

spending this money more wisely on improving salmon runs that are genetically indistinguishable from the Snake River Sockeye but have a far better chance of complete recovery.

Under H.R. 2275, the ESA is amended so that salmon runs like the Snake River Sockeye are protected. At the same time, the bill gives greater consideration to enhancing healthier runs that have a better chance of full recovery. This change in the law will lead to a much larger and healthier salmon supply for our entire region.

When one considers the ESA's current problems with the fact that only a handful of species nationwide have fully recovered to the point where they could be removed from the list since the act was first enacted in 1973, it is quite evident that the current law is neither protecting species nor families that depend on our natural resources for their livelihoods.

One of the major reasons for the act's failure to fully recover species is the set of perverse incentives that it encourages. The current law punishes people for protecting habitat on their property and rewards those who develop their land with no consideration for wildlife. These perverse incentives were mentioned over and over again by witnesses at our task force field hearings. That is why I am delighted that Chairman YOUNG has included a number of our recommended reforms in his bill.

First and foremost among our task force's concerns was the issue of compensation. H.R. 2275 encourages property owners to cooperate with the Federal Government in our efforts to protect species by compensating them when restrictions imposed by the ESA diminish their property's value by 20 percent or more.

This much needed reform will not only encourage greater cooperation between the public and private sectors in protecting species but will also force the Federal Government to prioritize our limited financial resources on species that are most in need of recovery. Rather than scattering our current resources on fully recovering all species, as the current act calls for, H.R. 2275 will lead to more recoveries and many more ESA success stories.

Equally important, our bill also encourages stronger science by requiring that current factual information be peer reviewed. In addition, the bill makes all data used in the decision process open to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I have barely scratched the surface in my limited time here this afternoon of all the improvements H.R. 2275 makes to the Endangered Species Act. Our task force continues to work hard in support of passing H.R. 2275 which addresses so many of our people's concerns.

I am pleased that Chairman YOUNG and Congressman POMBO have taken the lead on this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together on reforming this act so that it will better protect species and communities had hit by the current law.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support and information. He brings up a very valid point. If we had listened to the localities, the States, and the communities, we could have solved the problem on the river. I would suggest another thing, though, as long as the gentleman brought it up, because I brought it up myself about importing

the Canadian wolves down to reintroduce wolves.

I have also suggested we can rebuild the Columbia River fishery by the enhancement with Alaskan stock. The answer I get from NMFS and the Fish and Wildlife: "We cannot do it because they are not indigenous to the area. They are not part of the stream." To them I say, "I thought you wanted to bring the fish back. We can help you do that." They say, "We cannot do it."

But it is all right for them to bring the wolves down, against everybody's wishes and beliefs, and they are Canadians; because our fish come from Alaska, a State of the United States, they are saying, "They are not part of the system." It is the mindset that we are dealing with today that is not working.

Under our bill, we will bring the people in and it will be part of the State, part of the community, and we will solve the problems and bring the species back. I am very excited about that concept, and I hope those that might be listening to this program will think about what we are trying to do, not gut it, not repeal it, but to improve upon it. That is what our bill does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. One last thing I would mention, if I may, Mr. Speaker. That is that we had a meeting of some local people from our State, talking about the need to amend this act.

One local farmer made a very profound statement. I think it is indicative of probably all of us across the West that have private property, where the treat would come by having an endangered species found on our private property. This particular farmer said, "If I saw a potential endangered species walk across my property, my first reaction would be to shoot it and kill it and not tell anybody."

Mr. HASTINGS of Alaska. They belong to the "Three S Club," "Shoot, shut up, and shovel."

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. That is right. If we look at what the intention of the act was 23 years ago, and you voted for it because the intention was good, that action by this farmer would do nothing at all to enhance the species. It is counter to what we are trying to do. Why? Because of the heavyhanded administration coming from the Federal Government, because that is what this act says should be done. So it needs to be reformed, it needs to be reformed to bring the local people involved in this sort of stuff, but more important, common sense, and let us protect private property rights, because after all, that is a constitutional requirement.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, for decades the liberals in Congress have distorted the original intent of the Endangered Species Act to further their extreme agendas. In November, the voters cried foul and asked Republicans to restore rationality to our environmental laws.

Our reform proposal stops the radical environmentalists in their tracks. They will no

longer ride roughshod over our property rights. Instead, Republicans will protect our natural resources as well as our freedoms.

In its current form, the Endangered Species Act creates perverse incentives for landowners to destroy habitat which could attract endangered species. Once these animals migrate there, landowners lose their property rights to the snails, birds or rats who happen to move in. In essence, the ESA, as currently written discourages the very practices which will ultimately protect endangered species habitats. Instead, we need to ask landowners to participate in preserving our natural resources. Property owners are not villains. Everyone wants to preserve our resources.

In addition, Federal bureaucratic administration and enforcement of the Endangered Species Act is tantamount to Federal zoning of local property. State and local officials have no say in how the ESA is implemented and enforced in their States and communities. State and local officials need to have greater control. They know what is best for their communities.

In my district I can give you several recent examples of government violating the rights of private property owners. One hundred twenty-one acres of the most beautiful property in Dana Point valued at over \$1.5 million an acre was devalued because of the discovery of 30 pocket mice, an animal on the endangered species list. Years of planning for the use of this land had to be abandoned. The owner even offered to set aside four acres of his land just for the mice, about \$150,000 per mouse, but the government said that was not enough.

In another instance, a property owner had a multimillion dollar piece of property in escrow when the city declared it as wetlands. He was then offered \$1 an acre for this useless "wetland". This is a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, Congress passed the Endangered Species Act more than 20 years ago. Originally intended to protect animals, this act hurts humans. It is time to give human needs at least as much consideration as those of birds, fish, insects, and rodents. The time has come for a change. Private, voluntary, incentive-driven environmental protection is the only effective and fair answer to this controversial law.

RESTORING REASON TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I will only use a minute or two, because I know the gentleman from California, [Mr. RADANOVICH] would like to comment on this. I would just commend the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] for their leadership efforts in doing something to restore some reason, I think, to the laws of our country pertaining to this area.

The ESA is something that has a legitimate purpose. We need to have a law, however, that is balanced and reasonable and effective. I would submit that we have a number of stories heard in testimony around the country and I

have heard many of these myself as I have sat on the task force, on the committee, and we have held hearings, we have had a number of instances where this has proven not to be the case.

It is one thing to talk about it in theory. It is another to be the private property owner and to have the big hand of Government holding a gun pointed at your head. That is what we heard time and time again from these private property owners who all of a sudden are forced with mandates from the EPA or the Corps of Engineers, or any other number of State and Federal agencies. It is just nearly overwhelming.

Let me just express strong support for the efforts of the chairman of the committee, and indicate to the American people that there is a real need to make sure that we are reasonable and responsible in dealing with our species, but there is also an obligation to protect our private property rights, and there is an obligation to make sure we have a balanced, reasonable, and effective approach on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I wanted to add my comments into the RECORD regarding this legislation. I think anybody here on this floor is in favor of protecting endangered species, is in favor of protecting the environment, is in favor of good stewardship. The question remains, though, is it a responsibility of the private property owners, is it a responsibility of local government, or is it a responsibility of the Federal Government, and where do those responsibilities lie?

I think the folly of the endangered species over the last year has demonstrated that the heavy hand of Federal Government in care of the environment can produce some pretty crazy results. For instance, there was the arresting of a farmer in California for disking up five kangaroo rats and being sent to trial in Federal court. My hope is that in the adoption of the Endangered Species Act, according to the Pombo-Young bill, that that responsibility begins to be returned away from Federal bureaucrats and back down to the State, local, and private property owner level, because that is where good stewardship begins in this country.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman happens to come from a part of the country that has probably been impacted as greatly as any other region of the country in the central valley in California, with the multitude of species that are directly in the area that have been listed, as well as the aquatic species that survive within the natural river system in California, which has

impacted the delivery of irrigation water to a number of the gentleman's constituents.

Is it his opinion that if we went to an incentive-based system that operated where the individuals were rewarded for their stewardship or rewarded for being good stewards of the lands and, quite frankly, had more of an impact on what recovery plans were adopted, what they look like, what best worked, would that work better for your constituency?

Mr. RADANOVICH. Yes, it would. I have a number of cases where people have gone the extra mile to provide habitat on their farms, to provide for the environment, things that they would like to see on there, and then being further penalized because of the fact that they have done that. Current law penalizes any initiative like that that is out there and currently exists.

This country will not survive unless stewardship is brought down to the local level and people are given incentives to take care of their private property and the environment, because that is really a natural thing for people to want to do. I think that natural tendency ought to be encouraged through legislation.

Mr. POMBO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, being a farmer himself, could the gentleman describe the fear that his constituents feel when they may or may not have an endangered species on their property?

Mr. RADANOVICH. I can tell you from personal experience where there were times when we would allow onto our property certain environmental groups to catalog certain species of flowers and different things. There is no way in God's green Earth we would be allowing that right now, simply because what it does is it leads to stealing of your private property rights. So under current law, there is a disincentive. The gentleman earlier mentioned the term "shoot, shovel, and shut up." That is very, very clear in response to current legislation.

□ 1600

REPUBLICAN ENVIRONMENTAL SWAT TEAMS OUT IN FULL FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Republican environmental SWAT teams are out in full force today.

Speaker GINGRICH is advising his colleagues to do photo-ops at local zoos to counter the image that the Republicans are extremists on the environment.

And over the past few weeks, a number of our Republican colleagues have come to this floor to defend their record on the environment.

Every time I hear one of them, I'm reminded of the story about that man

who was arrested for eating a California condor.

He was dragged into court and the judge said, "before I lock you up, what do you have to say for yourself?"

The man said, "Judge, you don't understand. I was out hiking when I got caught in a terrible avalanche. I was trapped for days without food or water. When I was near death, a bird flew over my head, so I shot it down. I didn't know it was a California condor. But judge, if it wasn't for that bird, I would have starved to death."

The judge was so moved that he decided to let the man go free.

As he was walking out of the court, the man was stopped by reporters and they said, "Before you leave, we have to know one thing. What did the bird taste like?"

The man said, "Oh * * * it's kind of a cross between a bald eagle and a spotted owl."

It seems to me that the Republicans have the same problem on the environment. They don't have any credibility.

On one hand they come to this floor to talk about the environment. But on the other hand, they're working in the back room with the polluters lobby to destroy 25 years worth of progress on the environment.

Don't just take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Listen to what others have said.

The Sierra Club says that the GOP agenda "breaks faith with the American public."

The Natural Resources Defense Fund calls the first session of the Republican Congress "the year of living dangerously."

The nonpartisan National Journal says that a conservative Republican tide is threatening to wash away 25 years of progress on the environment.

And just today, the lead editorial in the Washington Post reads, and I quote, "Republican leaders began to complain last fall that their party has been misunderstood on the environment. They said they intended to moderate their position. But the persistence" of the legislative riders that they are continuing to push even this week "suggests that there's been no moderation."

In other words, they're just as extreme as they were a year ago.

And most telling of all in a recent poll: 55 percent of Republicans say they don't trust their own party on the environment.

Mr. Speaker, all over America today, people are wondering: how did this happen?

How did things go so wrong so fast?

For 25 years, Democrats and Republicans have worked together to protect the environment.

And we are rightfully proud of all that we've been able to accomplish.

Working together, we've made tremendous progress. Today, 60 percent of our lakes and rivers are clean. Major rivers no longer catch on fire. Millions of Americans are breathing cleaner air.