 acres where the United States owned neither the surface nor the mineral rights, and some 440 acres more where the United States owned the surface but not the minerals.

Since then, United States has acquired most of the inholdings, by purchase from willing sellers—and we have drawn our boundaries so most of the rest are outside the wilderness. So, the way is now clear for Congress to finish the job of protecting this outstanding area as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

That's what this bill do, by adding the Spanish Peaks to the list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993. As a result, all the provisions of that Act—including the provisions related to water—would apply to the Spanish Peaks area just as they do to the other areas on that list. Like all the areas now on that list, the Spanish Peaks area covered by this bill is a headwaters area, which for all practical purposes eliminates the possibility of water conflicts. There are no water diversions within the area.

The lands covered by this bill are not only striking for their beauty and value for primitive recreation, but also for their natural values. They fully merit—and need—the protection that will come from the enactment of H.R. 1865. We should all be proud that it has now passed the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give me a ''no'' vote on the rule before you. The rule is unworthy of a serious national legislature. The Congress has received a balanced consensus budget with a surplus no less from a local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, containing only the city's taxpayer-raised funds. Instead of minding its own national business and getting on with the mountain of work left for us to do, this bill has become an excuse for indulging the controversial social and financial whims of some Members of this body. That is unfair to you, it is unfair to me, and it is unfair to District residents. Defeat this rule, unless you are prepared to waste a lot more time in Washington on the smallest appropriation and the one least relevant to your constituents.

I have the Administration's Statement of Policy here. A litany of objections to this bill are listed by the Administration. Among them are three amendments which have been made in order, vouchers, the prohibition on adoption by married couples, and the prohibition on local funds for needle exchange, among others.

This rule reads like a who's who of special interests. It nullifies a modest residency rule that the Control Board supports because the residency law strengthens the recovering D.C. economy. It puts this body through another vouchers fight not three months after the President has vetoed vouchers. It will make you vote on tricky social issues many Republican and Democratic Members would just as soon avoid.

Two provisions strike at the core of democracy. One gratuitously bars the use of local funds in cooperating with a pro bono voting rights lawsuit that hardly involves the city, anyway. The other defunds the advisory neighborhood commissions that get pittance amounts as elected neighborhood officials who attend to grassroots problems like assuring that parks and river banks do not accumulate trash or harbor crime. At the last minute, a Member got a bright idea, he decided that the District's tobacco prohibitions might be strengthened but did not give me the courtesy of allowing me to ask the City Council to do it themselves.

When you vote on this rule, you will make a statement of where you stand on controversial social issues and where you stand on democracy and devolution. The D.C. appropriation is not the place to take your stand on social legislation. The D.C. appropriation is the place to stand up for democracy. The way to do both is to defeat this rule.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, school vouchers are the original bad idea for the improvement of public education.

We will hear from the other side that the establishment of school vouchers are the best way to reform and improve education.

This is basically what they are saying. If you provide 2,000 children the option to attend other schools, the remaining 75,000 will have their public education magically improved. The argument is like saying that the best way to improve health programs for everyone is to provide options for 3% of the population and by magic, the health care system will improve.

Public schools need our help and our criticism when it is appropriate; what they do not need is to have their resources taken away for programs which can only benefit a few.

We will hear that the main motivation for the establishment of vouchers is to improve the public schools. This is simply not the case. There are people who like school vouchers because they want to take their kids out of public schools, not because they want to improve the schools, but because they do not like public schools.

I don't mind this. If you want to do this, it's OK, but do not do it at the expense of public schools and do not say you are doing it to improve those schools. You are doing it because you don't care about the public schools which