In the DelMar exchange in Utah, the BLM paid more than seven times the appraised value.

The Forest Service acquired lands in three exchanges in Nevada that were ''overvalued by a total of $8.8 million'' because the appraised values ''were not supported by credible evidence.''

In the Cache Creek exchange in California, the BLM failed to ''present the reasons for acquiring'' the land.

In another Nevada exchange, the Del Webb exchange, BLM removed an agency appraiser and violated the BLM's own policy by hiring a non-federal appraiser recommended by the exchange's private party.

The GAO said the problems were so bad that Congress should consider eliminating the programs altogether. I believe that the appropriate step is to halt the programs and then fix them. in light of the GAO's report, I asked the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to immediately suspend their programs while they evaluate the best method to achieve exchanges' laudable goals. Both agencies declined my request for a moratorium but have begun to review their exchange programs. Although, the reviews may prove to correct many of the problems, I will watch the efforts closely, especially because the BLM continues the land transactions that GAO said were illegal. So now what does this Congress do when faced with a clear demonstration of the problems of the exchange program? Instead of supporting efforts to ensure that taxpayers and the environment are protected, Congress has passed some of the worst land swaps I have seen in my 26 years of Congress.

Since the GAO report was released: The House passed and the President signed into law, S. 1629, the Oregon Land Exchange Act, which mandated the exchange of 90,000 acres without sufficient NEPA review or public disclosure of appraisal information. The House and Senate passed H.R. 4828, the Steens Mountain exchange bill. The bill contains 5 legislated land exchanges. The exchanges were negotiated behind closed doors among a select group of participants. No appraisals were done. Further, while the exchanges themselves are unequal, the ranchers asked for even more and the bill includes nearly $5 million in cash payments to them. As if that was not enough, the bill directs the Secretary to provide fencing and water developments for their grazing operations.

Finally, these trades involve the unprecedented transfer of more than 18,000 acres of wilderness study areas (WSAs) to the ranchers. While it is true that the BLM would receive more than 14,000 acres of private land within WSAs, this is not only a net loss but it also sets a bad precedent of trading wilderness for wilderness. Further, significant private inholdings will remain in the proposed wilderness areas even after these trades.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that those perfecting amendments they were talking about were, of course, removing the restrictions for the limitation of using this property only as a school site and also to remove the restriction of a reversionary clause, which would be that, if it were not used for a school, it would be reverted back to the Federal Government.

Those provisions are in the bill; and to remove those, of course, would allow for the appraisal process to be one which would garner that of a commercially developed piece of property. This school district is not interested in developing this property as commercial property. It certainly wants to use the property for a school site. It is going to protect the environment.

Let me also say to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), over here that his support of H.R. 695, which is a bill that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL) supported not long ago to acquire land for San Juan College, was sold and acquired with a restriction to be used for educational purposes, which, of course, had an effect on the valuation of it.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of bills that have been passed through this body with the support of the other side that have not been raised on the issue of fairness to the taxpayer that actually gave property away and let Federal taxpayers receive zero, zip, nada, nothing for the property that was given away; and those are clearly on record here. I can go through and cite many of those bills, Mr. Speaker.

But this is an important piece of legislation for the education of some children. We are asking for the fair market value based on the use of the land as an educational site. It was acquired for $500,000. I think with the restrictions placed on it that we could actually give back to the taxpayers the money they paid for it and maybe even a little extra, depending upon the valuation of that property.

But this is an important bill for the education of those children. We want to have an opportunity to give these children up there a place to go to school. The nearest, closest land that could be suitable for a school for an elementary school site in the area is about 26 miles away. Otherwise, these schoolchildren will have to be bussed over a mountainous pass in the wintertime, which is oftentimes closed by snow and ice, a very dangerous road in the wintertime.

It is the safety of these children, it is the education of these children that we are so very, very much concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, noting that my good friends on the other side of the aisle have been gracious, and I do have great respect for their opinions, I would ask that all of my colleagues support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 634, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1930

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on all de novo questions on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2413, de novo;
H.R. 4940, de novo;
S. 1865, de novo; and
S. 1453, de novo.

COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2413, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2413, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4940, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICA'S LAW ENFORCEMENT AND MENTAL HEALTH PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1865.