

a dozen projects in California. A lot of these are environmentally very sensitive and important. I know there are eight in Colorado that likewise are important; a couple in Arizona; Alaska has several.

There are a bunch of projects in here that I think will improve the Park System in the country that will have strong bipartisan support. If we can ever get this bill to a vote my guess is that it will pass if not unanimously very close to unanimously.

So I hope that we could do that, send it to the House, and hopefully get it on the President's desk before the 104th Congress adjourns sine die.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

---

#### END-OF-SESSION LOGJAM

Mr. FORD. I listened to my counterpart on the Republican side as he has talked about the parks bill. I have not been in the negotiations, but I know something about the negotiations. I understand several offers have been made in an effort to work out this piece of legislation. However, it has always come back, it is all or nothing.

I know it is very easy to pull on the strings of emotion here saying that these items for our retiring Members need to be done and that you are trying to get them done for retiring Members, but it is what kind of meat you put on that skeleton of projects for retiring Members. Now, you can use this all you want to. Hopefully, we will be able to work out something, but when you say it is all or nothing at all, I have been very concerned about the number of bills that have come out of the Energy Committee in the last 2 years. We have not been very productive, I think, and then all of a sudden at the end, next to the last day, we get a humongous bill.

And so the offers have been made. The struggle is still available. And if it is not all or nothing, I think we may be able to sit down and work out a little Henry Clay. Henry Clay was the great compromiser. Henry Clay said compromise was "negotiated hurt." Well, let us sit down and hurt a little bit and get a bill out here that is in the best interests of the country instead of saying, if you do not take this, you do not get anything.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FORD. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I was listening to the discussion about the parks bill, and I listened to the discussion yesterday about the bill. I listened to the discussions about the continuing resolution and appropriations bills, about the FAA bill. And the common issue with respect to all of them is we find ourselves here right at the edge of the midnight hour on this legislative session and in a circumstance where, as I understand it, four appropriations bills were not even brought to the floor of the Senate. We have a circumstance

here the Senator from Kentucky would know more than most about where the FAA bill was not able to be resolved and finally got here, and now obviously an amendment has been offered. But the reason we find ourselves in a time crunch on these things is because they did not get here until right near the midnight hour.

Mr. FORD. I say to my friend, they are not here yet. They are not here yet.

Mr. DORGAN. That is true. In terms of trying to reach some agreements, I hope very much that those who want to advance the parks bill will understand that all of the interests that are involved in this, including the White House and both bodies here in the Congress, need to be involved in the discussions.

My understanding is that recommendations and negotiations have been offered, and that bill can be resolved. But I am also concerned about our finding ourselves at the end of a session once again with a CR, a continuing resolution which simply throws all of the appropriations bills that are not completed into one big pile, completed at 3 o'clock in the morning. There is not one Member of the Senate who has read it. I do not even know where it is. I do not suspect it is available. But if it is available, no one has read it. When it is available, no one will read it. Maybe the Senate will be forced to read it. I do not know.

But in any event, we should not find ourselves at the end of a session like this up against the wall on critical pieces of legislation. The reasonable way to do completion is earlier in the year to start the pieces of legislation through the process so that you can have back and forth negotiations.

I ask the Senator from Kentucky who has been involved integrally in a couple of these situations, is that not the case? We have seen a legislative logjam self-created, and then people express surprise that, gee, I do not understand why this is not being greased through here. Well, because they created a logjam themselves. We ought to resolve at least never to do this again. I hope we will.

Mr. FORD. I say to my friend, the continuing resolution is nothing new. Sometimes it is for a short period of time; sometimes it is for longer. I think this is the first time we have had a continuing resolution with appropriations bills that have never been to the Senate. There are four of them.

So we do not have to leave here. As I said last night, we do not have to leave here. We are still getting paid whether we are up here or not. You still draw your salary. So we do not have to leave here. We are being paid. I do not think we are earning our keep if we do not do our job. And so here we are with a continuing resolution with appropriations bills that are a must. Throw everything else aside. Appropriations bills are a must to operate government. The Defense bill conference report I do not think is here yet. We are going to try

to wrap all that CR in that so we cannot amend it.

What kind of game are we playing here? And so everybody is checking their list to see if they have their little project in the CR. If they did not get it in the CR, they are fussing. So let us get it out in the Chamber and start looking at it.

I tell you one thing we might do to stop all this. Have a 2-year budget. I have been trying to get it for 8 or 10 years now. We now have a 1-year budget process and 1-year oversight. You can make all the changes in a 2-year budget you can make in a 1-year budget. If you have an emergency, you can correct it. If you have a flood or earthquake or hurricane, whatever it might be, you can have a method by which you can change that.

So let us have some oversight in 1 year. We have a budget for 2 years. We would not be up here with this logjam backed up to the wall and trying to go home, trying to go home without doing the people's business.

I know we are not in the majority, and so therefore we have very little control. So the majority wants to get out of town. With their record, I would want to get out of town, too.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

---

#### OMNIBUS PARKS LEGISLATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I could respond to my good friend from North Dakota relative to his concerns about the process here, particularly on the Presidio-omnibus parks bill, because, I, too, as chairman of the committee on which he serves, feel an extraordinary frustration about what we went through in committee because, as the Members know, we held the hearings, accommodated members as they introduced their bills, and then we attempted to move these bills to the floor.

I think it is important to recognize that virtually every single bill in the parks package, 126 sections to accommodate Members, immediately have holds put on them by one Senator from New Jersey. That is just the fact. The record will reflect that reality. His motivation—it is part of the rules; it is appropriately done—was to get the House to move on Sterling Forest. There were objections over there on Sterling Forest. And that is part of the process. They have a right to do that. But as a consequence, we could not move a single bill to the floor for action because there was a hold on them.

Here we have this package today of 126 sections in the Presidio parks bill, and that is why we have it, Madam President. It is as a consequence of Members using the rules, if you will, to advance the position of their own bills. But my job as chairman of the committee is to try to advance all those bills

that came out of my committee. That is what the Presidio parks package is all about.

As a consequence, we are in a situation now where, having been notified by the administration of certain objections to that package, we responded. We responded in a conference mode, and we pulled off what they objected to. They objected to Utah wilderness. They objected to grazing. They objected to the 15-year Tongass extension contractual commitment. They objected to the Minnesota wilderness waters. So we pulled those. And then they came back 2 days later with provisions in the Presidio conference report which would invoke a Presidential veto, and they listed: Conveyance to the city of Sumner, 1.5 acres to the City of Sumner, OR; 218. Shenandoah National Park; 219. Tulare conveyance; Alpine school district, 30 acres of land to the Alpine School District for a public school facility, passed the House by suspension. They never raised an objection. Coastal barrier, FL, 40 acres of developed property out of 1.2 million acres, supported by a bipartisan Florida delegation and the Governor; conveyance to Del Norte County Unified School District, transfer of small acres to the school district in California for recreation, recess purposes.

Now, Madam President, this administration has a responsibility for killing this package. This package is dead once the CR comes over from the House, as the majority whip is well aware. Right now there is a hold on this package, and the hold is by the minority leader on behalf of the administration. Otherwise we can move this conference back to the House while they are still in session and they will move it back here and it is passed. And the Presidio takes place as a reality, the Snow Basin takes place, so we can host the winter Olympics, that becomes a reality, the San Francisco Bay delta cleanup becomes a reality, Sterling Forest becomes a reality. And they are not even responding.

Last night we sent a letter down saying we are ready to continue discussions to get this done. It is 2:30, Saturday afternoon, no response.

I ask unanimous consent this letter be printed in the RECORD, as well as the identification of the 40-some-odd individual items that they indicated they would invoke a Presidential veto over, with an explanation on them, so that everyone who reads the RECORD can readily understand, if you will.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, September 27, 1996.

Mr. JOHN L. HILLEY,  
Assistant to the President and Director for Legislative Affairs,

The White House.

DEAR MR. HILLEY: After our discussion earlier today, I thought it would be constructive if as Chairman of the Conference on H.R. 1296, I provided you with comments on the

items to which the Administration appears to object by virtue of the fact they were not included on the list of acceptable items you provided to me late last night.

As you will see many of the legislative provisions previously passed the House under suspension with no Administration objections. Still other provisions passed the Senate or the House after the Administration testified in support. Others had passed the House or Senate after bi-partisan negotiations had attempted to address specific Administration concerns. Yet other provisions, while important to individual members, relate to such minor matter as the study of a four foot radio tower at the site of an existing tower on a national forest. It is difficult to comprehend an objection to such a provision in the context of this conference report. Finally, some provisions to which you apparently object have the broad bi-partisan support of House and Senate delegations, often including the Governor of the relevant state.

I hope this information is helpful to the Administration in re-considering its position. Tomorrow I will again attempt to re-commit H.R. 1296 to conference for the purpose of allowing the conferees to meet and consider changes to the conference report. If the Administration would care to present information concerning its objections to specific provisions at such a meeting of the conferees I would be pleased to arrange this meeting and give the information presented due consideration. Obviously such a meeting will not be possible unless H.R. 1296 is recommended to conference. I believe that in the short time remaining in the 104th Congress this is a reasonable path to take to a successful conference report. It is my sincere hope that for the benefit of the many intensely interested members both Democrat and Republican, some retiring at the end of this Congress, this important parks and public lands legislation will pass the Congress.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,  
Chairman.

---

PROVISIONS IN PRESIDIO CONFERENCE REPORT WHICH WOULD INVOKE A PRESIDENTIAL VETO.

216—*Conveyance to city of Sumpter Oregon*: Authorizes Secretary of Agriculture to convey 1.5 acres to City of Sumpter, Oregon for public purposes. Administration raised no objections when bill passed under suspension in the House.

218—*Shenandoah National Park*: Adjusts 1923 Park boundary authorization to match today's existing park boundary. Similar bill passed House 377-33 under suspension. Provision has support of bi-partisan VA. Delegation.

219—*Tulare conveyance*: Clears title of 14 acres owned by a railroad to citizens of Tulare, California. Attempt by City of Tulare to clean-up blighted downtown area. Hearings held and provision was reported by Resources Committee. DOI reportedly has no objection.

220—*Alpine School District*: Conveys 30 acres of land to the Alpine school district for a public school facility. Passed House by suspension and Administration never raised objection.

223—*Coastal Barrier Resource System*: Removes 40 acres of developed property out of a 1.2 million acre Coastal Barrier Resource System. Reported by the Resources Committee. Supported by bi-partisan Florida Delegation and the Governor.

224—*Conveyance to Del Norte County Unified school district*: Transfers small acreage to the School district in California for educational purposes. Passed House under suspension. Provision includes Forest Service requested amendments.

303—*Alaska peninsular subsurface consolidation*: Authorizes Secretary to exchange subsurface holdings of Koniag Corporation on an equal value basis for lands and interest owned by the federal gov't. Passed House and Senate. Included in the original Presidio package, the Administration indicated it would sign.

304—*Snow basin land exchange*: Would allow expedited land exchange to facilitate the 2002 Winter Olympics. Passed both House and Senate. Included in the original Presidio package, the Administration indicated it would sign.

309—*Sand Hollow exchange*: Equal value exchange in Zion National Park to transfer water development rights in order to protect Zion National Park. Passed the House. The Administration has indicated supported.

311—*Land exchange, city of Greeley, Colorado*: Equal value exchange to secure property needed by the city to secure protection of the city's water supply.

312—*Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve land exchange and boundary adjustment*: This would add more than 2 million acres of native owned lands to Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve in AK—in exchange for lands in the NPR-A.

313—*Kenai Natives Association land exchange*: This would facilitate exchange between KNA and the FWS to allow an Alaska Native Corp. to gain economic use of their land—this would be an acre-for-acre exchange. An Administration supported two-for-one acre exchange passed the House.

401—*Cache La Poudre corridor*: Establishes a corridor to interpret and protect a unique and historical waterway. Included in the original Presidio package the Administration indicated it would sign.

405—*RS2477*: Places a moratorium on final regulations without Congressional approval. Language agreed to by Senate Republicans and Democrats and the Administration. Reported by Energy Committee.

406—*Hanford Reach preservation*: Extends a moratorium on construction of any new dams or impoundments in this area. Passed House under suspension with Administration objections.

502—*Vancouver National historic reserve*: Establishes a new historic reserve. Administration testified in support. Passed the Senate. Hearings held in both bodies.

602—*Corinth, Mississippi Battlefield Act*: Establishes a visitors center at Shiloh National Military Park in Mississippi. Included in the original Presidio package the Administration indicated it would sign. Passed the Senate.

603—*Richmond National Battlefield Park*: Establishes boundary in accordance with new NPS management plan dated 8/96. Passed the House 337-33 under suspension. Administration opposed House-passed bill, however it has been modified to address their concerns. Supported by the bipartisan Va. Delegation.

604—*Revolutionary War*: A study to determine if these sites warrant further protection Senate Energy reported bill—Administration testified in support. Hearings in both bodies.

607—*Shenandoah Valley Battlefield*: Establishes Historical Area. Does not create a new park. Administration opposed House-passed bill, however it has been modified to address their concerns. Supported by the bi-partisan Va. Delegation.

701—*Ski area permits*: Simplifies ski area fee collection. Passed House and Senate. Included in the original Presidio package the Administration indicated it would sign. Administration testified in support.

703—*Visitor services*: Would raise \$150 million for parks to help with badly needed repairs of existing park structures. 100% of new fees go back to the parks. Provision was

modified to address Administration concerns.

704—*Glacier Bay National Park*: Raises fees to support research and natural resources protection through a per-person charge on vessels entering Glacier Bay.

803—*Ozark wild horses*: Would protect and prevent the removal of a existing wild horse herds at Ozark National Scenic Riverway. Passed the House under suspension without Administration objection. Passed Senate Committee.

806—*Katmai National Park agreements*: Authorizes research in National Parks, including the ability of the USGS to conduct volcanological research in Katmai National Park. Administration has supported research cooperative agreements for the last three Congressional sessions.

811—*Expenditures of funds outside boundary of Rock Mountain National Park*: Allows NPS to build a visitor center outside the park with private funds. Administration and the National Park Service requested this provision. Passed the House under suspension. Passed Senate Energy Committee.

815—*NPS administrative reform*: Provides authorities NPS has requested for years—aids parks in protection of resources and provide facilities for employees. Provides Senate confirmation of NPS Director. Administration testified in support at House hearings. Portions incorporated in President Clinton's Earth Day address on National Parks. Passed House under suspension with no Administration opposition.

816—*Mineral King*: Authorizes the continuation of summer cabin leases. Totally discretionary for the Secretary. Supported by bipartisan members of House and Senate California Delegation. House hearings held. Reported by Resources Committee. Provision has been modified to address Administration's concerns.

818—*Calumet Ecological Park*: A study of the Calumet Lake area to determine alternatives for preservation.

819—*Acquisition of certain property in Santa Cruz*: Provides for the acquisition of property on Santa Cruz Island to prevent the further destruction of the resource due to over-population of feral goats.

1021—*Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park*: Formally designates a recreation area. Changes monument status to park and creates a BLM Conservation area. Designates 22,000 acres of wilderness. Energy Committee hearings held.

1022—*National Park Foundation*: Provides the opportunity for the private sector to sponsor the NPS, similar to the sponsorship of the Olympic games. Administration has testified in support. Administration testified in support. Part of President Clinton's Earth Day proclamation on Parks. Provision has been modified to address last minute Administration concerns.

1028—*Mount Hood*: Exchange between private company and federal govt. Passed the Senate with no Administration objection.

1029—*Creation of the Coquille Forest*: Equal value exchange creating a tribal forest. Passed the Senate with no Administration objection.

1034—*Natchez National Historical Park*: Creates an auxiliary area to a NPS unit and provides \$3 million for an intermodal transportation system and visitor center. Administration testified in support at Energy Committee hearing. Reported by Senate Energy.

1036—*Rural electric and telephone facilities*: Authorizes BLM to waive right-of-way rental charges for small rural electric and phone cooperatives.

1037—*Federal borough recognition*: Allows the unorganized borough in Alaska to receive PILT payments. Language was modified in conjunction with BLM and Adminis-

tration has raised no objection. Reported by Energy Committee.

1038—*Alternative processing*: Prohibits the termination of a timber sale contract solely for the reason of failure to operate a pulp mill. Provides flexibility so that jobs in the sawmill portion of the contract are not lost along with the pulp mill jobs. This is not a contract extension nor is it an increase in timber harvesting. Language has been drastically modified from original proposal. Hearings on contract issues held in both bodies.

1039—*Village land negotiations*: Provides authority for the Secretary to negotiate with five tiny Alaskan villages regarding their entitlements under ANCSA. Language has been modified to address Administration concerns. Provides the Secretary with already existing authority to negotiate without the restrictions of a legal challenge against him. Language has been further modified from earlier versions and does not include the conveyance of any land or assets. Hearings held in both bodies.

1040—*Unrecognized communities in SE Alaska*: Authorizes the native residents of five Southeast Alaska villages to organize as urban or group corporations under an amendment to ANCSA. Provision does not direct grants of any federal land or compensation to these villages without a future act of congress. Language has been drastically modified from earlier proposals in that it does not contain any guarantee of land to the villages.

1041—*Gross brothers*: Transfers approximately 160 acres of Forest Service land to Daniel J. Gross and Douglas K. Gross of Wrangell, Alaska. These are the children of the original homesteaders. Energy Committee hearing held.

1043—*Credit for reconveyance*: Would allow Cape Fox Corporation to transfer 320 acres of land near the Beaver Falls Hydro project to the Forest Service. CFC's ANCSA entitlement would be credited with an equal amount of acreage. This provision does not provide CFC any additional entitlement. Hearing held in the House. Administration raised no objection to this provision.

1044—*Radio site report*: A study to determine if an existing radio site continues to be necessary.

1045—*Retention and maintenance of certain dams and weirs, etc.*: Requires the Forest Service to maintain specific dams and weirs in the Immigrant Wilderness Area.

1046—*Matching land conveyance (University of Alaska)*: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to discuss a land grant with the University of Alaska who has never received its federal entitlement under the Land Grant College Program. Provides for a matching grant to the State. Provision specifically excludes lands that are part of a CSU or part of a National Forest.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Correct me if I am wrong, but I remember the administration originally said they might veto it if it had a provision dealing with an Alaska pulp mill, a provision in Minnesota, a couple of major provisions that they strongly objected to.

Those were removed, were they not, out of the package?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct. They were removed. The 15-year contract extension was removed. Minnesota wilderness waters were removed. And, of course,

Utah wilderness and grazing were removed.

Mr. NICKLES. I was going to say, the grazing provisions were also seriously objected to. So you have removed the really contentious issues. I have looked through the list of 46. There are some Democrat's, and mostly Republican projects. For most of those there is not a great deal of land, there are not significant projects that they are trying to have removed. But it bothers me to think in many cases there has never been an objection raised to any of those, even in the Senate, when we passed it in the past, or from the House. Is that not correct?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

For example, this is in Missouri: Ozark wild horses preservation. What we would do would be to protect, prevent the removal, of the wild horse herds of the Ozarks on the national scenic riverway. This passed the House under the suspension without the administration's objection. It passed the Senate Energy Committee. Without this in the package, without this passing, those horses are going to be killed. They are going to be shot.

There is no explanation. I cannot imagine the administration, in an election year—I cannot imagine the administration not responding to the needs of the Presidio, or cleaning up the San Francisco Bay area, or getting behind the land exchange for Snow Basin, allowing the Olympics to continue in this plan. But there is no explanation.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I compliment the Senator from Alaska, again. I want to encourage him not to give up faith, and maybe we will have some better cooperation from the administration and hopefully the minority leader so we can pass this package. It does have strong bipartisan support.

As I mentioned before, I read through a few of these projects. There are a lot of projects by Democrats and Republicans in this package. The Senator from Alaska runs the Energy Committee in a very bipartisan way, as Senator JOHNSTON has. So these projects are not partisan.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Absolutely, the Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, I have a list here of those that affect Democratic Members, many of whom are retiring, that they want to encourage passage of. My Democratic friends on the committee know that, as we address the hearing process, it is in a bipartisan manner. We work very well together. I have always felt very comfortable with Senator JOHNSTON as the ranking member, and the professional staff of both sides.

I think our efforts are recognized, as trying to be responsive to Members regardless of what their party affiliation is.

I will share this with my friend from Oklahoma. The largest single beneficiary is the State of California. There are probably about 18 sections in here,

including the Presidio, Elsmere Canyon, San Francisco Bay enhancement—cleanup of the San Francisco Bay area.

The Arkansas-Oklahoma land exchange, which affects you and the State of Arkansas as well. Obviously, Senator BUMPERS is interested in that. Senator HEFLIN, who is retiring—Alabama, Selma to Montgomery Historic Trail. These are in the package and these affect our Democratic colleagues.

Florida, the Florida coastal barrier amendments, Senator GRAHAM. Georgia, Senator NUNN retiring, Chickamauga-Chattanooga. Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan—Montana, Lost Creek exchange; New Jersey, Sterling Forest; Senator MOYNIHAN in New York, Women's rights boundary adjustment, Sterling Forest; Virginia, Senator ROBB, Senator WARNER, Cumberland Gap boundary, Richmond Battlefield boundary adjustment, Shenandoah Valley Battlefield establishment.

That is why this is so cumbersome, because there are so many sections, 126 sections. West Virginia, West Virginia rivers, Senator BYRD.

I am absolutely at a loss. Maybe the administration simply feels that, somehow, they can put a spin on this that this is not important; or somehow the environmental community is not supporting the package in its entirety. There are a few items in here that probably the environmental community would not support. But when you put a package together in a democratic process it is a give and take, and that is why this package is together and not individually brought before the Senate, because holds were put on every single bill that came out of the committee. As the whip knows, as a member of the committee, we could not get anything to the floor because we had holds on every single bill that came out of this committee by the Senator from New Jersey, who saw fit to do that to influence the House. That issue was Sterling Forest, which I have always supported. I do not have any problem with Sterling Forest. It is a good piece of legislation. I want it to happen.

Now we are in the process of sacrificing everything, and I think, in these waning hours, it is very important the public understand where the responsibility has to lie. It has to lie at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, again, I thank my colleague from Alaska for his leadership. He has been very fair, No. 1, in putting this package together. As a member of the Energy Committee for many, many years, working with him, he has done a good job. I might say, most of these deal with our national parks. I think a lot of us like to consider ourselves big friends of the national parks. We like to enjoy them. You mentioned Shenandoah Park. You think of Yellowstone or you think of some of the other projects, Presidio next to San Francisco.

That is a project that a lot of people have been working on. The compromise package on Presidio is going to allow better management so the Federal Government is not writing checks, as we were, and utilization of the property is going to be a lot better for the public. Thinking of some of the other parks and systems that we have in this, to enhance the parks throughout our country is a good, significant investment. That is what we are trying to do by this bill.

I did talk to our colleague, Senator CAMPBELL, from Colorado, who, unfortunately, had a bad motorcycle accident and is not here. But he requested, he said, would you please help me try to pass some of these bills? I have been working on these for the last couple of years. I counted, I think, eight or nine bills dealing with Colorado and the parks and so on, some land exchanges, that are important to Colorado and really important to our country.

I told him I would try to help. I told the Senator from California I would try to pass Presidio. I want to do it.

There have been holds, primarily on the Democrat side, that have been blocking this bill for months. The Senator from Alaska has been trying to bring it up. Some of that dealt with the land in New Jersey.

That is in this bill. So we do need to pass it. I hope we can still find a way. I cannot imagine, when you have such strong bipartisan support, that we cannot find a way to do it. I am troubled by the administration's objection. I am troubled by the fact that they would come up with moving the goalposts.

They had objections before. The Senator from Alaska took those out. I urged him to take out, at some sacrifice to the Senator and to the State of Alaska, one of his largest year-round employers. And he made that sacrifice so we could pass this package. I compliment him for his willingness to make some sacrifice so we could enact a bill that would benefit most of the country.

Now, for the administration to come up with a lot of, I don't know, excuses, to object to that package? I hope they will relent. I hope they will reconsider. Because it will be a real shame not to be able to pass most all of this legislation that the Senator from Alaska has brought before the Senate.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I can ask my colleague a question, relative to what the possible motivation might be? Why will they not allow us as a body, bipartisan, to address this and resolve it by lifting the holds and letting us vote on it? Because the procedure is that it would come before the Senate. There would be, if it were in order, a vote to recommit back. If it prevails, then the Presidio and the entire omnibus package is dead.

We are being prevented from voting to make an ultimate determination of the disposition of the package. I tried to find out what possible explanation there might be. With this hold on it we

cannot move the conference report back to the House. It is my understanding, procedurally, in the House, someone could move to recommit. That would kill it in the House. But I have been assured by the Members in the House that is very unlikely to occur. It is doubtful it would even come up, but, procedurally, it would come back here, be subject to recommital, and we would have a vote so we could determine by a democratic process the disposition. But we are being precluded from that at this time.

Mr. NICKLES. To respond to the question of the Senator from Alaska, the parliamentary situation is such, in the last day or two of the Senate, a lot of things will not move unless you have unanimous consent. I know the Senator from Alaska has tried to get this bill up but there have been holds. There have been objections. Now I think we are at the place where we cannot bring this bill up unless we have unanimous consent.

We have an objection from the Democratic side. Maybe that will be removed. I hope that it will. I hope they realize what is at stake, and maybe it will be reconsidered. I am urging them to do so. I just think there are too many positive things for the entire country for us to let this fall.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the sections which I understand the administration is objecting to, so people can see.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SECTIONS DELETED

**216—Conveyance to City of Sumter Oregon (Hatfield):** Authorizes Secretary to convey 1.5 acres to City of Sumter Oregon for public purposes.

Parks—public purpose—this is supposed to be the people President—What in the world does he have against a place for kids to play.

**218—Shenandoah National Park (Robb/Warner/Biley/Wolf):** Adjusts 1923 Park boundary authorization to match today's existing park boundary.

White House Staff informs you that they would have reached the same conclusion on the boundary adjustment but they needed more process.

Doesn't take anything away from the park—old map authorized 500,000 acres—if we went to that limit there wouldn't be enough money in the Treasury to buy all the private farms and homes that would be in the park.

**219—Tulare conveyance (House GOP):** Affirms that land sold by the railroad to citizens in Tulare, California is free from any title problems.

This was an attempt to bring some stability and certainty to land ownership in the town of Tulare—this administration doesn't seem to care about the towns folks or their future.

**220—Alpine School District (Kyl, McCain):** 30 acres of land to the Alpine School District for a public school facility.

What in the world is wrong with supporting a school district and aiding in the education of school children—I thought this was the education President.

**223—Coastal barrier resource system (All Florida):** Transfers 40 acres of development property out of a 2.1 million acre undeveloped resource area.

This was what the Florida delegation and the Governor believes is best for their citizens—since this President knows better than the States “elected” officials what’s good for the people—there is certainly no longer a need for State level elected officials.

**224—Conveyance to Del Norte County Unified School District** (House California GOP): Transfers small acreage to the school district for educational purposes.

I guess that it now takes more than a village to raise a child—the title to the new book he is writing is “All You Really Need is a President to Raise a Child.”

**303—Alaska Peninsula subsurface consolidation** (Murkowski): Authorizes Secretary to exchange subsurface holdings of Koniag Corporation on an equal value for lands and interest owned by the federal govt. This will complete exchanges approved earlier.

It was this provision of the bill that caused the tax problem in the bill.

From this action I can only conclude that the President thinks it’s a “good” idea to have private in-holdings in national parks and refuges.

**304—Snow-Basin land exchange** (Hatch/Bennett/Hansen and all of Utah): This provision would allow expedited land exchange to facilitate the 2002 winter Olympics which would be an economic boom for the U.S. especially the west. This has been in the process for six years and have received nothing from the Clinton Administration.

I’m not sure what the President has against the Olympics or the people of Utah—maybe he would like to see the United States embarrassed in the eyes of the world.

**309—Sand Hollow exchange** (Hatch/Bennett): Equal value exchange to add acreage to Zion National Park and allows additional water to flow through the park.

His “own” people and the environmental community have pushed this exchange—what does this guy have against Utah!—all I can conclude is that a young Bill Clinton must have been pushed down by a big kid from Utah during recess.

**311—Land exchange city of Greely, Colorado** (Campbell/Brown):

Equal value exchange to secure property needed by city to secure ownership of the cities water supply.

Apparently this administration would like to manage the city of Greely’s water supply—having achieved world peace and cured the common cold they apparently are bored and need something to do—sorry Greely.

**312—Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve land exchange and boundary adjustment** (Murkowski, Knowles):

This exchange could have led to a more than 2 million acre expansion of the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve in AK—in Exchange for lands in the N.P.R.-A.

Since when is helping the national parks a bad idea in the Clinton administration—the only conclusion that can be drawn is that they don’t like it because its not their idea.

**313—Kenai Natives Association land exchange:**

This would facilitate exchange between KNA and the FWS to allow an Alaska Native Corp. to gain economic use of their land—this would be an acre-for-acre exchange.

There seems to be no rhyme or reason in the White House position—on one hand they don’t want to add two million acres to a national park and on the other they want to double the acreage put into a withdrawal.

**401—Cache la Poudre Corridor** (Campbell/Brown’s number #1 priority):

Establishes Corridor to interpret and protect unique and historical waterway.

All I can conclude from their refusal to support this action is that they don’t think the Cache la Poudre deserves to be protected—I guess the people of Colorado are

wrong in wanting to preserve an important piece of their history.

**405—RS2477** (Murkowski/Hatch/Bennett/Stevens):

Puts a moratorium on the putting new regulations in place without Congressional approval.

This is “just” moratorium language—the minority and the BLM negotiated this language with us—we were all in agreement.

**406—Hanford Reach Preservation** (Gorton/Doc Hastings):

Extends a moratorium on construction of any new dams or impoundments in this area.

Can we conclude from this action that Clinton “wants” to start building dams on the river.

**502—Vancouver National Historic Preserve** (Gorton/Murray):

Changes a historic site into a National Park.

Apparently Senator Gorton doesn’t know his constituents.

**602—Corinth, Mississippi Battlefield Act** (Lott):

Establishes a NPS civil war site in Mississippi.

Is there something wrong with honoring the events associated with the civil war in Mississippi?—or could it be that this is in Trent Lott’s State.

**603—Richmond National Battlefield Park** (Warner/Robb/Bliley/Wolf):

Establishes Boundary in accordance with new NPS management Plan dated 8/96.

Administration concerned about the process—this did not seem to bother them when he declared a national monument in Utah—no process!

**604—Revolutionary War** (Jeffords):

A study to determine if these sites warrant further protection.

Most of the problems we have had with this administration is that the leap before they think—I guess the idea of studying the need for something before doing it is a alien concept in the White House.

**607—Shenadoah Valley Battlefield** (Warner/Robb):

Establishes Historical Area. Does not make a new park.

This is what the delegation wants—can they not be trusted to determine what’s right for their own constituents.

**701—Ski area permits:**

Simplifies ski area fee collection.

This is supported by National Ski Association and western State elected officials.

**703—Visitor services:**

Would raise \$150 million dollars for parks to help with badly needed repairs of existing park structures. 100% of new fees go back to park.

Opposition to this provision is simply ridiculous—the Park Service needs these funds to maintain operations—this seems like a blatant attempt to tear down the national parks and blame the Congress.

**704—Glacier Bay National Park** (Murkowski):

Raises fees to support research and natural resource protection through a head tax on passenger vessels into Glacier Bay.

Never let it be said that this administration would let scientific data get between them and a political decision.

**803—Feral burros and horses** (Ashcroft and Bond):

Our bill would prevent the slaughter of horses by the N.P.S.

It’s not bad enough that the White House has declared an open hunting season on people in the West—now they want to shoot the horse they rode in on, too.

**806—Katmai National Park agreements** (Young):

Authorizes USGS to drill scientific core samples.

Volcanological research—what can be wrong with that—maybe Mr. Clinton needs to live at the base of an active volcano for a while to appreciate the need for volcano research.

**811—Expenditures of funds outside boundary of Rocky Mountain National Park** (Campbell/Brown):

Simply allows NPS to build a visitor center outside the park mostly with private funds.

The NPS has sought this for years—I guess that Mr. Clinton no longer even trusts his own park service.

**815—NPS administrative reform:**

Provides authorities NPS has requested for years—Aid park in protection of resources and provide facilities for employees. Provides Senate confirmation of NPS Director.

In keeping with that theme—not only does he not trust his park employees—now he wants them to live under substandard conditions.

**816—Mineral King** (Boxer/Feinstein):

Extends summer cabin leases. Totally discretionary by Secretary.

Again, the President does not trust his Secretary of the Interior or his Park Service folks to do the right thing—this bill gives them complete control.

**818—Calumet Ecological Park** (Simon/Mosley/Braun):

A study to Extend I and M canal National Heritage Corridor to incorporate a large portion of Chicago.

Not much to say about this one.

**819—Acquisition of certain property in Santa Cruz**

Goats are ruining this Island—provision in this bill would allow the NPS to remove goats from Island and restore to pristine conditions.

Those portions of the island that are not under government management look like Afghanistan—the remainder of this island needs to be protected.

**1021—Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park** (The only thing that Campbell wants. They are punishing him):

Formally creates a recreation area. Changes monument status to park. Creates a BLM Conservation area. Creates 22,000 acres of wilderness. Has all the four management agencies involved operating under one complex.

**1022—National Park Foundation: Park Foundation**—Murkowski/Lieberman/et. al. Provides for the opportunity for the Private Sector to sponsor the NPS similar to the sponsorship of the Olympic games. We have accepted Bumpers 6 amendments which clarify the sanctity of the NPS. Which clarifies that in no way the corporate entity can over commercialize the Park service system.

Can anybody deny that our national parks are in need of help and support and that Government funding is certainly not on the increase!

**1028—Mount Hood** (Hatfield): Exchange between private company and federal Gov’t. Provision is already in CR.

**1029—Creation of the Coquille Forest** (Hatfield): Already in CR. Equal value exchange creating a tribal forest.

**1034—Natchez National Historical Park** (Cochran): Creates an auxiliary area to a NPS unit and provides \$3 million for an intermodel transportation system and visitor system.

Is this administration opposed to creating less intrusive modes of transportation to allow more people to be able to enjoin the magnificent national park system—or are the just opposed to Republicans getting something for their home States?

**1036—Rural electric and telephone facilities:** Authorizes BLM to waive Right-of-way rental charges for small rural electric and phone cooperatives.

**1037—Federal borough recognition (PILT)** (Murkowski/Stevens): This allows the unorganized borough in Alaska to receive PILT payments. 60% of the federal lands in Alaska are in this borough. The Administration did not oppose this during committee and the language was worked out in cooperation with them.

The administration supported this in committee. This is a slap in the face to rural Alaskans who lose out of economic opportunities because of the massive amount of public lands in their backyards—what could possibly be the reason for opposing this—other than it is in a State that did not vote for the President.

**1038—Alternative processing** (Murkowski): This is an attempt to save the remaining jobs in SE Alaska.

Why doesn't the President just tell us, "I want the remaining jobs to go away and I want the communities to suffer." This is what he is doing.

**1039—Village Land Negotiations (Appendix C issue)** (Murkowski): This is an outright slap in the face of Alaska natives. This provision just asked the Secretary to talk to five tiny Alaskan villages who have waited more than 20 years to receive the land they were promised under ANCSA.

This is a classic example of the Federal Government giving the old bait-and-switch routine to America's native people and having no intention of ever making good on their promises.

**1040—Unrecognized communities in SE Alaska** (Murkowski): This merely let five communities in Alaska establish as a group or Urban corporation. It involved no land transfers. It was a Native Alaska equal right bill.

Another situation in which the Federal Government has turned its back on Alaska's Native people!

**1041—Gross brothers** (Murkowski): They served their country in uniform and now there country is denying them the land they homesteaded.

**1043—Credit for reconveyance** (Murkowski): This would have allowed Cape Fox Corporation to transfer 320 acres of land near the Beaver Falls Hydro project Back to the Forest Service. CFC would not have gotten any new lands in exchange.

Does the Federal Government oppose receiving land back?

**1044—Radio site report**

A study to determine if a existing radio site is needed.

**1045—Retention and maintenance of certain dams and weirs etc.**: Forces the Forest Service to maintain specific dams and weirs in the Immigrant Wilderness Area.

**1046—Matching land conveyance (University of Alaska)** (Murkowski): This authorized the Secretary of the Interior to discuss a land grant with the University of Alaska who has never received it's federal entitlement. On a matching basis with the state.

Once again the "Education President" strikes again and proves he is against education.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I will make one comment. Looking at the first one, authorizes the Secretary of Interior, I believe, to convey 1.5 acres to the city of Sumter, OR, for public purposes. Senator HATFIELD and Senator WYDEN, I am guessing, felt like this was important to the city of Sumter. I don't know. It is an acre and a half. I somewhat question why they are objecting to that. Senator HATFIELD is going to be retiring.

I am shocked, and I almost bet there has never been a veto threat or objection raised on that land before.

I see the Shenandoah National Park, adjust 1923 park boundary authorization to match today's existing park boundary. That seems to me to make sense.

We could go through this entire list. We already have entered it in the RECORD so people can see.

I have looked through this list, and there is no reason to veto this bill or to object to taking up this bill. To answer the question of my colleague from Alaska, I urge the minority to allow us to bring the bill up and vote. I will be shocked if we don't get 90 votes for this bill, 90-some votes, because there is no reason to object to this package, if you look at all the good things in this bill.

I am not totally knowledgeable of all 126 projects, but I have looked through the list, and what they are objecting to makes very, very little sense. My guess is—and I count votes on occasion—my guess is we will have overwhelming support. At least 80 or 90 percent of our colleagues would vote for passage of this package.

So I urge the minority leader to reconsider and talk to the administration and allow us to bring this bill up, pass it and let it become law this year.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if I can just share with my friend, the whip, the Senator from Oklahoma, relative to the roles that seem to be eroding here as authorizers, and as a member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, my friend from Oklahoma knows really what is happening here. It is almost like a line-item veto that is being dictated by the administration on this legislation, where we have met with them, taken out what they objected to, then they move the goalposts and come back with 46 more.

The constitutional structure of Government suggests the legislative body is involved in a process. Our process is hearings, input and movement on the bill. But they seem to come in and line-item veto or cherry-pick and say, "No, this is unacceptable."

If this continues, clearly the legislative responsibility that we have as authorizers is taken away. Of course, I have always had a concern about these items moving on to the appropriations bill, because the appropriators then become the authorizers as well, or they simply control the disposition.

It would seem to me that as a consequence of what happened this year in our committee, I refer to the experience and observation of my friend from Oklahoma, where every single bill that you try to move out results in a hold, that we are going to have to take some extreme means next year in the process, if we introduce this package and pass it out of committee, that if Members put holds on it, maybe the Senate is simply going to have to stop, maybe we are going to have to object to any unanimous consent agreement until we can get some kind of a restructuring so we can move bills as we report them out of committee, get them to the floor and get them to a vote. The disposition

should be determined by a vote, not one Member holding up 126 bills.

So that is my degree of frustration, having the responsibility of chairman of the committee and the authorizing responsibility. To be put in a position where I am subject to negotiations with the administration to spin off bills that we passed and reported out for those that they will take and those they won't take clearly puts them in a position of line-item veto and circumvents the responsibility that we have as authorizers.

I know there are a lot of Members out there who have bills that are very important to them who want some kind of exception from the package, but the problem I have is I hold a responsibility equally to Republicans and Democrats within the committee to do the best I can to get their bills collectively passed. When I get in the position of having to pick and choose because of the administration's dictate, it is very, very difficult, and I am not sure I want to proceed in that kind of a manner because it is simply not fair to all the Members. I would like the RECORD to note that.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator's comment. I agree with him. Hopefully, we will figure out a way to get through this impasse. I am going to work with the Senator from Alaska today to try and make that happen, but it has to happen today because I think the House will be leaving later this evening.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. This is the last chance. The bus has left. If we don't get this done, I am guessing by—well, I am guessing the House is going to probably finish around 6 with the CR.

Mr. NICKLES. Or before.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. So we probably don't have much more than an hour or an hour and a half to have a hold that is applicable now, put on by the Democrats at the dictate of the White House, and if we don't get this thing done now, it is going to be too late and there is not going to be a Presidio, there is not going to be a San Francisco Bay cleanup, there is not going to be Sterling Forest, there is not going to be the ski exchange, and we simply have to move now. It is now or never, and I implore my colleagues on the other side to look at the merits of this package in its entirety and let us vote on it. That is why we are here.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in today's paper, Saturday, September 28, from the Denver Post. The headline of the editorial is "Clinton's partisanship threatens lands bill."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Sept. 28, 1996]

**CLINTON'S PARTISANSHIP THREATENS LANDS BILL**

In an election, a certain number of power plays are expected. But the reasons President Clinton gave for threatening to veto an omnibus parks bill go beyond power politics to inject a dangerous level of partisanship into public lands policies.

A congressional conference committee already had stripped many of the most objectionable provisions from the bill, including an ill-advised grazing proposal. Most of the 126 projects that survived into the final version were noncontroversial.

Clinton, however, has labeled 45 of those remaining projects as unacceptable and threatened to veto the whole bill because of them. Of those, four are in Colorado.

Only one Colorado project had stirred much controversy previously: A deal would have let the U.S. Forest Service cede control of a reservoir whose water the city of Greeley wants, in exchange for Greeley giving the U.S. government some ranchland next to national forest property. Environmentalists feared the deal could let Greeley dry up streams near the reservoir. At the very least, the deal should wait until a pending study of the region's bypass flow issue has been completed.

But Clinton didn't cite only controversial projects as reasons for threatening to kill the bill. He also targeted mundane projects that enjoyed widespread bipartisan support.

For example, the bill would have funded construction of a new visitors center at the Fall River entrance of Rocky Mountain National Park, a project Clinton's own Interior Department had requested.

The president also objected to a deal that would have added 22,000 acres of wilderness to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and transformed it into a full-fledged national park. A series of lengthy public hearings already had resolved concerns about the national park designation.

Strangest of all, the White House spurned plans to protect a stretch of the Cache La Poudre River from development and to build a system of hiking, biking and horse-riding trails in the preserved open space. Environmental groups had joined the cities of Fort Collins and Greeley in support of the plan.

Now, the GOP is howling because the 45 projects on Clinton's hit list all happen to be sponsored by congressional Republicans. Clinton thus handed his foes a whole box of political ammunition that they will shoot back at him from now until Election Day.

If Clinton decided to veto the bill based on policy concerns, he has been poorly advised on the merits of the projects. If he is simply opposing projects as an election-year ploy, however, he may have committed a serious blunder in the eyes of many Colorado voters.

**Mr. NICKLES.** Madam President, looking through it, there are several projects in Colorado that are objected to. It says:

The President also objected to a deal that would have added 22,000 acres of wilderness to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and transformed it into a full-fledged national park. A series of lengthy public hearings already had resolved concerns about the national park designation.

That is just one. I know President Clinton stood outside of the Grand Canyon and had a big environmental picture day and talked about taking 1.8 million acres in Utah, without consulting the Utah delegation or the Utah

Governor. But I am looking at their reluctance to cooperate with us on this package as being a lot more detrimental, because this package does lots of things in all States, from California to New Jersey, including Colorado.

I just think there are some real inconsistencies here. I hope our colleagues will join us in working together to see if we can't pass this bill later today.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**TRIBUTE TO JOYCE McCLUNEY**

**Mr. LOTT.** Mr. President, I rise today to say thank you, and express my appreciation, on behalf of all Senators for the outstanding work of Joyce McCluney who has served this Government for 29 years. She was with Senator Bob Dole during his tenure both as minority leader and as majority leader of this body. For 9 years, she served as his office manager and coordinated the Senator's support team, an endless challenge of organization and detail that I am witnessing first hand now. Along with her other responsibilities, she spent countless hours making the complicated arrangements for visiting heads of state and foreign parliamentary delegations meeting with the Republican leader.

These past 2 years, Joyce served as Deputy Sergeant at Arms with Sergeant at Arms Howard O. Greene, Jr. Time and again, she demonstrated her foresight and excellent administrative skills in administering the Senate's largest, most technologically complex office in the U.S. Senate and her unquestionable support to all Senators in this body has been exemplary. She has just done an outstanding job.

She raised three children while she was accumulating outstanding career credentials. Her impressive resume includes assignments with the Senate Finance Committee, the White House, the Commerce Department, the State Department, and the offices of the leader of the U.S. Senate.

Joyce is retiring from the Senate and from Government. She plans a brief interlude of well-deserved rest and recreation and I know that in the near future she will contribute her many talents to new and exciting endeavors. Joyce McCluney takes with her many, many accolades for her achievements and the gratitude of everyone who benefited from her dedication to this institution. She leaves a legacy of outstanding contributions and a legion of friends and admirers. I want to thank Joyce McCluney for all she has done

for this institution and to wish the best of all good things in her future.

I extend best wishes to Joyce McCluney and express the appreciation of the Senate for her fine work.

**THE Calendar**

**Mr. LOTT.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed, en bloc, to the consideration of Calendar No. 579, which is H.R. 3660; Calendar No. 576, which is H.R. 1514; Calendar No. 476, which is H.R. 2967; and Calendar No. 475, which is H.R. 1823.

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

**Mr. LOTT.** Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be deemed read a third time, and passed, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

**RECLAMATION RECYCLING AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1996**

The bill (H.R. 3660) to make amendments to the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act, and for other purposes, and was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ACT OF 1996**

The bill (H.R. 1514) to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance safety, training, research, and development, and safety education in the propane gas industry for the benefit of propane consumers and the public, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**Mr. BUMPERS.** Mr. President, Senator THOMPSON and I would like to enter into a brief colloquy with the sponsor of this bill, Senator DOMENICI. Some concerns were raised in the last Congress, with respect to a similar bill, that such legislation might adversely affect users of propane by interfering with propane markets or artificially stimulating the demand for propane. Does the bill before us address these concerns?

**Mr. DOMENICI.** I thank my colleague from Arkansas for his question. He is correct that such concerns were raised, but the bill before the Senate today addresses these concerns. This bill includes changes that make clear that the Propane Research and Education Council [PERC], which is created by this bill, is not a marketing and promotion agency, but rather a research and educational one. It also caps the level of funding that can be committed to motor fuel uses of propane, which is