

else's State who have gone to work day after day after day doing the best for the greatest country on Earth and being talked about as though they were pawns on a political chess board.

It is time we wake up to the fact that we have the greatest democracy history has ever known. It is also a country of 260 million Americans. This country doesn't just run by itself. It runs because of a lot of very good men and women make it run. They are not helped by those who want to make political pawns of them.

So I probably am naive to assume that there will not be misstatements and distortions during the political season now upon us this fall. But I think some of those who go home and want to castigate the President or want to say, what are those Democrats doing in their spending plans? maybe somebody in the audience will stand up and say, let us be clear.

President Clinton and those who support him brought the deficit down 4 years in a row. Nobody else has done that in the 22 years I have been here. Under that watch, family incomes have gone up. The economy has improved. As my friend from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, pointed out, a lot of us are going to live a lot longer and a lot better because of those dedicated men and women who put first and foremost the interests of their fellow Americans.

We ought to just think about that, and maybe we ought to lower the rhetoric and, instead of looking for people to attack, people to beat up on, let us start talking about what is right with this country, what is right about what we do here and maybe —maybe— we will find people will have more respect for those of us who serve them.

I think the two Senators from North Dakota have done this body and this country a service this afternoon in their statements. I hope more will do the same. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE OMNIBUS PARKS LEGISLATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as I indicated in my conversation yesterday, we have an opportunity, a rare opportunity, to move the omnibus parks legislation, including some 126 individual titles. The sequence of events that has occurred since our conferees on the Senate side met and sent the package over to the House bears some examination at this time.

Let me recount the status of the Presidio omnibus parks legislation. When

it went over to the House yesterday, we anticipated that the House would address it today. However, there was an error in the technical submission which resulted in an objection on technical language. As a consequence, in order to rectify that situation, it is necessary that it come back to this body and that the corrections be taken, which, again, are of a technical nature, and it be sent back to the House of Representatives for action, and then it would come over here, and the anticipated procedure would be that an objection would result and a vote to recommit the conference report, which would basically terminate the conference report and the Presidio omnibus parks legislation.

As chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which reported out this package after working some 2 years, and recognizing that it affects the interests in some 41 individual States, and recognizing that we knew there were controversial issues in the package, including the Utah wilderness, which was withdrawn at the request of the administration, the grazing issue which was withdrawn at the request of the administration over a veto threat, the Tongass 15-year extension for the benefit of the Ketchikan pulp contract in my State of Alaska, which would enable a \$200 million investment to go into a new facility, chlorine free, state-of-the-art, which was threatened by a Presidential veto, I assume because of objections from environmental groups, that, too, was withdrawn. We had the issue affecting the State of Minnesota known as the boundary wilderness waters. That, too, was withdrawn.

So, Mr. President, the point I am making here is that there was a genuine effort to respond to the administration's concern by withdrawing what was assumed to be the controversial issues.

Well, Mr. President, last night we were in for another surprise. The Office of Management and Budget came up with a letter indicating that they still were not satisfied. Mr. President, it is the observation of the Senator from Alaska that the White House has a goalpost on wheels. They simply move it around when it is convenient.

I am sure there are some legitimate concerns, but they were not expressed in the first letter from the White House relative to their concerns and objections. They include some new areas that we had not been advised were controversial in the last 2 years that we have held hearings. So I would like to go over those so my colleagues will know just where we are.

In the receipt of the second proposed veto letter, where it simply says that the Office of Management and Budget would recommend a veto either through the Secretary of Agriculture or to the Office of the President, the letter points out that there are procedures and provisions that are unacceptable to the administration that would warrant veto action.

These include, No. 1, unwarranted boundary restrictions to the Shenandoah and Richmond Battlefield National Parks in Virginia.

The second was special-interest benefits adversely affecting the management of the Sequoia National Park in California.

Three, an unfavorable modification of the Ketchikan pulp contract on the Tongass in my State of Alaska.

Four, erosion of the coastal barrier island protections in Florida.

Five, mandated changes that would significantly alter and delay completion of the Tongass land management plan.

And, six, permanent changes in process for regulating rights-of-way across national parks and other Federal lands.

Mr. President, the indication here is that this administration would hold up the omnibus parks package, including the Presidio, that magnificent jewel in the Pacific under the Golden Gate Bridge, that needs attention and needs attention badly. It needs attention now; it cannot wait. It is going to deteriorate.

We proposed to set up a trust of outstanding citizens in San Francisco to manage that like the Pennsylvania Redevelopment Corporation has done such an extraordinary job in Washington, DC, in renovating the areas along Pennsylvania Avenue.

The administration is implying, suggesting, recommending they are going to hold up this package as a consequence now of these issues after we took the controversial issues away.

Mr. President, let there be no mistake about it, the game plan—the game plan—of this administration is evidenced in its letter. That letter does not address the legislative package, which is the omnibus parks bill, as the vehicle. What it recommends is that we initiate further discussions so that the appropriations process can cherry pick, if you will, certain aspects, certain portions out of the omnibus package and put it in the appropriations process.

The committee chairman, Senator GORTON of Washington, indicated yesterday, in no uncertain terms, that the omnibus parks package was the only train leaving, the only bus leaving the station. This was it, because he was not going to entertain taking segments out of the omnibus parks package and putting it in the appropriations legislation that they are drafting. Mr. President, we are in a situation now where that bus has left.

The Senator from Washington is known for his outspokenness, his commitment, his word. I have communicated with Senator HATFIELD of the Appropriations Committee relative to the possibility that is the game plan now, to abandon the Presidio omnibus parks legislation, and selectively pull pieces out of there and put it, Mr. President, in the appropriation package.

Now, as we look at these issues specifically which I think need examination, since the White House brought

them up, one might say, "Well, there must be something wrong with these." On the surface, it may be something bad. We must be out of our minds to even consider passing such provisions as objected to by the director of the Executive Office of the President.

Let me read the last sentence of the letter.

The conference report does not meet the test. We remain willing to work with you to develop a compromise package that could be included in a bill to provide continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

There it is, Mr. President. That is what the administration wants to do. They want to take the omnibus parks bill, the hours my committee has worked—as a matter of fact, the years—126 individual bills that are in that package, they want to cherry pick them out. Do you know what will happen if that is done? Some of the senior Members with long-term seniority in this body are going to try and prevail. They will try and prevail. We know how that works. But it is not something that I will stand and watch silently happen. I am prepared to take whatever means is necessary to keep this package together. If it starts coming apart, to take whatever means is necessary to block it if it is in an appropriations process, because this concept is simply wrong.

We have held the hearings. We participated in the public process. Now it is time to legislate on the package. I am not buying the excuse that, "Well, the Senator from Alaska has put together this huge package. Why did we not pass these individually?" Because every Member in this body knows why. There has been a hold on every 1 of the 126 individual bills that are in this package for over a year, in some cases a year and a half, nearly 2 years, by some individuals who wanted to use the whole process to force the House to initiate action on bills that were objected to in the House. That is why this package exists.

If there is going to be some political heat around here, Mr. President, that political heat goes right down to the White House for breaking up or attempting to break up a well put together package, by withdrawing Utah wilderness, grazing, Tongass, 15-year extension, as well as the Minnesota boundary waters. We have done our part. But, no, they want more.

Mr. President, this is a small item in passing. I am losing 1,000 jobs directly, 3,000 to 4,000 jobs indirectly. That means 25 percent of the economy of southeastern Alaska because this administration will not support a 15-year extension. I met the Secretary of the Office of the President on Environmental Quality Council, Ms. McGinty. She did not recommend the extension. She could not give me a reason.

I have in front of me a statement from the U.S. Forest Service and their consultants. In the summer of 1996 there were enough trees that died in my State of Alaska in south central

and interior Alaska as a result of the infestation of the spruce bark beetle to run that Ketchikan pulp mill at full capacity for 8 years. So, there we have it, Mr. President. No sensitivity to the dead, dying timber, jobs, people out of work, unemployment, no tax base.

Mr. President, as we look at where we are today, we wonder if it is not precisely what the Framers of the Constitution of the United States had in mind when they created the three branches of Government. If one goes a little off, the other can bring some balance into the process.

I want to share and examine the issues concerning the permanent changes in the process for regulating right of ways across national parks and other Federal lands. The resolution of right of way claims, or RS 2477, which they suggest that they do not find suitable in this legislation, these claims as they are called, have been a complex, contentious process. The committee reported an amended bill that allows the Department to proceed with the development of new regulations while prohibiting their implementation until approved by Congress. That is what we did in committee, put the balance in there, so that, obviously, it would require the implementation by Congress, and the Department could proceed with the regulations while prohibiting the implementation until approved by Congress.

In other words, this legislation provided the ability to keep the process going, but Congress wants to act. This does not permanently change the process. It just provides a system of checks and balances. It is fairly difficult to argue with this logic unless, of course, the White House does not want to participate in the check and balance.

Mr. President, what is even more phenomenal is the fact that the original bill was significantly amended as requested by this administration. In other words, we have already responded to the administration, but clearly OMB does not know anything about it. The same bill that is in this package, let me repeat, the same bill is the administration's position, and actually relaxes the conditions of the moratorium currently in effect. The bill in this package was unanimously agreed to by all of the committee members. The Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, voted for it, Senator BRADLEY from New Jersey voted for it, Senator BUMPERS voted for it. Mr. President, I doubt that the President of the United States would seriously veto a legislative package of this magnitude over a bill they agreed to—agreed to it—last May.

Now, the threat of a veto on Shenandoah and Richmond Battlefield National Park in Virginia—well, let's cut to the quick. The Richmond Battlefield provision in this package is the same map, same boundaries as depicted on the National Park Service's newly released general management plan, dated August 1996. The reduction in acreage

is the administration's initiative. I repeat. This is a plan from the administration. During the course of deliberations, a provision was added. The land could only be purchased from a willing seller. But, at the same time, the restriction to the purchase of lands by donated funds only was expanded to include appropriated funds.

In the case of the Shenandoah National Park, the park boundary was reduced from the original 1926 authorization of 521,000 acres to 196,500 acres, currently managed by the National Park Service.

The conferees also directed that the Secretary shall complete a boundary study, which would address the future needs of the park in the way of lands acquisition and give the Secretary authority to acquire those lands. The Park Service did not testify or make the case that the entire acreage, as envisioned in 1926, was required to complete the park. In fact, there are many areas within the original acreage that are already developed and no longer possess those qualities for inclusion as units for the National Park System.

The provisions in the package were worked out between the Virginia delegation over a period of months—bipartisan, Mr. President. Negotiations were intense when the delegation first addressed the problems at Shenandoah. They were all over the spectrum. Finally, they reached an agreement. The provision protects the park and rectifies the problems experienced by their constituents. In conversation with the White House staff last night, Mr. President, when asked what was the real problem, they allowed that they would probably reach the same conclusion, but the program needed more process. Well, it has been 2 years, Mr. President. Why does the administration object to this? They won't tell us. They just put it down.

Mr. President, they want more process. This comes from an administration who, in many cases, ignored any process. In declaring the 1.8 million acres in the State of Utah a national monument, there was no process, no NEPA, no FLPMA—no process. On one hand, they want process, and on the other hand, they make a decision based on political expediency. What happens? The President doesn't go to Utah. The President sits on the edge of the Grand Canyon and makes his pronouncement from the State of Arizona. Why didn't he go to Utah? It is clear. He wasn't welcome in Utah. Because of his land grab under the Antiquities Act, he would have been protested by children who were objecting to the revenue that would be lost to the school fund as a consequence of this designation.

The pathetic part of that action—and it was not the action of a work horse, Mr. President, it was the action of a show horse, because that legislation, the Antiquities Act had no business being invoked, and the administration uses the excuse, well, Teddy Roosevelt did it. It was necessary when Teddy

Roosevelt was around, but he did it right. There was a lot of discussion over it. The Antiquities Act was applied by President Carter in my State of Alaska, but there was a lot of discussion. There was absolutely no discussion in this case—none whatsoever. Check with the delegation from Utah, check with the Governor, check with the House Members. This came as a surprise. It was a photo opportunity, a crass effort to take advantage, if you will, of a designation land grab which some of the President's advisers suggested. I have even heard Dick Morris was in on the recommendation. So, on one hand, the administration talks about a public process. They want more process in this parks package. But they have no process in declaring 1.8 million acres of the State of Utah a national monument.

Mr. President, as late as, I believe, the 103d Congress, we had an extended debate over California desert wilderness. Not everybody was happy, but there was a process, a democratic process, where the people were heard. And we passed that legislation. Everybody wasn't happy. I wasn't particularly happy, but DIANNE FEINSTEIN was very happy. But it was a process. That was circumvented here. It was circumvented, and the media can't seem to see through it. They proclaim the merits. Nobody proclaims the loss of participation or the loss of the process by the people of Utah.

This is not an issue of the State of Alaska, but there is a principle involved here. This Senator is introducing legislation, along with Senator CRAIG and others, to take away the President's authority to invoke the Antiquities Act, because it has been abused. There is every reason that we could have continued the dialog in the next session of Congress on the Utah wilderness, to make legitimate designations of wilderness for Utah. But here we have a land grab. So when the President and the White House talks about process, I want to talk about their process. Their process is a land grab.

Mr. President, the administration has a problem with the extension of a few summer cabin leases at Sequoia National Park where they are going to develop a campground and other facilities. However, there are no definitive plans or moneys programmed at the current time.

They are ready to sacrifice the whole package on this issue. The original bill was heavily amended as a result of a veto threat by the Department. All of the erroneous provisions were removed, to our knowledge, at that time. Under this bill, the Secretary has total discretion to continue to lease it. The language does not direct the Secretary to do anything, but he may if he wants to. What is wrong with that? Full discretion.

Last year, we saw Senator FEINSTEIN, my good friend from California, as I indicated, prevail in the establishment of

the largest park and wilderness package in quite a while, the California desert. Now, I can't believe my good friend, Senator FEINSTEIN, would support the destruction of the Sequoia National Park, nor would I suspect that Senator BOXER would allow anything inappropriate to take place. Both support this legislation. If the Secretary thinks it is a neat thing to do it, why, we have given him the authority to do it.

The administration cites "unfavorable modifications" of the Ketchikan pulp contract as a possible veto item. Is this a national issue for which the President would sacrifice a billion-dollar environmental program for the San Francisco Bay area to clean up the San Francisco Bay? I went to school down there, and I know it well. It needs cleaning up. This is a great piece of legislation. He sacrificed that and the establishment of the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve, the preservation of the Sterling Forest corridor, which is a federally funded purchase of land in New Jersey and land in New York, and a bipartisan solution for the management of the Presidio. "Well, this is unfavorable." Unfavorable to whom?

The administration has made it perfectly clear that they would veto any timber concession that would allow for environmental investment and the continued operation of the only remaining pulp mill in my State, as I have stated. As a result, we pulled this provision and will have only the President to hold accountable for the jobs that we will lose.

It is rather interesting, because the President chooses to sacrifice, if you will, some of his own—or at least the administration does. Our Governor has worked very hard—a Democrat—to try to prevail upon the White House. First was ANWR and now the Tongass. Well, unfortunately, they have seen fit to disregard his recommendations. They have seen fit to disregard the recommendations of the congressional delegation from Utah. One can only conclude they have simply written off Alaska and Utah—at least politically.

What I left in this is one sentence that, in my State, would give the Forest Service the flexibility to work with the company that still holds an 8-year pulp contract, to simply transfer that over so it could be made available to the sawmills in the State of Alaska. We only have four—two are operating and one co-op, one marginally operation, and one in Wrangell is closed.

That is all I am proposing. Yet, they say this is ground for veto threat. After the administration scores a victory for the environmental lobby and closes our last pulp mill—our only year-round manufacturing facility—are we also to be denied the opportunity to try to salvage something? Which is what I propose—and that is allowing the transfer of the existing contract from pulp to sawmill because if the pulp mill continued to operate for the balance of this contract they would have the right

to do that to the year 2004 when it would be terminated.

No. What we have here is a rhetorical reach for the symbol Tongass to raise fears about this conference report. Well, this does not sell with the Senator from Alaska.

The White House takes issue with the Coastal Barrier Resource Act amendments—in Florida—which appear in this package. The corrections remove roughly 40 acres of land in Florida from the 1.272 million acre Coastal Barrier Resource System. It has the support of the Florida delegation. I understand the Governor of Florida, Governor Chiles, has made a concerted effort to try to get the White House to change its mind. He strongly supports these changes. This is a bipartisan issue. The Florida House delegation are cosponsors of this specific legislation. The two Senators from Florida, as I indicated, support it.

One wonders what the motivation of the White House is. The answer perhaps is simple. In this case the bill removes developed lands—40 acres—from the 1.2 million acre system that is supposed to contain undeveloped land. So the executive branch is giving little consideration to the legislative branch.

The administration also cites "mandated changes that would significantly alter and delay the completion of the Tongass Land Management Plan" as a possible veto item. This conclusion represents probably the most gross, misleading of any language in the bill.

The provisions they are apparently referring to—though they are so off base it is hard to tell because they know nothing about the subject—is one that directs the Forest Service to make recommendations to the Congress about potential compensation for Alaska Natives unfairly left out of the Alaska Natives Claim Settlement Act. These are natives that unfortunately were left out. They were not included, and this is only the authority—the authorization—to include them; no mandate for land; no designation; just the authority that these people have a right as Alaska Natives and indigenous people to their claim because they were left out and the other natives shared in that claim.

This is an equity issue.

The provision also directs the Forest Service to incorporate these recommendations into the Tongass Land Management Plan so that Congress can properly evaluate the impact of any recommendation involving land status changes on management of the forest. Any proposed changes would have to be acted upon by Congress and approved by the President.

This is a safeguard. What is wrong with that?

One of the interesting things that Alaskans can understand is the significance of this so-called TLMP. No one can do anything in Alaska until the TLMP is finished. The purpose was to settle the harvest—sustainable yield—on 1.7 million acres out of the 17 million acre Tongass National Forest. The

only problem is that by the time the Forest Service completes it—which was initially going to be August and now is going to be the end of the year—we are not going to have any industry left.

So it is not going to be applicable, if you will, in any practical way because it was designed for an area and level of utilization. If we do not have industry, there is no utilization.

I would encourage my colleagues from other Western States to recognize what is happening here. This is a carefully contrived effort by extreme environmental groups who want to terminate timber harvesting on all Forest Service national land. What does that mean in any State? Unfortunately, we have no private timber with the exception of Native regional corporations which have been able to select under their indigenous selection opportunity. That is private timber. They can export it at a higher price. There is no State timber in southeastern Alaska. Our people lived in the forests—Ketchikan, Haines, Skagway, Wrangell—before the national forests were established. People were assured they would have an opportunity for a livelihood. And, since we, if you will, designated wilderness in the forests as national monuments and left only a small segment, we are faced with the reality of trying to continue a modest industry when others clearly are trying to terminate it. And it is going to move to other Western States. What are we going to do? I guess we are going to simply import our raw materials from nations who do not have the same sensitivity, forgetting the fact that we are much more environmentally sensitive, and do a better job. And we are dealing with a renewable resource here properly managed. We have 50-year-old second-growth timber; beautiful timber.

But in any event, we are faced with this reality associated with the general theme of this administration, whether it is timbering, oil and gas exploration, opening ANWR safely, whether it is grazing, or whether it is mining. There is no substantive support for resource development on public lands. They are selling America short, American technology short, American know-how short, exporting the jobs overseas, and exporting the dollars. And one only has to look at the increasing balance of payments deficit to recognize its significance.

The cost of imported oil is over a third of our trade deficit. What are we doing? We are simply importing more. We tried to put Saddam Hussein in the cage not so long ago. He got out. Saddam Hussein is better off this week than he was 4 weeks ago. What are we doing about it?

Where is our energy policy? What are we subjecting ourselves to? Where is our national security interest? We are 51.1 percent dependent on imported oil. During the Arab oil embargo in 1973, we were 37 percent dependent. What do we do? We created SPR, the strategic petroleum reserve. We created a fall

back so we have a supply which we need. This administration has chosen to use it as a piggy bank. We paid some \$27 or \$28 a barrel for a 90-day supply. We have never achieved the 90-day supply. Now we are selling it at \$18 to \$19 a barrel to meet budget objectives. There is a huge increase in the President's budget in the year 2000. This is what they are doing.

Where are we going, Mr. President? We are sacrificing our national energy security. We are sacrificing it in this way. The Department of Energy has indicated by the year 2000 we will be 66 percent dependent on imported oil. And where does that come from? It comes from the Mideast. Anybody that suggests that the Mideast is a stable area only has to recognize the troop buildup, and the fact that we were sharpening our missiles a few days ago and firing them a few weeks ago. So sooner or later, Mr. President, we are going to pay the piper.

And the reason for going into this rather extended dialog is simply to alert my colleagues of the inevitability that what goes around comes around, and history repeats itself. And it is going to repeat itself relative to our increased dependence on imported oil and the fact that we are losing our leverage with our Arab neighbors as evidenced by our effort to generate their physical support in the last go-round with Saddam Hussein.

Finally, Mr. President, as I get back to this analysis of the position of the administration, I conclude by saying, as the administration letter indicates, that mandated changes are required to significantly alter various aspects of this to make changes for the purpose of raising concerns that are not documented in any detail but seem to be raised as an excuse to find an excuse to initiate a veto threat.

Politics and rhetoric have overtaken substance and reality. It will be truly sad if the misleading statements and inferences and threats in the administration's recent statement bring down the largest parks bill since 1978, the largest environmental package in the last several decades. The President of the United States currently has on more than one occasion stated he would veto appropriation language that contained riders, so I am concluding from the statement from the Office of Management and Budget, "We remain willing to work with you in developing a package that would include a bill to provide continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1997," there is your rider.

Now he wants the rider; he thinks that is a good idea. The reason is, one can avoid the legislative process. You just take what you want and trash the rest. I tell you, if that happens, there are going to be a lot of unhappy Members because some of you will have your bill selected and others will not.

I believe in the legislative process. That is why I am here. That is why I have accepted the responsibility of

working with my members on the committee to bring this parks package before this body. I believe in the legislative process, working collectively, and I am proud of the fact that we have crafted a bipartisan package that serves to enhance our parks and our public lands.

I have answered the veto letter. I believe my colleagues see that there is very little substance, and the President is standing tall, perhaps, but standing in the mush.

So for those who have followed this debate, I would appeal to you that the parks package may, indeed, be in jeopardy from objections unidentified in detail from the White House—not based on their first series of objections, but based on, apparently, an afterthought. Maybe for some reason unknown to this Senator, there is a political reason at this late date prior to the election for a veto of this package, but I cannot imagine what it is. I think they are misreading it downtown. I do not think they recognize we have stripped it of its objectionable parts, and I encourage those who are out there and are concerned with these issues to notify the President, notify the Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, notify their elected Representatives, Senator and Congressman, because it is getting late, and if this package, this omnibus parks package, is delayed or set aside because of pending business so there is not enough time to take it up, the White House and the President are going to have to bear that responsibility—not the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, not Congressman DON YOUNG from Alaska, not FRANK MURKOWSKI, Senator from Alaska, not Ted STEVENS, Senator from Alaska, not the members from my Energy and Resources Committee, not the professional staff, not Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, but the White House for obstructing the most significant legislative package that has come before this body, as I have said, in several decades.

So I urge those out in California who are interested in the Presidio or interested in the portion of the legislation to clean up the San Francisco Bay or any of the other 126 titles in the other 41 States to get busy, because the countdown has begun. It is not going to go in the appropriations process. I have had that assurance over here. This is the right way to do it. This is the right time to do it. There is absolutely no excuse for further delay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed for up to a half-hour as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.