

than the current market price. Mr. Cox may say there is no specific language which prohibits sales from the stockpile, but when it is priced 25 to 48 percent above the market price, I doubt there will be much sold. So not only can we not privatize the helium operation, but the taxpayers will not see the deficit go down because none of the helium will be sold.

The substitute which I offered in the House Resources Committee would still get the Government out of the helium business. But it would also allow some helium to be sold according to the market price at the time it was sold, as long as it did not disrupt the market. It would have also canceled the debt, which consists mainly of compound interest which one part of the Government owes another part of the Government. And it would have delayed closure of the plant for 3 years, not 18 months, which would have provided additional time not only for NASA to transition to private sources of helium, but for the plant's workers to transition to new jobs and careers. This plan was similar to the proposal suggested by the Clinton administration, and makes a lot more sense than the proposal we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we're serious about doing this the right way or just interested in a press release. I don't know if the President was serious about doing this the right way when he mentioned helium in his State of the Union speech in 1995. But I do know that there is a right way and a wrong way to end this Federal program, and this bill is the wrong way.

The House registered its clear opposition to continued Federal funding of the helium program when it approved H.R. 3008 by a vote of 411-10 on April 30 of this year. I do not plan to request a vote on H.R. 4168.

But I do urge my colleagues to remember that in considering the future of other programs, we ought to strive to make the Federal Government not just smaller—but smarter, as well.

This bill is not a smart way to reform the helium program, and for that reason, I oppose it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4168.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3752) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3752

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States is vested in the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution.

(2) Some Federal land designations made pursuant to international agreements concern land use policies and regulations for lands belonging to the United States which under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution can only be implemented through laws enacted by the Congress.

(3) Some international land designations, such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Cultural Organization, operate under independent national committees, such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee, which have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress.

(4) Actions by the United States in making such designations may affect the use and value of nearby or intermixed non-Federal lands.

(5) The sovereignty of the States is a critical component of our Federal system of government and a bulwark against the unwise concentration of power.

(6) Private property rights are essential for the protection of freedom.

(7) Actions by the United States to designate lands belonging to the United States pursuant to international agreements in some cases conflict with congressional constitutional responsibilities and State sovereign capabilities.

(8) Actions by the President in applying certain international agreements to lands owned by the United States diminishes the authority of the Congress to make rules and regulations respecting these lands.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To reaffirm the power of the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution over international agreements which concern disposal, management, and use of lands belonging to the United States.

(2) To protect State powers not reserved to the Federal Government under the Constitution from Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(3) To ensure that no United States citizen suffers any diminishment or loss of individual rights as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements for purposes of imposing restrictions on use of those lands.

(4) To protect private interests in real property from diminishment as a result of

Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(5) To provide a process under which the United States may, when desirable, designate lands pursuant to international agreements.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence, by—

(A) inserting "(in this section referred to as the 'Convention') after '1973'; and

(B) inserting "and subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f)" before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b) in the first sentence, by inserting "subject to subsection (d)," after "shall"; and

(3) adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall not nominate any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention unless such nomination is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1996. The Secretary may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such a nomination.

"(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall object to the inclusion of any property in the United States on the list of World Heritage in Danger established under Article 11.4 of the Convention unless—

"(1) the Secretary has submitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate a report describing the necessity for including that property on the list; and

"(2) the Secretary is specifically authorized to assent to the inclusion of the property on the list, by a joint resolution of the Congress enacted after the date that report is submitted.

"(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit an annual report on each World Heritage Site within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains the following information for each site:

"(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the site.

"(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the site.

"(3) A list and explanation of all non-governmental organizations contributing to the management of the site.

"(4) A summary and account of the disposition of complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the site."

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION AND TERMINATION OF UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 403. (a) No Federal official may nominate any lands in the United States for designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

"(b) Any designation of an area in the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve—

"(1) is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1996 and before December 31, 1999;

"(2) consists solely of lands that on the date of that enactment are owned by the United States; and

"(3) is subject to a management plan that specifically ensures that the use of intermixed or adjacent non-Federal property is not limited or restricted as a result of that designation.

"(c) The Secretary of State shall submit an annual report on each Biosphere Reserve within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains the following information for each reserve:

"(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the reserve.

"(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the reserve.

"(3) A list and explanation of all non-governmental organizations contributing to the management of the reserve.

"(4) A summary and account of the disposition of the complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the reserve."

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN GENERAL.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 404. (a) No Federal official may nominate, classify, or designate any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such a nomination, classification, or designation.

"(b) A nomination, classification, or designation of lands owned by a State or local government, under any international agreement shall have no force or effect unless the nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by a law enacted by the State or local government, respectively.

"(c) A nomination, classification, or designation of privately owned lands under any international agreement shall have no force or effect without the written consent of the owner of the lands.

"(d) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) sites nominated under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (popularly known as the Ramsar Convention);

"(2) agreements established under section 16(a) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4413); and

"(3) conventions referred to in section 3(h)(3) of the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 712(2)).

"(e) In this section, the term 'international agreement' means any treaty, compact, executive agreement, convention, or bilateral 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."

SEC. 6. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 401(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1(b)) is amended by striking

"Committee on Natural Resources" and inserting "Committee on Resources".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3752, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1996, asserts the power of Congress under article IV, section 3 of the United States Constitution over management and use of lands belonging to the United States. So that everyone understands, the concern here is the U.S. Congress—and therefore, the people of the United States—are left out of the domestic process to designate "World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves." This will require the participation of the U.S. Congress and the citizens of this Nation in the process.

Within the last 25 years, more and more of our Nation's land has become subject to international land-use restrictions. A total of 67 sites in the United States have been designated as "UN Biosphere Reserves or World Heritage Sites." These land designations under the World Heritage and Biosphere Reserve programs have been created with virtually no congressional oversight and no congressional hearings. The public and local governments are rarely consulted.

The World Heritage Site program is based on a treaty. This bill does not suggest that the United States shrug off the World Heritage Site program. We have a domestic law implementing the program and H.R. 3752 proposes to change that domestic law so that Congress must approve the sites.

In the case of Biosphere Reserves, the program is not even authorized by a single U.S. law or even an international treaty. That is wrong. Executive branch appointees—whatever their political party—cannot and should not do things that the law does not authorize.

What is unreasonable about Congress insisting that no land be designated for inclusion in these international land use programs without clear and direct approval of Congress? We need to reemphasize the congressional duty to keep international commitments from floating free of traditional Constitutional constraints. Otherwise, the boundaries between one owner's land and another or even between the government's land and private property are too easily ignored.

H.R. 3752 provides a process under which the United States may when desirable designate lands for inclusion under certain international agreements. This process will protect: State

sovereignty, individual rights of United States citizens, and private interests in real property. This bill will also prevent attempts by the Executive branch to use international land designations to bypass the Congress in making land use decisions.

H.R. 3752 is a good bill which will protect our domestic land use decision-making process from unnecessary international interference. I look forward to reporting this bill to the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves have strong grassroots support, then why haven't we seen any evidence of this?

I have here a letter from the chairman of the Minnesota Senate Environment and Natural Resources Committee, the Honorable Bob Lessard, which supports H.R. 3752 lamenting the lack of public input in these designations. I request that this letter along with the attached letters be entered in the RECORD.

At our committee hearing, local elected officials from Eddy County, NM; Ulster County, NY; and Lake George, NY testified in support of H.R. 3752 and also criticized the lack of public process in making these international designations.

Moreover, we also have received letters of support from the coalition of Arizona/New Mexico coalition and northern counties land use coordinating council in Minnesota.

SENATE,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
September 25, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, House Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: I am writing to express my strong support for your bill the American Land Sovereignty Act (H.R. 3752) which would provide badly needed congressional oversight for areas designated as World Heritage Sites or International Biosphere Reserves in accordance with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve was proposed for much of northern Minnesota in the mid-1980's. This proposal included Voyageurs National Park and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

Thankfully, the area was withdrawn from consideration because of massive local oppositions. A bipartisan commission created by the Minnesota Legislature concluded, among other things, that the designation would be contrary to the purpose for which Voyageurs National Park was established. It was also found that this designation included provisions for creating buffer zones around federal areas. I understand that former Wilderness Society President George Frampton, who is currently Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, proposed creating biosphere reserves around all national parks and wilderness areas where roads would be closed and economic development would be eliminated.

I also understand that dozens of these areas have been created throughout the United States with virtually no legislative oversight or public input. I consider this an appalling situation that needs to be remedied.

As Chairman of the Senate Environmental and Natural Resources Committee, I am concerned about the motives and intentions of those who propose increased federal and state land use control under the guise of program administered by the United Nations.

In that day and age of open government. I cannot understand how programs like these can continue without congressional oversight and local public input. As a result, I enthusiastically support the American Land Sovereignty Act.

SENATOR BOB LESSARD,
*Chairman, Senate Environment
and Natural Resources Committee.*

NORTHERN COUNTIES
LAND USE COORDINATING BOARD,
Duluth, MN, September 25, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Chairman, House Resources Committee, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: I am writing to support the American Lands Sovereignty Act that would require Congressional approval for areas proposed for designation as Biosphere Reserves.

My district includes the eastern portion of Voyageurs National Park in Minnesota. In 1985, the National Park Service proposed that the park and adjacent areas be designated as the Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve. Local opposition resulted in the elimination of this proposal in 1987. One of the main concerns was that there was no congressional approval required for these areas, although they clearly have implications for the future of lands and waters both inside and outside boundaries established by Congress. Furthermore, a commission created by the Minnesota legislature concludes that the Biosphere Reserve purpose was contrary to the purposes for which the national park was established.

As you know, we have had persistent problems in Northern Minnesota with federal land management policies, as evidenced by the results of Congressional Hearings held over the past year. More Congressional oversight of federal land management policies and practices is clearly necessary to restore public trust and confidence in these agencies. The American Land Sovereignty Act will go a long way toward achieving that goal.

Sincerely,

Chairman.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Chairman, House Resources Committee, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Sheep Industry Association (ASI), the National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) and the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) representing 4.5 million members, wish to express their support for your American Land Sovereignty Protection Act (H.R. 3752). As you are aware, the Department of the Interior presently operates the Man & Biosphere Program on Biosphere Reserves without legislative direction and no authorization from Congress. Furthermore, the 1995 designations of Glacier National Park and the Carlsbad Caverns as World Heritage sites, and the 1989 designation of Yellowstone National Park as a Biosphere Reserve were made with no public or Congressional input. Your bill makes available a process in which we can begin to correct these problems.

The operational guidelines for both World Heritage sites and Biosphere Reserves require the establishment of a buffer zone near or around designated areas. In many areas, the establishment of buffer zones conflicts with the property rights of both the individual and the state. ASI, NCBA and AFBF policies support the language of your bill that compels Congress to consider the implications of international designations on these rights before the designations are made.

The undersigned organizations stand with you and other members of Congress in support of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act and thank you for your efforts in support of fairness to land owners.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION.
AMERICAN SHEEP INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S
BEEF ASSOCIATION.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
Organization,
Hollow Rock, TN, September 20, 1996.

Hon. DON YOUNG, Chairman,
*House Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: Thank you for introducing The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act (HR3752). Since Congress bears the Constitutional responsibility for managing federal lands and for protecting the private property rights of individual citizens, the Bill offers welcome relief from the intrusions of the international community. The 20 World Heritage Sites, authorized under the World Heritage Treaty, and the 47 Biosphere Reserves, administered in lock-step with UNESCO's Biosphere Program by the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program, have imposed land use controls on public and private lands that have not been authorized by Congress. Your Bill, HR3752, will assure that the people affected by such designations will have an opportunity to express their views on such designations—before the designation is imposed.

We are equally concerned about Presidential, and Administrative declarations that exclude Congress from land management decisions on public lands and restrict and erode property rights on private lands. The President's decision to designate "Canyons of the Escalante" in Utah as a National Monument is an excellent example of federal land use control by Presidential decree which excludes Congress, locally elected officials, and the people whose lives are directly affected. The Chenoweth Bill, HR4120, would prevent these unilateral Presidential decrees. These two Bills together, would put Congress back in control of the management of federal lands and give private property owners a measure of protection—as is required by the Constitution.

The undersigned organizations support both these measures, HR3752 and HR4120. We stand with you and other members of Congress who support these measures, and we will work to see that both become the law of the land.

Thank you for all of your efforts.

Sincerely,

HENRY LAMB,
*Executive Vice President,
and the following organizations:*

Citizens for Private Property Rights, Sullivan, MO; Western States Coalition, New Harmony, WY; New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, Albuquerque, NM; Bootheel Heritage Association, Animas, NM; Earthcare Contractors Coalition, Hollow Rock, TN; Texas Wildlife Association, San Antonio, TX; Davis Mountains Trans-Pecos Heritage Association, Alpine, TX; Hill Country Heritage Association, Lampasas, TX; Trans Texas Heritage Association, Alpine, TX; Network for Eco-Policy Awareness, Anchorage, AK; National Federal Lands Conference, Bountiful, UT; Oregonians in Action, Tigard, OR; Texas Eagle Forum, Dallas, TX; New Mexico Wool Growers Action Committee, Yeso, NM; Take Back Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR; Multiple Use Association, Shellburne, NH; Coalition of

Arizona/New Mexico Counties, Glenwood, NM; Citizens Against Repressive Zoning, Haslett, MI; ACCORD People for the West, Phoenix, AZ.

□ 1403

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

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

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we have passed a number of bipartisan bills under this Committee on Resources, which is very ably led by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] who works very cooperatively with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. But this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a disaster, and this bill should be defeated.

I have with me a statement from the Office of Management and Budget that just came in that the administration would veto this bill. Just as well, Mr. Speaker. This bill could be called the Black Helicopters Prevention Act. As my colleagues know, at their town meetings somebody gets up and says "There's a bunch of black helicopters coming from the United Nations to take over our land." This bill plays to the delusion of the paranoid people that put out information like that.

Mr. Speaker, Smokey the Bear is not fitted for a U.N. uniform and a blue helmet. World Heritage designation is an honor. Nations fight to have sites designated. It does not change, if one is a World Heritage site, U.S. laws one iota; management of these sites is completely, 100 hundred percent, under U.S. control.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does is, it helps extractive industries whose activities, if unchecked, would despoil our national parks and other public lands. If there was ever a solution in search of a problem, this bill is it.

This bill exploits the myth spread by anti-U.N. right wing groups that the World Heritage Convention, other international environmental conventions, and the manned and biosphere programs somehow undermine U.S. sovereignty; simply not true. All of these programs are carried out in the United States only to the extent consistent with U.S. domestic law, and sites can only be nominated for World Heritage or biosphere designation by the country in which the site lies. No land or resource use restrictions are imposed within these areas beyond those imposed under domestic law.

What this bill would do is unnecessarily restrict American participation in successful and prestigious international conservation and historic preservation efforts. The World Heritage Convention is not a scheme hatched by U.N. bureaucrats for global hegemony.

We are opposing the United Nations right now because it is mismanaged and because it has too much staff, and

we have said that the Secretary General of the United Nations must be replaced because he is not a reformer. But this bill here exceeds the paranoia that some have for the United Nations.

World Heritage designation has been an American initiative modeled after our national parks program. It was our idea. We pushed for it in the international community, and we were the first country to ratify the treaty.

Opponents of these programs allege that they violate the constitutional rights of the States and property owners, but not one shred of credible evidence has emerged.

When we get beyond the flag-waving and Constitution quoting, what we find is this legislation is about mining and other corporate interests whose activities, often on public lands, would degrade our national parks if left unchecked. For example, international concern over a proposed coal mine just outside of Yellowstone helped to motivate the administration, acting strictly within U.S. law, to negotiate a voluntary settlement with a claim holder. We had the industry and the administration and the environmentalists negotiating on something that should have been resolved that way, rather than as a Heritage site or through U.S. legislation. The New World Mine at the Yellowstone would have polluted streams within the park, a wild and scenic river in a wilderness area.

In the end, a bipartisan solution was found to this problem.

Of course these special interests would prefer to operate without the harsh glare of publicity and international media attention that World Heritage or biosphere reserve status brings with it. But this is America, and the supporters of this legislation passed over one of the most important amendments on their way to the 5th and 10th. They forgot about the first amendment, and that is what this really comes down to.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has not had a good environmental record. There is little time left, but we still have important legislation to consider. This legislation is not going anywhere. It should not have been under suspension; it should have been under a modified closed rule to offer alternatives. The President is never going to sign it into law. He has already said he is going to veto it even if we are going to take it up.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a good bill, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has done a good job as our chairman, but this is not one of the pieces of legislation that we should approve. I will ask for a recorded vote. This legislation should go down.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 26, 1996.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 3752—American Land Sovereignty Act of 1996—Young(R) AK and 27 cosponsors.

If H.R. 3752 were presented to the President, the Department of the Interior would recommend that the bill be vetoed.

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3752, which would impose unnecessary restrictions on the existing legal and administrative framework that implements U.S. commitments to international environmental cooperative efforts. This bill could significantly reduce U.S. leadership and influence in global conservation and is counter to the U.S. role in global environmental cooperation.

H.R. 3752 is based upon the faulty premise that the World Heritage Convention, the Biosphere Reserve Program, and other international conservation agreements threaten the United States' sovereignty over its lands. There are several reasons why these agreements do not encroach upon U.S. sovereignty:

International agreements, such as the World Heritage Convention, and programs, such as the U.S. Man in the Biosphere Program, do not give the United Nations the authority to affect land management decisions within the United States and have in no way been utilized to exclude Congress from land management decisions, nor could they do so.

The nomination processes for international conservation designations are consultative in a nature and based on demonstrated commitment as the local level.

International site recognitions do not affect land use decisions by the local governments, tribes, or private property owners, and are subject to applicable domestic laws.

International site recognitions do not impose restrictions on land use or stop economic growth. To the contrary, World Heritage sites and U.S. Biosphere Reserves have been embraced in many local areas as value-added designations, increasing partnership among Federal, State and local governments and private property owners for mutual benefit and have contributed to an increase in international tourism, which is especially vital to rural economies.

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

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

Just like to say I hope the gentleman asks for a recorded vote. I want the people on record, being recorded they are against the people of the United States being involved in land decisions. They do not let the executive branch be involved in deciding what type of property should be taken off and what private property should be infringed upon. I want to have that vote. I want to see who has the guts to vote against the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting how the debate deteriorates when people do not have the facts at hand, and we are not debating about black helicopters and paranoid people and extremists. We are debating about this issue, which is, who should control the land mass in the United States? Should not the Congress have a say in whether the U.N. comes in in certain instances and controls certain areas? That is the simple question. There is nothing in

here about blue helmets or anything like that.

I stand today in strong support of H.R. 3752, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1996, and I commend the chairman of the Committee on Resources, Mr. YOUNG, for introducing and moving this bill. It has to be part of the debate, and I hope we can stick to the facts.

H.R. 3752 will establish a simple process of due process, and will reestablish the role of Congress where it should be in the first place, as the ultimate decision-maker who manages the lands of the United States and who should maintain sovereign control of the lands in the United States of America.

There are two types of land designations of international status by the United Nations currently taking place with no congressional approval. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. There are biosphere reserves carried out by the United Nations environmental, sociological and cultural organizations, and World Heritage sites which are sponsored by the U.N.-backed World Heritage Committee.

Mr. Speaker, more than 51 million acres in this country has already been designated by the U.N., with the agency's consent, without congressional consent, as either World Heritage sites or biosphere reserves. That is 51 million acres of U.S. soil, an area nearly the size of the whole State of Colorado, that the U.N. has taken control of without congressional involvement and legitimate public participation.

A biosphere reserve is a federally zoned and coordinated region consisting of three areas or zones that meet certain minimum requirements established by the United Nations. The inner or most protected area, the core zone, are usually Federal lands, whereas the outer zones are not-Federal lands. That is either private property or State property.

Mr. Speaker, currently 10 Federal agencies involved in the biosphere reserve are competing for turf with each other. This is occurring despite the fact that the United States withdrew their participation from UNESCO in 1984 because of gross financial mismanagement, and Congress has never, not once, ratified the Biodiversity Treaty which calls for these biosphere reserve designations.

When the Committee on Resources held hearings on this bill, we heard testimony from private property owners and local officials all around the country who felt that their role in the land management process had been significantly diminished by these designations. Many of these people did not even know their own property or their city or country's property, and State property, and surrounding lands were involved in this particular designation until final decisions were made.

Mr. Speaker, when laws and processes established by the Congress to manage our resources are bypassed by the agencies and by the executive, not

only does this create an atmosphere of secrecy and confusion, but it violates our very sovereignty. What we are doing in this bill is saying, let us open up the process to the light of day, instead of such a secretive process as we have seen with the impact of the World Heritage site. That includes a large buffer zone surrounding Yellowstone Park.

My colleague from New Mexico, Mr. RICHARDSON stated empirically that the particular mine that was shut down because the agencies called the U.N. in before they had been able to finish their environmental impact statement, my colleague from New Mexico stated that the problem was that this mine was going to pollute the rivers and streams. No so, Mr. Speaker, because the environmental impact statement had not even been completed.

So this bill should be considered a noncontroversial bill. It simply protects the lands for our citizens. Mr. Speaker, it protects, this bill simply protects our lands and the citizens by rightfully placing Congress in the primary role for determining land use policy where it should be.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member from California, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this, I think, as was just demonstrated in the previous testimony, is why this bill should be rejected. The gentlewoman from Idaho talked about the outer zones and the inner zones in these Heritage areas. What she did not talk about was the twilight zone, where the support for this legislation comes from. It comes from those individuals who believe that there is some worldwide conspiracy of the U.N. to take over U.S. lands. The gentlewoman kept saying that the U.N. controlled 55 million acres, would take control of these lands.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues do not get a right to just stand up here and misrepresent the laws of the United States and what legislation does or does not do. The fact of the matter is, long before there was ever the U.N., there was the United States Congress that designates these lands as national parks or other assets of the public lands of the United States. Then, sometimes, we ask for the honor of being designated as part of the international heritage provisions.

□ 1445

What does that do? Very often, in the gentlewoman's State she represents, that drives up tourist receipts. People travel from all over the world to see these, whether it is the Everglades or whether it is Yellowstone, or the other assets within the United States.

We really have got to separate fantasy, absolute fantasy, by a group of people that are trying to find a way to

beat up on the U.N. and what the laws of this Nation are. That is, we control the management of the parks, we control the management of the public lands, we design the reviews, we design the management plans. That is how those parks, that is how those assets are run, not by some group of people from the U.N. in black helicopters who hide in these areas and then spring forth on our community. Absolute fantasy, absolutely from the twilight zone.

The gentlewoman is representing them well when she characterizes this legislation as somehow stopping some kind of mythical group of people from taking over the national parks and the lands of the United States. This ought to be laughed off the floor, but, unfortunately, we will have to vote it off the floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask only, I would suggest to our friend, the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER, all I am asking in this legislation is, let the Congress, the House of the people, have some say. I cannot, for the life of me, see why anyone would object.

Members have not heard me attack the U.N. I am very reasonably attacking those agencies that actually implement and instigate the heritage areas. All I am asking for is for us to play a role.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3752, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. The United States has a long and proud record of preserving areas which we consider of national importance. We do this because in a democracy it is what the people ask of us and it preserves part of our rich heritage.

However, the same cannot be said of other countries around the world. Former Socialist and Communist countries have endured some of the worst environmental damage of all. Why? Because the people of those countries were not in charge of their land management. Instead, environmental and land use decisions were left to a central bureaucracy that was more interested in power and not in the wishes of the people. Fortunately, communism and socialism have been discredited around the world, but their central principles live on in the United Nations.

Back in the 1970s, as stated, this body made a mistake. They entered into a treaty with the U.N. to establish a body called the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. In this treaty we gave the U.N. the ability to designate World Heritage Sites in the U.S. without seeking approval of Congress. This was wrong. H.R. 3752 will correct this mistake by requiring any new designations to be cleared by Congress. That is all this bill does.

Our environmental and land use successes have come from allowing the

people of the United States to make decisions about our land. This has proven a balance between wise use of our natural resources and environmental protection. This bill takes the power away from a huge world bureaucracy and puts the land use decisions back where they belong, in the hands of the people of the United States, and not in the U.N.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] an environmental leader.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the name of this bill is the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. Most Americans would be surprised to learn that America's sovereignty over its lands is at risk here this afternoon and in need of protection. It would have been leading every news story in America for the past week, because it is 130 years since the end of the Civil War, the last time our national sovereignty was directly threatened.

There does not appear to be any imminent threat of invasion from Canada or Mexico. The Russians are having a tough time with the Chechnyans. So just where does this threat to America's national sovereignty come from? What group of Fifth Columnists stand ready to betray us? What band of modern day Benedict Arnolds is threatening America?

According to the bill's sponsor, the answer is very simple: It is Bruce Babbitt. That is right. According to the bill, America's national sovereignty is threatened by our own Secretary of the Interior and the Babbitt brigade serving under him. The danger to our national sovereignty comes not from some foreign despot or from some dictator, but from the risk that Bruce Babbitt might actually name sites such as Yellowstone Park and the Everglades to the U.N. List of World Heritage Sites.

According to this bill, we cannot trust Bruce Babbitt, so we will not let him name any site to the World Heritage List without prior congressional approval.

So what are we worried about? Are we afraid that the World Heritage List, once it is constructed, will have U.N. Secretary Boutros Boutros-Ghali in our districts, which is what the Republicans have been handing out here on the floor?

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the threat because I have been listening to the Republicans over the last year, because we very well might have blue-helmeted U.N. troops sweeping in in black helicopters, driving out our poor Smoky the Bear-hatted park rangers in a triumphant victory of the new world order of sinister forces. That is their version.

What this whole thing is about is putting the Everglades on a national honorary list of the environmentally protected parts of America that we are proudest of.

Let me say this: If in fact we were putting a mining company on the U.N.

list of the best mining companies in the world, we would have this side up here cheering. If we were putting the best timber-cutting companies in the United States on some world list, to be honored, we would have these guys up cheering. But if we want to honor the Everglades, if we want to honor Yellowstone Park or the Grand Canyon internationally, oh, my God, it is a conspiracy.

The problem here is that, just like the Presidential Medal of Freedom that we give to Americans, just because people receive it does not exempt them from the laws of the United States; they still have to live under all the laws. If we honor the Everglades by having it recognized internationally, it is still under all American laws, not international laws.

The problem that the Republicans have is that they are afraid that the world will recognize that the Everglades and Yellowstone Park and the Grand Canyon are parts of the world that should not be mined, that should not be stripped. That is the one thing they are afraid of, is that the whole world will recognize what they have been trying to do for the last 2 years. That is what they are afraid of. That is why the only environmental vote for the coming generations of Americans is a no vote on this preposterous, absurd, last-minute, crazy consumption of congressional time.

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

Mr. Speaker, someone who would protest so loudly must have something to hide.

All we have tried to do in this legislation is let the people and the Congress have a say. That is all we are trying to suggest in this legislation. So when one gives a presentation as radical as that was, something must be wrong. They must be trying to cover up what can and has happened.

We had a hearing on this, Mr. Speaker. We had a hearing. We had 10 witnesses all testify in favor of the bill but one. That is this administration. We had no participation from the other side. Not one showed up to listen to those private citizens, those landholders that have been abused by previous administrations and this administration because of the biospheres and heritage areas.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, he who protests too loud and tries to protect those trying to take away our rights may have something to hide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I should stand up after that last performance or not. I was a little confused about "Boutros Boutros Babbitt," or was it "Bruce Ghali," or whatever he was talking about.

I just wonder how this country survived the previous 20 years. We had those Watergate babies came romping

in here, and they took over this place. Most of them could not even get jobs in the private sector until they came down here. They ran this place for 20 years, almost ran it into the ground. Now this kind of legislation is changing that. That is why I rise in the strongest possible support of this American Land Sovereignty Act of 1996.

I credit the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], with having the courage and foresight to bring this bill forward. He is truly a defender of American property rights, individual property rights in this country.

This bill sends one overall message, and let me say this loud and clear, only Americans in America have sovereignty over U.S. lands. That may be a hard concept for some people in the United States to grasp, in the United Nations, but that is the law we are laying down here today. Frankly, it is rather sad that we even have to do this, but considering the willingness of some Federal and State officials in the country to rubberstamp U.N. designs for American land use, this bill is absolutely imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a place in New York State consisting of the Hudson Valley, the Catskill Mountains, the Adirondack Mountains. They snuck this thing into the Adirondack Mountains before we even knew about it. They tried to do this in the Catskill Mountains, and we caught them. We stopped them dead in their tracks. It is a beautiful place we live in, and we want to keep it that way.

Let me just point this out, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1986, UNESCO, that arm of the United Nations that has always been a hotbed of extreme leftwing internationalism, decided that our Adirondacks would become a U.N. Biosphere Reserve. Now they are trying to enforce it up there. Thus, the Adirondackers were subject to the double indignity of having their land designated for varying degrees of preservation, not only by an unelected international body but one from which the United States had withdrawn in 1984. What an outrage, Mr. Speaker. Since when does the United Nations or UNESCO have the right to do this? And since when does the Department of the Interior have the right to, in turn, declare these areas a U.S. Biosphere Reserve without congressional authorization?

Let me tell the Members something. This bill is going to put an end to it. The gentleman said President Clinton will veto it. President Dole will sign it. That is why I am voting for Dole come November.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, just as a Member of the Watergate reform class, I would like to remind the gentleman from New York

that this was supported by that well-known Watergate figure, Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], the former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure. The fact is that the Man in the Biosphere and the World Heritage conventions have been in place during the term of our last six Presidents, four Republicans and two Democrats. This is an issue where the United States had taken the lead, with some credit to the American people and the American ideas in terms of conservation, in terms of preservation and restoration of landscapes, as being one of the best ideas that our people have ever had. But it is pretty clear today that that sort of notion does not necessarily prevail universally in this Congress. I very much regret that. It seems like some of my colleagues, my G.O.P. colleagues want to stop the world and get off.

I think there is apparently a deep need to conjure up problems with the positive leadership that the United States is trying to provide and has provided on a global basis the past three decades. The fact is that all of these sites have been voluntary on the part of the countries that have joined, 140 signatures to these conventions on a global basis that the United States has led, and 126 countries have participated in having these sites within their borders all of a voluntary basis.

What is the problem in 1996 that we face? I will tell the Members what the problem is. It is that the New World Mine outside of Yellowstone received global attention, because it would have affected Yellowstone Park. The fact is that those that want to defend and want to shield from criticism those various interests, from any criticisms of the effects on Yellowstone Park because of that new mine, are up here today protesting, because that particular type of international biosphere recognition actually weighed in and probably had some impact, as well it should have some impact. These international designations are entirely voluntary and honorific but apparently carry some communication and symbolic clout.

One Member got up here and said that this bill really did not do anything with existing sites. That is incorrect. Because under this bill, there is a prohibition and actual termination of United Nations Biosphere Reserves in this bill. Some 47 different Biosphere Reserves that are recognized on a voluntary basis in the U.S. by Republican and Democratic administrations over the last 30 years, or 25 years, would be terminated under this bill.

□ 1500

We would be sending a negative message on a global basis to the recognition, antiscience, anticonservation to the voluntary leadership that the United States has provided on a global basis with this bill, in one stroke, would be stripped away.

Why are we doing this when it is a voluntary effort? We need, and I would suggest that one of the leading issues into the next century is going to be the environment on a global basis, in terms of air, water, in terms of landscapes, in terms of resources, and we need at least this type of voluntary effort that exists in this particular law—not this head in the sand action of this measure. We have been successful in pursuit of this logical policy under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and yet this action of this House shows that it wants to put its head in the sand and go back to those thrilling days of yesteryear when the robber barons were running amuck over this land in terms of what is going on without comment without any role or sense of global consciousness. The actions of this Congress, I think, speak louder than their words. The buzz words that are going on here within measure that are being used in terms of anti-U.N., affecting property rights, are to say the least misleading. Where are the court cases? Where is the property owner that has been denied anything or suffered a loss? Where has it been demonstrated in a court of law or anyplace else across this land in a State or in this Nation? We do not have that type of information because the events and injury has not happened from this program. Most of these designations, the 20 designations for world heritage sites, are almost all U.S. national parks. The level of recognition accorded by this World Heritage Convention is far less than that of a national park. The fact is you are attacking this measure because of the park protection. If some of the Members of this body had their way, they would strip away the park designation or undercut the basic park and wilderness land as has failed this session. But we have stood up to that type of pressure and we should stand up today and vote "no" on this silly idea that is being presented to us.

I urge my colleagues to vote no, Mr. Speaker.

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

May again I remind that he who protests too loudly, what is wrong with the Congress, the house of the people, having a say? There is nothing wrong. I urge the people that are watching this debate to consider the people's involvement. There is nothing in this bill that repeals any existing heritage sites or biosphere sites. I am suggesting respectfully, all I am asking these people to understand, let the Congress play a role in making these designations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation. This bill champions the rights of local governments; it champions the constitutional role of the United States in making federal land policy; and it champions the self-determination and absolute sovereignty of the United States within the world community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the past 25 year has seen an explosion of global treaties and programs about which U.S. citizens have had little or no say. Among the most troubling of these has been a 1971 United Nations agreement to establish so-called "biosphere reserves" around the world each surrounded by enormous buffer zones encompassing both public and private property within which human activity is significantly restricted. Quietly, over the last 25 years, without the arrogant election-year fanfare that we recently saw in Utah, faceless federal bureaucrats have classified a total area larger than the entire state of Colorado as biosphere reserves.

Local communities did not consent to these designations. Neither did State governments. Even Congress was not allowed to participate in the designation process. All that was required to create these biosphere reserves was the urging of an international environmental organization and the stroke of a pen from a Federal authority who was not accountable to a single U.S. citizen for his actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring our communities, our States and the United States Congress back into the process of governing our public lands. The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act will do just that. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on this important legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Los Angeles, CA [Mr. TORRES], the distinguished environmental leader.

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us really understand here what we are talking about when we say biosphere reserve. It is a term denoting an area that has been nominated by the locality and the country in which it is located for participation in the worldwide biosphere reserve program under what is called the U.S. Man in the Biosphere program. It is a program that is administered worldwide, if you will, in cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. We have heard it batted around here as UNESCO.

Areas are nominated and recognized on the basis of their significance for research and the study of representative biological regions of the world. The United States has 47 such reserve regions. It is part of a worldwide network of 324 biosphere reserves in 82 countries

in the globe. Biosphere reserve recognition does not convey any control or its jurisdiction over such sites to the United Nations or any other entity. The United States and/or State and local communities where biosphere reserves are located continue to exercise the same jurisdiction in place as before designation. Areas are listed only at the request of the country in which they are located, and they can be removed from the biosphere reserve list at any time upon the request of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I know the process. I represented the United States as its Ambassador before UNESCO, that organization that we heard here labeled as an extremist lift-wing conspiracy. I was there as a U.S. representative under instruction from the President of the United States, the Department of Interior and the State Department and the people of this Nation. There is a process. And simply the process is to promote cooperation and communication along a worldwide network of areas that would include all the major ecosystems globally.

This issue, this scare that we are hearing here today about U.N. control, the representative from New Mexico citing the scare tactics, the conspiracy, the specter of the United Nation, the black helicopters, is so much a red herring and just a politically timely bill that approaches this House at this time. Already people in the parks are calling up their local radio stations, as we hear in some cases, because somehow the U.N. has taken over the public parks because they saw a plaque that said United Nations Heritage Wilderness Area. Can you imagine the scare?

I think some of my colleagues who propose this bill simply have seen the number of efforts by mining and timber interests to exploit public lands or lands that are near public facilities that are slowed down or even stopped by the fact that facilities are on this World Heritage protected list.

Certainly we have plenty of examples about U.S. gold mining within 1 mile of Yellowstone National Park and Canadian mining, gold mining at Glacier Bay in Alaska or the Florida Everglades. And yes, ladies and gentlemen, it was not the U.N. that designated the park in Utah so that it would not be a big coal mine and exploit that park; it was the President of the United States. And Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali and nobody else, UNESCO or nobody else had anything to say to that except the President of the United States.

This is a ludicrous, insidious bill that comes before us that my colleague has said is just a simple waster of time. I urge my colleagues here today to use common sense. The American people are in charge. Our Nation is in charge of our lands. And they should vote no.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO].

(Mr. BONO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is a useless waste of billions of dollars, and frankly I wish this bill was for the abolishment of the United Nations. It is another bureaucracy that does not do anything but eat dollars that we could easily control and handle much better ourselves.

People, start understanding what bureaucracies are and what all this rhetoric is and what all this bleeding heart is. The further away you get from issues, the less control you have of issues. And when you hear all this drama, it astounds me that there is so much drama. It is more than the industry I came from before. I have never seen performances like this, but it is pure drama. It is not a reality. The reality is why would you want the United Nations to control anything or be involved in anything? Can Congress not, and can the President not handle things, and can we not appoint people to do the jobs that are necessary to do, at much less the funds?

I presume you all know how well the United Nations did in Bosnia. I hope you all know how well they did. I hope you all know how esteemed Boutros Boutros-Ghali is as he cracks his jokes about us. So I find it disgusting that bureaucrats continue to inhabit this marvelous building and try to install more bureaucracy, and more bureaucracy, and more Government, and more dollars. We can handle it. We can handle it fine.

Biosphere. You like the word? Well, that word allows all these things to happen. I hope they have been to other countries lately, because other countries have not nearly done what we have as far as taking care of our environment. Go over there and start working on that first, then come over here and try to get one-tenth the effectiveness that we have in environment right now.

Mr. Speaker, I find any opposition to this disgusting.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, just to summarize, this is a bad bill, the bill has been called a Black Helicopters Prevention Act, the Boutros-Ghali/Babbitt bill. Whatever it is, this is a bad bill. We should vote it down. World heritage designation is not a threat. It is an honor. The United States has total control.

International agreements such as these do not give the United Nations any authority. Congress has delegated this authority to our national parks. These are professional American men and women that work for the Government that do a good job. The bill is going nowhere. This is an easy way to pick up an environmental vote for colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Let us defeat this bill. It is a bad bill. It is searching for a problem. There are a number of other issues we should be spending time on as we adjourn.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

(Mr. POMBO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and I think for the very reasons that were just outlined by my colleague. These designations are called honorary, something that just bestows an honorary status on sites in America and yet they are extremely important. This is ranked as an environmental vote. They are extremely important.

We heard my other colleague say that these are used to stop mining, timber, grazing. For the very reasons that you guys have outlined is the exact reason why Congress should have oversight over this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

May I suggest one thing. Let the House participate. Let this Congress participate in this process. This is the people's house. Let the people have the decision to make. That is crucially important, to continue the process. That is all this bill does.

For those that are afraid of letting this Congress participate, you should not be in Congress. It is that simple. What is wrong with us being involved? Why should we let the executive branch and the U.N. make decisions about my private property rights? I urge the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3752, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1515

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 just considered.

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

There was no objection.

ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to make certain clarifications to the land bank protection provisions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2505

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTOMATIC LAND BANK PROTECTION.

(a) LANDS RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The matter preceding clause (i) of section 907(d)(1)(A) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "or conveyed to a Native Corporation pursuant to an exchange authorized by section 22(f) of Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act or section 1302(h) of this Act or other applicable law" after "Settlement Trust".

(b) LANDS EXCHANGED AMONG NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—Section 907(d)(2)(B) of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)(2)) is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) lands or interest in lands shall not be considered developed or leased or sold to a third party as a result of an exchange or conveyance of such land or interest in land between or among Native Corporations and trusts, partnerships, corporations, or joint ventures, whose beneficiaries, partners, shareholders, or joint venturers are Native Corporations."

(c) ACTIONS BY TRUSTEE SERVING PURSUANT TO AGREEMENT OF NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—Section 907(d)(3)(B) of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)(3)(B)) is amended by striking "or" at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting "; or", and by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) to actions by any trustee whose right, title, or interest in land or interests in land arises pursuant to an agreement between or among Native Corporations and trusts, partnerships, or joint ventures whose beneficiaries, partners, shareholders, or joint venturers are Native Corporations."

SEC. 2. RETAINED MINERAL ESTATE.

Section 12(c)(4) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) Where such public lands are surrounded by or contiguous to subsurface lands obtained by a Regional Corporation under subsections (a) or (b), the Corporation may, upon request, have such public land conveyed to it.

"(D)(i) A Regional Corporation which elects to obtain public lands under subparagraph (C) shall be limited to a total of not more than 12,000 acres. Selection by a Regional Corporation of in lieu surface acres under subparagraph (E) pursuant to an election under subparagraph (C) shall not be made from any lands within a conservation system unit (as that term is defined by section 102(4) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3102(4)).

"(ii) An election to obtain the public lands described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) shall include all available parcels within the township in which the public lands are located.

"(iii) For purposes of this subparagraph and subparagraph (C), the term "Regional Corporation" shall refer only to Doyon, Limited."; and

(2) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking "(A) or (B)" and inserting "(A), (B), or (C)".

SEC. 3. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 102-415.

Section 20 of the Alaska Land Status Technical Corrections Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2129)