

NOES—220

Aderholt	Gillmor	Pappas
Archer	Goode	Parker
Armey	Goodlatte	Paul
Bachus	Goodling	Paxon
Baesler	Gordon	Pease
Baker	Goss	Peterson (MN)
Ballenger	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Barcia	Granger	Petri
Barr	Green	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Pickett
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Pitts
Barton	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bass	Hansen	Portman
Bateman	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Berry	Hayworth	Redmond
Billbray	Hefley	Regula
Bishop	Herger	Riggs
Bliley	Hill	Riley
Blunt	Hillery	Rogan
Boehlert	Hobson	Rogers
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bono	Holden	Ros-Lehtinen
Boswell	Hostettler	Royce
Brady	Houghton	Ryun
Bryant	Hulshof	Salmon
Bunning	Hunter	Scarborough
Burr	Hutchinson	Schaefer, Dan
Buyer	Hyde	Schaffer, Bob
Callahan	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Istook	Sessions
Camp	Jenkins	Shadegg
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Canady	Jones	Shimkus
Cannon	Kasich	Shuster
Chabot	Kim	Skeen
Chambliss	King (NY)	Skelton
Chenoweth	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Christensen	Klink	Smith (OR)
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith, Linda
Collins	LaHood	Snowbarger
Combest	Largent	Solomon
Condit	Latham	Souder
Cook	Lazio	Spence
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Stenholm
Cramer	Linder	Stump
Crane	Livingston	Stupak
Crapo	LoBiondo	Sununu
Cubin	Lucas	Talent
Cunningham	Manzullo	Tanner
Danner	Martinez	Tauzin
Davis (VA)	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Deal	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	McHugh	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	McInnis	Thornberry
Dickey	McIntosh	Thune
Doolittle	McIntyre	Tiaht
Doyle	McKeon	Trafficant
Dreier	Metcalfe	Turner
Duncan	Mica	Upton
Dunn	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Edwards	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Ehrlich	Murtha	Watts (OK)
Emerson	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Ensign	Nethercutt	Weller
Everett	Neumann	White
Foley	Ney	Whitfield
Fowler	Northup	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Wolf
Gallely	Nussle	Young (AK)
Ganske	Oberstar	Young (FL)
Gekas	Oxley	
Gibbons	Packard	

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis	Gonzalez	Moran (VA)
Boehner	Hilliard	Radanovich
Burton	Kennelly	Schiff
Cooksey	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Etheridge	McDade	Viscosky
Foglietta	Moakley	Yates

□ 2012

Mr. QUINN and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "aye" to "no".

Mr. FILNER, Mr. SNYDER and Ms. HARMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye".

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, on the last amendment, the Vento amend-

ment, I was unavoidably detained; and had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SOL-OMON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SUNUNU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 901), to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2015

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, October 7, 1997, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOL-OMON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 901.

□ 2015

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill [H.R. 901] to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, with Mr. SUNUNU in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 27 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider

amendment No. 5 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. FARR of California:

On page 10 of the bill, after line 8, insert the following:

"(d) Subsection (b) shall not apply to California Coastal Ranges Biosphere Reserve."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] and a Member opposed, each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, is this the amendment that affects the Central Valley California district or is this the amendment that affects the Redwoods?

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, it affects the California coast ranges, only to central California.

Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, this amendment is very simple. What it says is that we want to be exempted from the bill of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG]. And that is the California coast ranges. This includes State forests, the Jackson Demonstration State Forest, the Landels-Hill Big Creek Reserve, which is part of the university. This amendment exempts the California coast ranges and the biosphere reserve from the bill.

What it does is retain existing biosphere designations for the State forests, for the Channel Islands, the National Marine Sanctuary, for the Audubon Canyon, Bodega Marine Reserve, Cordell Banks National Marine Sanctuary, the Farallon National Wildlife Refuge, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, the Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve, and the Marin Municipal Water District.

The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], myself, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS] are affected by this amendment and to my knowledge we all support it. I will not speak for the gentleman from California Mr. RIGGS, but for Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. CAPPS, we think that the process for the designation of biosphere reserves has been adequate. It has gone up through a local process. It has gone up through the State lands commission.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts the California coastal range biosphere reserve, which includes the Elder Creek area of critical environmental concern, the Heath & Marjorie Angelo Coast Range Preserve, the Jackson Demonstration State Forest, the Landels-Hill Big Creek Reserve, the Redwood Experimental Forest, the Redwood National Park, the Redwood State Parks and the western slopes of Cone Peak in Los Padres National Forest. These properties are part of the coast range reserves. They have come up through a bottoms up process and they have been designated and we would like to be exempted from it. We do not want Congress to intrude upon the fact that these have been in the process, been in the biosphere reserve program for some time.

In fact I can speak to one of them, the Landels-Hill reserve, because our group of people have an inholding in there which is private property. We enjoy having that designation. It allows us to have an internationally recognized place to do biological study on weather data, on climate, on the fisheries of the reserve. And it is one of the most unique ecological zones on the Pacific Coast because the distance between the shoreline and the highest coastal peak is in the shortest ecological zone, meaning we have more ecological units in a shorter distance and it makes it an ideal study area.

So these California coast ranges have been part of the biosphere reserve program and the amendment says, do not mess with them. Do not take them away. Allow us to be what we have historically been. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman accept this amendment because I think that he will see that the Members of Congress overwhelmingly support it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for yielding time to me.

The gentleman from California, my home State colleague, concluded his remarks by saying that the Members of Congress affected by his amendment support his amendment. I want to make it clear to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I do not support this amendment for a number of reasons, not least of which is very little consultation by Mr. FARR prior to proposing his amendment.

I was attempting to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] to yield to me so that I could ask him if he has any kind of map or survey plat or property description that accompanies his amendment so he could show us perhaps precisely the land areas involved. I would also like to know from him why he feels, briefly, why he feels it is necessary to take land such as the coastal redwoods that are permanently

protected under public ownership in my congressional district, namely the Redwoods National Park and the California State Redwood Parks, and apply to them this further designation of biosphere reserve under international auspices. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], I wondered if I yielded to the gentleman if he could tell me where interested Members might obtain a precise description of the land areas involved here?

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

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer the gentleman. As the Congressman from the district, he knows it very well. He knows that the Redwood State Park has had a biosphere designation, and that is why he has cosponsored the bill to wipe it out, to say that it cannot exist, that the State Parks Commission has no ability, not under old law and certainly not under new law, because the new law will not allow anything but Federal lands to be approved by congressional approval, and that it is going to cost untold sums of money to go out and do the research because they have to do an economic impact within a 10-mile radius in order just to have an international study zone.

The gentleman knows that because it is in his district that the Redwood National Park has had the biosphere since the early 1980's. He knows that the northern California coast range under the Bureau of Land Management has had that designation since 1983.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, since the gentleman is being unresponsive to the query that I posed to him, which I thought was a very reasonable one, instead he prefers to talk around it.

The unfortunate aspect of this is that this is a very, very generic amendment that has potentially far-reaching legal implications and real impacts on local residents. I can tell the gentleman, since I think he stipulates that I might know my congressional district better than he knows my congressional district, that my constituents would not favor his amendment and in fact would strongly support the underlying bill offered by the chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG]. I do not think I have to belabor this debate.

I was able to watch the interchange between the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] and the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] earlier back in my office. I think Mr. POMBO put it well, that we do not need another layer of regulation or potential regulation, an overlay on top of all the other existing protections that these lands already enjoy at considerable, I will not yield, so I would appreciate the gentleman not interrupting me, that are already permanently protected and maintained at considerable expense to taxpayers.

I can further tell the gentleman that there are many of my constituents who still have very strong feelings and reservations and misgivings about the creation of the Redwood National Park by the legislative branch of the Federal Government, by the Congress back in the early 1970's. They believe that there were some promises made then, specifically "If you build it, they will come," that somehow tourism will take the place of timber production as a way of life and as a mainstay of our economy, that have not today almost 30 years later materialized. So we do not appreciate this intrusion in our affairs, Mr. Chairman. We do not want to be subject to the gentleman's amendment.

Therefore, I feel compelled to oppose the amendment, and will be happy to continue this debate. Although I might suggest to the gentleman, if it in fact is the case that the other Members of Congress whose districts are affected by the gentleman's amendment support his amendment, perhaps he would consider excluding my district from the gentleman's amendment and therefore we might allow the House to move forward with its business. I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for yielding me the time.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from San Francisco [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support the central California coastal biosphere reserve as an exception to the legislation presented by the very distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to represent an area which was included in the United Nations biosphere reserve program in 1989, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and many surrounding sites, including the Gulf of Farallones Islands and Cordell Banks National Marine Sanctuaries and Point Reyes National Seashore across the bay.

The area of reserve encompasses 85,710,300 acres. During this time, since 1989, collaborative activities include a symposium on biodiversity on the central California coast, a tide pool monitoring and public education program and research exchange program with a similar reserve in France, and workshops with educators and scientists exploring opportunities for new environmental education programs. The fact that this area has been designated a biosphere reserve has enhanced its standing as worthy of protection.

Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], the maker of the amendment, has spelled out very clearly the land areas that are covered by his amendment and has

enumerated some of the other collaborative efforts relating to weather and other environmental concerns.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for our colleagues to understand a biosphere reserve does not change what is already taking place in a designated area. It does not change the management of a site. It does not change the ownership of the site.

A biosphere reserve designation does foster cooperation, shared research and science and a greater understanding of the natural value of the resource. All of the uses of the site are regulated in accordance with the conservation and management goals of the administering agencies. There is no significant change in what exists except that knowledge about protecting the area by preserving its resources becomes elevated through scientific research, education and collective problem solving. United States law prevails in these areas, the laws we have created to protect the rich and diverse national treasures.

For my communities, this effort is very important because of the outreach of the biosphere reserve partners to engage inner city youth and to enhance opportunities for young people to understand and respect our environment.

□ 2030

It provides an invaluable contribution for an urban population.

The Department of the Interior, the agency we have entrusted with the protection of our national parks; the Department of Commerce, the agency which we have entrusted with the protection of our marine resources; the State of California, the governing body for a State population of more than 32 million people; universities and private organizations all contribute to this important effort. These partners do not advocate policy in management practices, but together provide a cooperative framework for making the best information and technology available to all of the partners, domestically and internationally, in performing their responsibilities to protect the resources we have deemed irreplaceable.

Mr. Chairman, there are no black helicopters; there are no U.N. troops and there is no global takeover. The U.N. Biosphere Reserve Program is a legitimate program that fosters understanding and elevates our knowledge of the biodiversity that surrounds us. It has been in effect since 1970, under four Republican Presidents, two Democratic Presidents. It came into being under President Nixon and was reauthorized under President Bush. There is nothing sinister about it.

I urge my colleagues to support the Farr amendment and to oppose the legislation that is the underlying bill on the floor.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] has 8 min-

utes remaining and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to rise in strong opposition to the amendment and urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

For 15 years the California Coast Ranges Biosphere Reserve Program has been in existence. This bill wipes that out entirely. My amendment puts it back in. This bill creates a bureaucracy. My bill prohibits in having a bureaucracy.

The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is opposing this amendment without permission from the University of California, without permission from the California Department of Forests, without permission from the Jedediah Smith and the Prairie Creek, the California Parks and Recreation, all of those in his district. The point that I am trying to make is that if the gentleman accepts this amendment, there is no change, no change to the law that has been there for the last 15 years. In all that time the gentleman served in Congress he never opposed those designations because there was no impact.

Frankly, what I am appalled about with this entire bill is that the gentleman is taking scientific studies and saying that we can no longer collaborate in these studies if indeed they have an international perspective when these studies are petitioned in a bottoms-up process. And this bill would no longer allow, the gentleman is not only saying that they are wiped out, the bill also says they can never get back in.

State Parks can never get back in, California Department of Forests can never get back in, University of California can never get back in, the Prairie Creek and Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast State Parks can never get back in. Why? Because the bill says the only way they can get back in, after doing very extensive studies, if Congress so decides, can only be for those areas that are a Federal designation.

So if the gentleman wants no bureaucracy, if the gentleman wants to keep things the way they are in a peaceful state, and if the gentleman wants to allow these State and local and I would even say private agencies and the Cone Peak area, of which there is a lot of private inholdings, to allow them to maintain the international biosphere program, this is the only way he can do it, by adopting the amendment.

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

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

I suggest respectfully that this amendment is, frankly, unnecessary. As I mentioned before, I not only oppose it, but under the bill all areas that have been designated have a 3-year grandfather clause. And if everybody loves these areas, the people that represent these areas can come back, bring them before the committee and they become a reality.

All we are asking, to get back to the original intent of the bill, 901, is put this back in the hands of the people of America, the United States Congress, that makes these designations. But under my bill, in the sense of fairness, I did give them a 3-year grandfather clause.

So I do not believe this amendment is necessary. We can do it through the proper process. So I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to respond to the last comments by my colleague, just to point out to him that I was not aware until this very moment that I needed the permission, I believe that was the exact word used, the permission of the University of California, the permission of various regulatory agencies at the State and local level to represent, and I hope protect, the best interests of my constituents.

I did not know that. I thought they elected me and trusted me to act and use my own independent judgment to act on what I thought was in their best interests and what constitutes good public policy.

And I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] will not take this wrong, we are not saying over here that we support current law. To the contrary, we are saying we support the bill that came out of the Committee on Resources because it will restore Congress' proper constitutional role in managing Federal lands.

These are lands, by the way, that do not belong to a university, they do not belong to a resources agency, they do not belong to any bureaucracy. They belong to the people, all the taxpayers who foot the bills, which is a simple fact of life that too often gets lost in this place when we debate these kinds of issues.

Allowing the administration to arbitrarily nominate and designate land further centralizes land use policy-making authority in the executive branch and diminishes public participation in the process. That is the big problem that we have here. We do not want the Congress to be bypassed repeatedly, as it has been in the process of designating these sites.

We believe that the people of the Nation, who are represented by us, their elected Representatives here in Congress, we are the best arbiters of these kinds of issues, not some faceless international council.

So that the real problem we have here, I believe, is that we become a

party to these international land designations. I am glad we are having the opportunity to debate it here now, maybe expose this issue to the American people, but by becoming a party to these international land designations, made again by some faceless international council, a lot of us are concerned that the United States of America, the sovereign United States of America, may be indirectly agreeing to terms of international treaties, such as the Convention on Biodiversity, to which the United States is not a party and which the United States Senate has refused to ratify.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] has 5½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I want to state what this is all about, why we are getting so worked up. The U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program is a program that supports ecological research collaboration and coordination at an international level. It involves 114 countries. It is supported by the administration, going back since 1974 by four Republican presidents and two Democratic Presidents. It receives support from 15 U.S. Government agencies for interdisciplinary scientific research in projects of mutual interest.

Why should that cause so much problem? It is so passive. It is so unintrusive. It has no ability to vest regulatory authority. It has no grants and money that come with it. It has no effect on property. No one has ever been able to get up and speak of one instance where it has affected property values; and, in fact, most of the people that oppose this do not even have these in their districts.

The 15 agencies that were directed to come together were a collaboration ordered by OMB to participate in a collaborative program so that we could have, frankly, something that Republicans have offered for a long time, one-stop shopping. Simplify the Federal Government.

Why? Why are we so much opposed to local State parks, to local nonprofits, such as the Audubon Society, to State universities, such as the University of California, which the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] does have land ownership in his district, why are we opposed to those organizations? We can say let us have Federal land that has to get into this, to have permission of Congress. I wish the author would take that amendment, but he has not. In fact, he said that these properties can no longer, any of them, ever be in the program unless, one, they are Federal lands and they come back through in an act of Congress.

I think that is wrong. This amendment simply says those properties that have been in the program, and I might

add they were nominated by President Ronald Reagan, and the gentleman has represented them for all these years and there has been no problem and all of a sudden the gentleman wants to knock them out.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes an important point that under this legislation, and we will offer an amendment later to exempt the current biospheres area, but obviously this is important to us in California, the amendment the gentleman has offered; that this legislation wipes out this designation without regard to merit, whether local people like it, whether the local State agency thinks the research is important, or whether the local universities who are involved, or local citizens groups who are involved in these programs, whether the foundations that have put land into these programs, this is not a question of a review and then weeding out the bad ones. This takes 47 programs and just wipes them out in all the different States, in all the different districts, in all the different characteristics. Just wipes these programs out without any consideration of merit.

As we pointed out, I think several times tonight, this particular one that the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] has pointed out has been in existence for 15 years. No one has clamored to this committee saying get rid of this. No one has said this is harming the land. Others have existed for longer than that, 25 years. But this legislation comes along without regard to local opinion, involvement, concern, or support. The Federal Government just comes along and wipes it out, our unobtrusive Federal Government brought to us by the House Committee on Resources.

One would think Members would be asked whether or not they consent to this or not. But that is not what is going on here. Just flat out wiping them out. If anybody thinks that is not the heavy hand of the Federal Government, tell that to people who have spent so many resources trying to preserve and protect these areas and learn how to take care of them.

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

I want to again stress it is not the Government. We are asking the Congress to accept their role. All these projects were unauthorized. They never were authorized. We did not do our job. We blindly set aside because a certain party was in control of the House that believed in this type of thing and we did not do our duty.

So we are not doing anything in this bill. We are giving them the 3 years. If they are as good as they say they are, they can come back.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Here we go again. These particular sites have no regulatory authority, no money, no grants. They cannot do anything, they are totally powerless. But if we do not have them, the developers and the miners and the loggers are going to destroy all of these unique environmental areas.

Now, there is something that is contradictory about that. Either they have regulatory authority, either they have power to do something or they do not. We cannot argue both sides.

Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] will be the first to stand up and say that his district has unique environmental qualities that need to be protected. He will be the first one to stand up and say that the people of the First District in California want to protect those areas, and they have city councils, they have boards of supervisors, they have State representatives who fight day in and day out to protect those areas. The gentleman himself has spent an inordinate amount of time back here in Congress trying to protect the unique environmental qualities that exist in northern California. But that is the way it is supposed to work.

We do not need an international organization, an international designation that Congress never looks at, that Congress never has oversight authority on, that Congress never approves. Why do we need something that is kind of behind the doors to protect something? Do we really feel that the people of that particular area cannot protect their own resources; that they do not have anybody there with enough smarts or enough caring or enough compassion to protect their resources?

□ 2045

And there is no one in Congress who can protect these areas. Throughout the entire country, there is no one that can protect them. We need an international organization that can step forward and tell us what needs to be protected and how we are going to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I respond to somebody who is very familiar with this program, unlike those who have been talking, many of whom have none in their district. What they are taking away is the ability for America and for private landowners, for States, and for anybody other than the Federal Government to ever get into an interdisciplinary scientific research that may be done on a standardized basis around the world.

I think this is an embarrassment to take this away, say you have to come to Congress, and even if you are private

land, you cannot get it, if you are State land, you cannot get it, and if you are local land, you cannot get it.

This has existed because we ratified the treaty back in 1974. There may not be congressional authorization because there has never needed to be.

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

I want to remind the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] that there is no Biosphere treaty. There has never been a treaty. Let us keep that in mind. Let us not stretch this truth. There was no treaty.

Mr. FARR of California. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, the World Heritage Convention was ratified in 1973.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Not the Biosphere areas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding me the time.

I just want to say that the United States Supreme Court has addressed this issue in a very, very interesting case, Fong Yue Ting versus United States, where that highest court in the land wrote:

To preserve this Nation's independence and give security against foreign aggression and encroachment constitute the very highest duty of every nation, and to attain these ends, nearly all other considerations are to be subordinated. It matters not in what form such aggression and encroachment come.

I believe the Supreme Court understands what we are dealing with.

Furthermore, I just want to wind my comments up by saying that George Washington, in a letter dated October 9, 1795, wrote:

My ardent desire is, and my aim has been, to comply strictly with all engagements, foreign and domestic; but to keep the United States free from political connections with every other country, to see them independent of all and under the influence of none, is my ardent desire.

I share that. While I believe in a strong and vigorous trade policy, the sovereignty of the United States of America is so very important, and the protection of private property rights must be protected.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a property owner, and I want to protect private property rights. Support this amendment. I rise as a former county supervisor. Support local control. Support this amendment. I rise as a former State legislator. Support States' rights. Support this amendment. And I rise as a Member of the United States Congress, saying, thank God that this country has been a global leader in environmental protection and environmental resource management.

And in a time when we recognize global, global warming and global environmental pollution, which our national Defense Department says is not in our national security interest to

keep the world being polluted, that we can have international agreements that allow us to have some commonality and science, if there is anything that ought to be protected, it is that. Give us back our property rights. Support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Nothing in this bill precludes any scientific study, any type of cooperation with other countries. All we are doing is getting back the responsibility of this Congress that we swore to uphold. The Constitution of the United States is all I am asking for. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. VENTO: Page 10, line 15, Following the word "special" insert the following: ", including commercial."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and a Member opposed will each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment follows a different tack than that which had been offered before. In this newfound enthusiasm in this Congress to reassert its prerogatives and control, absolute control over land use designations and limits as they apply to preservation and study and surveys and really international voluntary conventions, I am offering an amendment which permits us to assert the same sort of control over commercial type of activities that are of an international nature.

A key component of the pending legislation is a requirement that Congress

specifically approve the recognition of any U.S. lands for conservation purposes as a result of agreement with a foreign entity. However, at the same time, this legislation does not require similar congressional action when the U.S.-owned lands are leased, oftentimes at a loss to American taxpayers, to foreign-owned companies for drilling, for mining, for timber harvesting, or other commercial endeavors. Claims can be made, and under law, hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. public land assets are handed over to foreign corporations or persons for a pittance, to foreign entities.

The Vento amendment establishes parity in that process. Under my amendment, the legislation requires for specific congressional authorization where it be extended to cover commercial uses and development of U.S. lands by foreign companies and U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies or entities. My amendment would not prevent such activities from occurring. It would encourage Congress to approve such actions, which has, of course, been the siren song that we have heard over and over again tonight. We need Congress to approve all of these specific conservation, these voluntary conservation agreements.

The Vento amendment is a responsible provision that responds to foreign exploitations which are now occurring and which neither the Congress nor the administration can legally stop.

Many of my colleagues would remember the public outcry when it was revealed that a concession facility at Yosemite National Park was going to be managed by a Japanese conglomerate, Matsushita. No legal recourse was available to block this action.

A similar outrage was voiced when the Secretary of the Interior was required, under Federal law and under court order, to release and to honor a claim and patent to release Federal lands containing more than \$10 billion in gold to a subsidiary of a Canadian-owned corporation for less than \$10,000.

Nothing has been done to prevent the repeat of this type of land use policy, a real ripoff of the American public. A foreign firm can operate the concession at the Statue of Liberty or any of our national parks. And foreign firms can continue to exploit American resources while ripping off the U.S. taxpayers.

We now have an opportunity to change those policies. While the Vento amendment will not prevent these activities from moving forward, it is intended to require Congress to consider the national consequences and specifically authorize those actions. If we are going to require Congress to approve actions to recognize U.S.-owned lands for conservation purposes, then Congress should also approve actions by foreign firms which exploit U.S. lands.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, if the Vento amendment does what it says it does, it is not germane. It was written, so it does not really say anything.

I do not want it in the RECORD to say that we happen to agree that we have to enter, if you read in this section the term "international agreement" means any compact, executive agreement, conservation, bilateral agreement, or multilateral agreements between the United States or any agency of the United States, any foreign entity.

And I am suggesting, respectfully, that the attempt of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is to preclude any type of activity under treaty, including the other treaties, such as NAFTA, and allowing other countries into our lands, as well we go into their lands.

So I adamantly oppose the amendment because all it is including commercial, and I am suggesting, respectfully, it is written very cleverly, but if it does what he says it does, and I do not believe it is, it would have been nongermane and I would have made a point of order. But it does not do that.

So I, very frankly, urge a strong "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], a distinguished member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the black helicopters are, indeed, circling over our lands. They are out there circling as we speak. And the agents of foreign powers are, indeed, locking up our public lands, intent upon not only controlling them, but ultimately America's very natural resource heritage.

But to be sure, Mr. Chairman, and let us be sure about this, the pilots of these helicopters are not wearing the blue helmets of the United Nations. Rather, they are wearing the corporate emblems of foreign conglomerates based in South Africa, Australia, Luxembourg, and Canada.

These foreign agents are not from the United Nations. Their weapons are not World Heritage sites or International Biospheres. Indeed, the true threat comes from the foreign conglomerates, multinational mining firms, who swoop down upon our public lands owned by the American taxpayers and extract the gold and the silver, with no rent, no royalties paid to the American people, the owners of this land.

The U.N. charter in this instance is not the issue. It is our very own mining law of 1872, of 1872, which continues with reckless disregard to our economy and our environment to turn over our Federal assets to the control of foreign nationals.

So I rise in support of this amendment, to this bill, the American Lands Sovereignty Protection Act, for if we are to protect the sovereignty of our American lands from foreign powers, then we must include commercial developments undertaken by foreign powers in this legislation. That is what this amendment is all about.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], said, it is about parity in this process. It is about restoring sanity and reasonableness to the fanaticism behind this bill. Our lands, our resources, owned by all Americans, are being claimed by foreign entities. Are we in Congress having a say on it? No. The hard-rock minerals of these lands are being mined, with no return to the public, and these lands are being privatized by foreign entities for a mere pittance, \$2.50 or \$5 an acre. That is what we are giving away to foreign entities, allowed under the mining law of 1872, yes. Should these practices be condoned in 1997? No, of course not. This House is on record, by an overwhelming majority, in a bipartisan manner, as saying no.

So the real issue here today is not what the proponents of H.R. 901 make it out to be. It is not about the United Nations. It is not about black helicopters descending upon an unsuspecting populace. It is, in these times of budgetary constraint, about the relinquishment of our lands and minerals to multinational conglomerates for what amounts to fast food hamburger prices.

So I say to my colleagues, vote "yes" on the Vento amendment. Cast a vote for America. Allow us in Congress to have a say where foreign entities are going to come in and control our concessionaires at the Statue of Liberty or Yosemite or at other national park areas. Let the Congress have a say on these issues before we lose further lands to foreign conglomerates.

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

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

□ 2100

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to acknowledge the gentleman's cosponsorship of this amendment. I neglected to do that in offering it, and I appreciate his guidance and strong support as a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals for many years on the Committee on Natural Resources. I appreciate the gentleman's strong support and his cosponsorship of this amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for introducing this amendment along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], who has just spoken, because this amendment takes us right to the crux of what this legislation is about.

This legislation is about international mining companies, timber companies and others that seek to beat back those individuals and local communities who want to protect the ecosystems, that want to protect the watersheds, that want to protect their local communities, that want to protect our national parks and our heritage areas. This bill is about beating those people back, under the guise of the sovereignty of the United States.

Yet the proponents of this legislation would happily hand over billions of dollars of taxpayer-owned platinum or gold or silver or coal or timber and think nothing of it, and have done that, and have supported that effort. They would think nothing of delegating their authority to the Department of Interior to enter into a lease for billions of dollars of what belongs to the taxpayers, and as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, the taxpayers get nothing back.

A private person can own the land right next to this and they can get royalties in the millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions. We get nothing, because these people are willing to delegate their authority over these lands to some bureaucrats who give it away to international mining companies who want to destroy maybe the Clarks Fork River, who wanted to take \$1 billion out of the lands of Idaho.

The gentleman says this is only about treaties. Well, maybe that is why the western Governors are not happy with fast track, because I say to my colleagues, we need this law to protect us in the future, because we do not get a right under arrangements like NAFTA, under the arrangements under fast track.

So what we have here is those great protectorates of a constitutional power, who will not let a faceless bureaucrat enter into a research grant to protect lands, will gladly hand them over to Canadian mining companies, South African mining companies, Canadian timber companies, "Come on in and get all you want." Do we think that is really what the taxpayers want? The taxpayers have said time and again they are tired of that arrangement, they are tired of seeing us lose money, they are tired of seeing us enter into leases where people spend \$270, \$270, and they have \$1 billion worth of minerals.

My colleagues on the other side are worried about sovereignty? I do not think so. I think it only cuts one way.

My colleagues are only worried about it when somebody wants to do a little

research and not harm the land, but when somebody wants to come in and tear up the landscape, walk off with the gold, walk off with the platinum, there is silence on the other side. So apparently, it is open season for international companies who want to come and rape and ruin the land and take the gold and take the silver.

Somehow this committee cannot figure out how to stop that, but if someone wants to come and study the watershed in the Redwood National Forest or somebody wants to study the Channel Islands or somebody wants to study the Big Ben Park down in Texas to see whether it can be protected, whether it can be developed in a way that is compatible; if someone wants to study the Everglades, somehow one is giving up sovereignty. But if somebody wants to give away the legacy of this country and the heritage of this country and its gold and its silver and its platinum, this committee says, "Come on in, buy it for \$5 an acre, and we will give you millions of dollars."

Mr. Chairman, the greatest scam going in the history of the American taxpayer. This is one where we just back up the big old dump truck, we put the shovel in the ground and we take the gold and do not even say "thank you" to the people of the United States.

I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] have put their thumb right on what this bill is about. Read it on the Internet, folks. This is a big push by those corporate interests to try to drive out of these communities people who have concerns for the environment, the watershed, the habitat and the wildlife, because then there is nobody to stop them from taking the gold and the silver and the platinum of this Nation.

This is a travesty, it is a travesty. It has been denounced by every editorial board, every public interest group, every periodical. Since 1872, somehow these people have not figured out how to amend the law so the taxpayer could get a fair break, and now they are going to use this law to drive off the researchers and the local communities and the universities and the State park system who are trying to protect the lands, the heritage and the history of this country. Do we think, my colleagues, maybe it is not on the level? Maybe it is just not on the level, and my colleagues ought to vote for this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague that I have heard some great demagoguery in my life, but that is one of the best, because this amendment only applies to commercial:

In this section, the term "international agreement" means any treaty, compact, executive agreement, convention, bilateral agreement, or multilateral agreement between the United States or any agency of the United States and any foreign entity or

agency of any foreign entity, having a primary purpose of conserving, preserving, or protecting the terrestrial or marine environment flora, or fauna.

That is all this does. This is just a great platform for my good friend from California [Mr. MILLER] to talk about the evils of mining, the terrible things that occur. It has nothing to do with this bill. It is a great smokescreen, and I compliment him on it. It is one of those issues that I am very pleased to say that I hope everybody could see through it.

This amendment is a mischievous amendment. It does nothing. I am tempted to vote for the silly thing, because it does nothing, it means nothing. It is a disaster when it comes to having taken the time to put this in this bill. As I told the Parliamentarian, and in fact, it is out of order if that is what it really does, because it does not do that with the amendment.

The amendment is an innocuous little amendment, but it gives them a platform to talk and pontificate on the terrible evils of the mining law. My good friend from West Virginia, [Mr. RAHALL], now, he does not have any foreign people digging the mountains out in West Virginia, no; destroying the environment, no. Those are not foreign countries, and in fact, they are all pure, homemade countries, but they are destroying West Virginia, but that is all right. But do not mess with the public lands. Lock it up so his price of coal goes up and his people get rich.

I do not blame him, but I am suggesting respectfully, that is a little hypocritical.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield? The gentleman brought up my name. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I did not bring up the gentleman's name.

Mr. RAHALL. These happen to be private lands, I will have the gentleman know.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota controls the time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for yielding, and I would respond to my chairman of the Committee on Resources, let us not mix apples and oranges here. West Virginia, these are private lands, these are private people that have come in.

Is the gentleman asking that the private developers not be allowed to do what they want on private land?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that. Is the gentleman telling me they are all privately owned companies? Is there any foreign money in those companies?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, absolutely, take back the time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say as well

that my coal miners are paying their taxes, their royalties to the Federal Government for mining on private land, not lands owned by the Federal taxpayers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that this amendment does in fact have an impact, we believe, because as we look at foreign entities and we look at the purpose of conserving, obviously if we are not conserving, if one is taking the products out of the land, mining or doing other activities, one still has to prepare an environmental impact statement. I would suggest to my colleagues that it is a lease agreement or other agreements that have to be entered into.

The fact is that as we look at what has happened, and I admit that this only affects those foreign entities that are coming in to do that, foreign countries, maybe even publicly owned foreign companies, but for instance, we have gold mining that has gone on. The value of that by the Barrick Gold Strike Company is \$8.9 billion in Nevada that was sold for a pittance. Gold Fields Mining Company, United Kingdom company, purchased for \$1,700; estimated value, \$266 million. The first one, incidentally, was purchased as a \$9 billion value, purchased for less than \$9,000. The Faxcalc Company of Denmark, Travatine, purchased for \$270; estimated value of the claim, \$1 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

What has this got to do with the gentleman's amendment to this bill? Nothing.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is another classic example of nothing about nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been a part of the legislative process for 20 years, and I want to sincerely say to my colleagues, the American public deserves a more upright and honest statement of the facts. I urge my colleagues tomorrow to read the record that has been created here tonight. I want to tell my colleagues, it is far from the truth. To make such outlandish statements that the sovereignty act is to take away the protection of public lands so people can take advantage of them is not true.

The American public had very little to say, if anything, at the local level, at the State level and at the national level about the biosphere program. It was created by administrations with no legislative oversight and no legislative funding and no legislative input. There is great concern among people around this country that decisions are going to be made in the future and are currently being made by world people,

people from around the world, and they do not want America governed that way, they want America governed by Americans at the local level, at the State level and at the national level. And for my colleagues on the other side to make these statements that have been made, and I mean this sincerely, they owe the American public an apology because they have talked about everything but the truth.

We heard about this being overreaching and so damaging. We had others call it crazy, trivial nonsense, and we had other ones saying it was all done by local community requests. The American public want to understand world agreements, and they have a right to. They want to understand international commitments that our Government makes, and they have a right to.

In conclusion, those who want to deprive the average American, those who want to deprive the American citizens from having the right to understand what biospheres are about, having the right to react to their local government or their Congress, whether they agree or disagree, and they may agree, but give them the right. When it is not to be publicly debated, people think we have something to hide when they do not have a shot, they do not have a bite of the apple. That is what America is all about. We cannot have too much sunshine, we cannot have too much people participation.

People in America are concerned about the proposal of world government and other countries making decisions in this country, and generally in a huge percentage they are opposed to that, and we should be sensitive to that for the long run of this country, because most other countries do not really care about the future of America, but Americans do, and they should have the right to understand clearly every agreement, every international commitment that is done, and it should be done in the sunshine, and that is what this whole bill is about, not the rhetoric we heard a few moments ago.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy if the gentleman would yield me some of his time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be postponed.

The point of order is considered withdrawn.

□ 2115

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider an amendment without a number offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] that will strike section 4(b).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California:

On page 9 of the bill, beginning at line 1, strike all through the end of line 16, and renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will control 15 minutes, and a Member in opposition will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation as currently drafted wipes out the Biosphere Reserves that have existed in this country for between 15 and 25 years, and have had the continued support of the local communities where they exist.

Some of them are as grand as the Big Bend in Texas, some of them are as grand as the Redwood Coastal Range in the State of California, the Glacier Bay National Park in Alaska, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Mojave National Preserve, the Olympic Peninsula in the Pacific Northwest, one of the great, great sites in this country.

These designations were first started in the early 1970s. This occurred throughout the 1970s. They have been worked on and researched, and assets have been brought to this effort by universities, by local foundations, by national foundations, by local civic organizations that have been brought into researching the effort, by the various park systems of the various States where these are involved.

The fact of the matter is there has been very little or no outcry about this because people did not realize what they had. What they had with this designation was the opportunity to participate in research not only in their local areas, but to be able to coordinate and work with other research going on around in other places of the world. It gave us a chance to look at some of these landscapes, and we know we mismanaged them when we managed them in very small portions. Now we are able to look on them in a grander scale.

But this legislation wipes them out, just wipes them out. It does not matter if those of us in California who are so concerned with the Channel Islands,

with the watersheds in the south of San Francisco, or with our great redwood parks, it does not matter, it just wipes them out. It does not matter that the people in Texas are proud of the Big Bend, and the Big Bend is serious desert research, habitat research. It just wipes them out.

It does not do that for the Heritage areas. It grandfathers them in. What this amendment would simply do is grandfather in the existing areas, and then if the bill passes, new areas would have to be designated in accordance with this legislation.

But what it does not do is it does not throw away the effort, the time, and the experience that we have gained in these programs. It is not a unilateral withdrawal from the biosphere program. It in fact leaves that in place, since there has been little or no complaint about the existing ones.

It is interesting that most of the people who have argued about this have been people who do not have these in their areas. People have come down and made remarkable speeches about the Constitution and what have you. They just do not happen to have a Biosphere Reserve. There are not people asking for time saying get rid of that biosphere in Texas or Arizona, get rid of that biosphere in California. So what we have here is legislation that deals with a problem that does not exist.

I do not think that is fair to these local organizations. I do not think that is fair to the parks department in our States that have put assets and resources and time and effort into this, or to the foundations, or to the universities that have engaged in this research. So I would simply leave the status quo. The last one designated was in 1991. It is not like they are roaring on here and designating them every year. There are only 47 nationwide. Then let the bill work its will on those programs.

This amendment is no more complicated than that. I would urge when the House votes tomorrow, that it votes to grandfather and exempt these provisions from this legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] claim the time in opposition?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I do claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], he propounded the statement that he does not hear anybody yelling, get rid of these biospheres. I would like to invite the gentleman

from California [Mr. MILLER] up to my district.

I just took the honorable chairman of the Committee on Resources and the honorable gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and a number of other Members up to the Catskill Mountains, where there was a proposed biosphere about to go in. They heard an earful.

I would invite them to come to another mountain range that I represent, called the Adirondack Mountains. As a Representative from that area with one of the largest U.N. Biosphere Reserves in the United States, I have a personal interest in this bill on behalf of the 600,000 people that I have the privilege of representing.

In my congressional district, the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve was created in 1989. It was created at the request of a quasi-governmental agency called the Adirondack Park Agency. If I have time, I will talk about how Nelson Rockefeller rammed this down the throats of the people I represent some 30 years ago. It was at the request of two Governors. One was a very liberal Governor from the State of New York, and one was a very liberal Governor from the State of Vermont. Without even any input from the State legislature or without congressional hearings or real input from any of the local citizens of the Adirondacks, this area was designated in the middle of the night, without anybody knowing about it, as a U.N. Biosphere Reserve.

The system completely bypassed the people directly affected by this program. None of us knew about it. In this case, and in many cases in this country, I would submit that with congressional oversight and public input, many of these U.N. sites would not even have been designated.

In fact, in 1994, this was only just 3 years ago, the Catskill region of New York, again in my district, was nominated for designation as a U.N. Biosphere Reserve, and we almost did not know anything about that. But we got wind of it. When I found out about it and when local officials and residents raised cain about it, and showed their opposition, the nomination was defeated.

That is probably what would have happened all over this country had these not been snuck in in the middle of the night. The American Land Sovereignty Act before us tonight unequivocally states that no lands in this country can be included in any international land use programs without the clear and direct approval of Congress.

That makes sense, because even on that side of the aisle, and I respect the gentleman and I believe he would let his constituents know about it, I do not think he would try to sneak it in in the middle of the night, if I look around, all of these Members look like respected Members of this body.

Most all of H.R. 901 protects individual private property rights. That is

the most important thing. Executive branch political appointees cannot and should not be making property decisions in the place of individual landowners. This bill is a first step in the right direction in returning power to the elected Representatives in Congress as well as to the local citizens and officials.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, this bill, if we defeat the Miller amendment, reasserts the constitutional rights of property owners all across the country to control their land without interference from some international organization. That is what this debate is all about.

Please come over here and defeat the Miller amendment, and we can defeat all of these amendments, and then vote for this bill that means so much to the people in this country.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPs].

Mr. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I rise because the Channel Islands Biosphere Reserve is in our district, in the Twenty-second District of California. I have had an opportunity to watch the cooperative work that goes on there with the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the national parks, the Channel Island National Park, and I would say most especially the University of California. And the Chair knew I was going to say that.

I think it is very, very positive work. It ought to be continued, too. I do not have the fear about world government that I think people on the other side have. I think this is really an attack on the United Nations. I do not have that fear. I think there are times when we need international cooperation for research purposes.

That is primarily what we are talking about here. There is some concern about persons from other countries participating in American research, or research having to do with American locales, but I want to point out that Americans participate in international research of a biospheric nature throughout the world. This is fair play.

I certainly support the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I again rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment is a backdoor way of authorizing existing Biosphere Reserves. The Heritage areas were recognized in the bill because it is under treaty, but there is no treaty on the biospheres, none. Let us make that perfectly clear. I have a 3-year grandfather clause. We can come back and talk about each one of these. If everybody loves them like they do, it will work.

By the way, I have no fear of outside world government at all. I believe in America. But I suggest respectfully I

do also believe, and I think each one of the Members were sworn to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution says that Congress, this Congress, the Members and I, are the only ones who can designate lands.

So why is the fear, why do Members want to give this away to somebody else? I have never understood that, and this whole argument. What is wrong with this Congress acting, and by the way, the areas that have been designated can still be, under State participation, under the individual participation, can still have the same type of study and research.

I keep hearing this research charade. The research can go on. There is nothing that stops the research, nothing at all. All we are asking in this legislation is that this Congress fulfill its responsibility of designating lands. If in fact UNESCO or somebody wants to designate it, let them come to Congress. That is all I will ask.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the ranking member yielding time to me.

I just wanted to ask the chairman to yield. Because his point is that under the World Heritage Convention, that the 20 sites that are in existence remain in existence that are designated, and he is correct about that. The Ramsar sites that are in existence, the 15, remain in effect. There is nothing that I said or intimated that they were not, and they are under treaty.

But I think that, in my judgment, the World Heritage sites, we will not have another World Heritage site in the United States based on this legislation, because it makes it impossible, based on the type of requirements that are in the legislation under that supposition.

In any case, looking, because we are talking about the Man and Biosphere program, that protocol right now, that agreement, of which 120-some nations are involved, the fact is this says you give 2 or 3 years of time, but then in terms of requirements, it says it consists solely of lands as of that date that are enacted that are owned by the United States.

So therefore, to be into that biosphere, to be part of that, you could not be a State land, you could not be a private land, you could not be anything. So in essence, saying you are going to give us an opportunity to go back and designate those is not entirely accurate, in my judgment, because this will take it apart. There is no way under the precepts of this bill that it can be put back together again. So once we break that apart, it cannot be put back together.

Earlier today it was suggested that some Members did not agree with some of the statements that were being made over here, and at that time they

would not yield, because I was wondering which statements. It reminds me of the adage that was once espoused by President Truman, that said that you do not have to really give them a lot of grief. He said, you just have to tell the truth, and they will think that they have a lot of grief.

Because I do not want to be accused of something else, the issue is I have been trying to strive for a common understanding. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts with regard to this. That is what this bill does. This is the literal reading of this bill.

If the gentleman disagrees with that, I would be happy to yield what time I have so I can engage in a realistic debate with regard to this issue.

□ 2130

No offers?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

It is ironic we are here debating and we find that this side of the aisle is out here trying to protect local property rights, local control. This bill wipes it out.

The bill that is before us wipes out what four Republican administrations and two Democratic administrations have been carrying on. It wipes out the ability for America to participate with 146 other nations. It wipes out the exchange of information among scientists on a common international one page.

Mr. Chairman, it wipes out the process that allowed the nomination from local governments, from State governments, from nonprofits, and from private land use. It wipes it out, Mr. Chairman, because it says that on page 9, "Any designation shall not be given any force or effect unless it consists solely of lands that of the date of enactment are owned by the United States."

So all of those programs that have been involved in this for so many years are wiped out. It wipes out, and I think this is something that has not been looked at, it wipes out the fact that a lot of international tourists come to the United States. And according to the Visitor's Service Survey conducted in the Everglades, 44 percent of the international visitors say they came to that because it was such a designated site. They knew about it because of their host countries. That is why the National Tourist Association of Kentucky has written in opposition to this bill, because this bill wipes out essentially a tourist attraction.

The Man and Biosphere program is a key program that helps train our Peace Corps volunteers. When we go overseas to try and develop an environmental program for the countries that the Peace Corps volunteers are serving in so that everybody can be on the same scientific page, they are trained by our

Biosphere programs here in the United States before they go overseas. This wipes that out. This wipes out the ability for America to participate, and that, I think, is why this bill is so fundamentally wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment that at least makes it prospective and not retrospective. Do not tread on property rights.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Let us understand something here. It has been suggested that somehow we were giving away the Constitution of the United States if we did not vote for this bill. But this bill leaves in place the World Heritage Areas that were designated by the United Nations, that were nominated by the United States, accepted by the United Nations pursuant to their criteria, and the treaty, the international treaty we have on Heritage areas. So this bill leaves those in place.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Biosphere areas that were designated by the U.S. Government, that were nominated by local communities, and are recognized, not designated, not accepted by them, recognized by the international program, that we nominated and we control them, those are wiped out.

But those of my colleagues on the other side who are so upset about one world government and the United Nations and so upset about international conspiracy, they leave in place the designation that is made by the United Nations.

So what is the problem here? This is wiping out the other treaty. I do not get it. There is some inconsistency here, folks. So it is now the treaty power that prevents proponents of this bill from acting to protect the sovereignty and their citizens? I see. OK. So now we have it clear.

Mr. Speaker, these areas that were nominated by local governments or organizations and agencies, and were designated by the various administrations starting from President Nixon to today, those are a threat to the United States, but the United Nations designated and accepted areas and the United Nations criteria are not? Something is very wrong here.

What is wrong here is that we are overriding with this legislation, we are overriding the local designation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] got up and talked about how people in his district raised Cain about one of these areas and it did not happen. Is the gentleman suggesting that the people in Florida and Texas and California and Montana and Idaho were snookered? Were they snookered in 1986, 1976, 1996? Were they snookered? I don't think so. The point is this: That is the process.

Somebody else got up here and said that in Minnesota back in 1983 somebody proposed one of these and the people turned it down. It sounds to me like the process is working, folks. But now they want to wipe out those local deci-

sions. Forty-seven areas said they thought it was OK; they want to wipe them out.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand my colleagues on the other side saying, "Hey, you do not like that process; you want to go through this one, and if in the future you want one of these, you have got to come to Congress." That is fine. But why would you wipe out all of these other areas?

Their contention is that the people in San Francisco or Los Angeles or Santa Barbara were snookered, even though they were interested in doing this and participating and they asked to participate. Kind of an interesting theory. Kind of an interesting theory.

Mr. Chairman, it should not happen. It should not happen. I would urge Members to support this amendment when we vote tomorrow to restore these areas that are currently in place and protect these very, very, very valuable assets of the United States of America.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind everybody, the treaty for the Heritage Areas was ratified by the Senate and voted on by the House, but not the Biospheres. That is why we had to leave the Heritage. If I had my way, they would be out too. Let us be very up front about this. The Biosphere is, again, a designation by the U.N., by UNESCO, without any local input.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] said that the Tourist Association of Kentucky supports the Biosphere Reserve Program. However, on May 29, 1997, the Kentucky State Senate, by a voice vote, approved Senate Resolution 35 which reads:

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky is unalterably opposed to the inclusion of any land within the borders of the Commonwealth within the purview of the Biosphere Treaty or any biodiversity program without the express consent of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, as provided by the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Kentucky.

Furthermore, the General Assembly urges the Members of the Congress of the United States, and especially the Kentucky delegation to the Congress of the United States, to oppose ratification of this treaty and the inclusion of any land within the Commonwealth of Kentucky in any Biosphere program of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, when we do something wrong, we go back and make it right. That is what the crux of this bill does, and that is what this amendment prevents.

Mr. Chairman, in Texas we have two Biosphere Reserves that total over three-quarters of a million acres in our State, a significant amount. Under this amendment, we as a Congress are prevented from going back to the communities that include those Biospheres and are adjacent to them. We are prevented from going back to those school districts, those county commissions, and the State legislature, and allowing them to ask the questions that they were not allowed to ask the first time: How does this affect our community and what does this allow us to do? What does it prevent us from doing? How will it affect our tourism? How will it affect our property tax values? How will it affect everything that we have been building in our community and our State?

This amendment prevents those very common sense and basic questions from being asked. And those Biosphere Reserves that have value in support will pass all those tests, and those that do not will at last have a local standard applied to them that we desperately need.

I know some believe the United Nations knows what is best for our communities, but I have a great deal of faith that local communities and counties and school boards and State legislatures, if given an opportunity to ask those questions and have them answered, will come up with the right decision. I have faith in them. This amendment prevents us, prevents them, from having a say. We all deserve to have a say in our property rights.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Pursuant to the previous order of the House, it is now in order to consider the amendment regarding specific Biosphere Reserves.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I will not offer the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania] having assumed the chair, Mr. SUNUNU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 901) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 901.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN IS GORE'S CURE FOR ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Times reported that, and I quote, "Vice President Al Gore, warning that overpopulation fosters global warming, yesterday suggested expanding abortion programs in developing countries to help reduce the environmental threat."

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely scandalous and inhumane that the Vice President of the United States is aggressively touting violence against babies to mitigate global warming. The Vice President is blaming the babies of the poor for the consumption excesses of the rich and powerful. How dare he blame the kids.

In a meeting with the weather forecasters, AL GORE gleefully pointed to the administration's repeal of the Mexico City policy, the Hyde amendment for the developing world, as a step towards population control.

Make no mistake about it, President Clinton's action has permitted hundreds of millions of dollars, U.S. tax dollars, to flow to the abortion industry overseas. The Vice President is blaming the problem of global warming on children and suggesting that somehow the world will be a much cleaner place if these innocent children are killed by abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 3, 1997]

GORE'S CURE FOR GLOBAL WARMING JOLTS PRO-LIFE ACTIVISTS
(By Paul Bedard)

Pro-life activists yesterday expressed alarm that Vice President Al Gore's suggestion to curb global warming by slashing population growth could lead to more abortions in Third World countries.

"What he would do is push violence against babies to advance a theory to cure greenhouse gas problems," said Rep. Christopher H. Smith, New Jersey Republican. "You don't use violence to get a cleaner atmosphere."

"Al Gore should not try to impose the immortality of abortion on developing nations," said Carol Long, director of the National Right to Life Political Action Committee.

Mr. Smith charged that the White House was being "elitist" in its effort to curb birth rates by targeting mostly poor, nonwhite populations in Africa, Asia and South America.

"It's elitist because it blames the poor and vulnerable for the problems of the rich and powerful," said Mr. Smith, chairman of the House International Relations human rights subcommittee. "It's very arrogant to persecute anyone to push a theory."

Mr. Gore this week told a White House global warming conference that overpopulation was the top proponent of climate change and, thus, should be a major focus for Government policy. He heralded President Clinton's early 1993 decision to reverse GOP policies blocking U.S. funding of family-planning groups that perform abortions abroad.

Mr. Gore suggested that the industrialized nations have "stabilized" their populations through a three-point program of birth control, abortion and a reduction in child mortality rates, but world populations would grow if developing nations aren't targeted now.

He suggested that pushing his three initiatives could cut 2 billion to 5 billion people from the projected 2050 world population of 14 billion.

"We're actually beginning to experience some good news around the world with the beginnings of a stabilization in world population. But the momentum in the demographic system is such that we're inevitably going to go to 8 or 9 billion. The question is whether these changes will keep us from going to 10, 12, 14 billion," Mr. Gore said.

Mr. Gore has long promoted a "Global Marshall Plan" that promotes birth control and family planning, but his comments at a White House summit of some 100 TV weathermen this week rattled some pro-life advocates.

"This will be the wake-up call," Mr. Smith said.

The National Right to Life Committee also took notice of Mr. Gore's comments and began alerting members, as did the House Pro-Life Caucus.

And Gary Bauer, head of the Family Research Council, said, "The problem with global warming isn't that there are too many people or too many children. That's our greatest asset."

Under the Gore plan, developing nations need three programs to slow population: one to cut child mortality rates so that families don't need to produce numerous children with the expectation that some will die young, birth control and moves to boost women politically and socially.

"When those three conditions are established, those countries make that change,