

each with the time equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. tomorrow. Following morning business, the Senate will recess for the weekly party conference lunches. In the afternoon the Senate is expected to begin consideration of several cabinet nominations. Senators therefore can expect votes with respect to these cabinet nominations during tomorrow afternoon's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the provisions of S. Res. 12, following the remarks of Senator STABENOW and Senator REID.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

(The remarks of Mr. REID pertaining to the introduction of S. 104 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Senator NELSON of Florida assumed the chair.)

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for as much time as I desire.

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

THE ANTIQUITIES ACT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise to be critical of President Clinton's recent actions dealing with the Antiquities Act in declaring millions of lands national monuments. He did this without consulting with the Governors, without consulting with elected officials, without consulting Congress. I believe that to be almost an act of contempt of Congress and certainly in defiance of what is considered the Antiquities Act and the purpose of the Antiquities Act.

The Antiquities Act was written in 1906. It was established at that time to protect very special historic, beautiful lands from development. It is a short act, and I will have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

The whole purpose of the act President Clinton has defied. It does not say he is King or that he can take an unlimited amount of lands without consulting Congress or elected officials or local officials and say, we declare this a national monument so you cannot touch it and we don't care what you think.

I was amused when I noticed the Washington Post and other media said President Clinton was being active in the final days as President of the United States. He was more than active when acting in a way I believe certainly exceeded the statutory language of the Antiquities Act. Certainly he was being more than active when he defied logic and did not consult elected officials. I think he abused the Antiquities Act and his actions prove that it needs to be reformed.

When I read it, I wonder where he gets this authority. I think he exceeded the authority of the act. The authority of the act says:

The President of the United States is authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic and scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

And it continues.

The media reported that President Clinton has created more national monuments than any other President going back to Theodore Roosevelt. I looked back and Theodore Roosevelt didn't do as much as President Clinton in the last month or certainly since the last election. Theodore Roosevelt, through his actions, did a total of 1.5 million acres. President Clinton did 2 million acres after the election. Why did he do it after the election? Is it because there were hundreds of thousands of acres he did not consult with people? He didn't ask the elected officials. He said: This is what we will do; we will declare a national acres monument. All together he has declared 5.7 million in national monuments.

I mention the elections because obviously President Clinton used this act for election purposes. He did it in September of 1996 right before the election, I might mention, and it dealt with the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, 1.7 million acres, right before the election in 1996. He announced it in Arizona, overlooking the Grand Canyon. That is interesting, but the Grand Escalante is not in Arizona; it is in Utah. Utah officials were outraged because they were not consulted. The resources involved mineral deposits

and coal, the value of which were billions of dollars and thousands of jobs. He did not consult with anybody in Utah. There was public outrage, but nothing happened. President Clinton did not declare any national monuments in 1997, not in 1998, not in 1999.

Then we come to election year 2000 and President Clinton used a lot of declarations of national monuments in the year 2000 and particularly in the last couple of months. In the year 2000, all together he has done a total of over 4 million acres. Since the election, over 2 million acres. In the last week, on January 17, he made eight more designations, just a few days ago, in his last week of office, of over 1 million acres. He didn't consult with anybody.

In the House, we have a committee that deals with lands issues, and in the Senate we have a committee that deals with land and national resources, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, a bipartisan committee, working on land issues all the time. We pass literally hundreds of bills through the committee. That committee passes more bills than any other committee in the Senate. We deal with the bills, particularly land issues, on a bipartisan basis. Most of the time on land issues we listen to the home State Senators. If they recommend a parcel of land be designated as a wilderness or national monument, we listen to the Senators and we know they are held accountable in their States. So we give them great respect and deference.

President Clinton didn't consult with Members of the Senate, and didn't consult with the Energy and Natural Resources Committee; didn't consult with the House Resources committee. He just designated a national monument. Maybe he did it right and maybe he didn't do it right. My guess is he is bound to have made mistakes trying to appease groups, perhaps environmental activists—I don't know.

I may well agree with many of these. I happen to be a preservationist. I happen to be a conservationist. I love the outdoors. I have been in the Colorado River. I love to hike. I love to camp. I love to be outdoors as much as anybody. I love to hike on trails. I love our natural resources.

What I don't like is a dictator. What I don't like is an emperor. What I don't like is to have a Presidential fiat, saying we will designate, and we don't care what the public thinks. We don't care what the elected officials think. We don't care what the Governors think. That is what I really object to.

I make the statements in great dissatisfaction with former President Clinton because he showed contempt of Congress, contempt of the Constitution, contempt of the people who live in those districts.

I think Congress should look at some of these recent declarations and have hearings. Did he draft these declarations correctly? Are the boundaries right? Are they too big? Are they too restrictive? Do they make sense? What