

out in the press here, but did come out in the press in Madrid in the ABC newspaper, which is one of the most prestigious and oldest newspapers in Madrid.

A doctor in Cuba in charge of the AIDS center in Santiago, Las Vegas, near Havana, has admitted that over 100 young people in Cuba have been injected with the AIDS virus in an experiment; that 90 percent of them have died; that they were told that, at the time they were injected, that there was a good chance that there would be a vaccine, a cure, developed before anything would happen to them, and that in the interim, they would be in a five-star luxury resort.

This is an admission by Dr. Jorge Perez, the director of the AIDS treatment center at Santiago Las Vegas in Havana. I have heard nothing from the national media in the United States, nothing on CNN, and yet an admission from this Cuban doctor was published in the ABC newspaper, this monstrosity.

The doctor said, "We sinned from paternalism by presenting the AIDS detention center as a paradise." This monstrosity is something that I think the media has an obligation to bring to the international community and that the national media in the United States has an obligation to bring to the American people.

What we have, Mr. Speaker, is a tyrant whose jokes continue to be laughed at and his beard caressed by even some of our colleagues who go and visit there occasionally and laugh at his jokes, while his crimes are not even reported. The American people are not told about what he is doing.

Nevertheless, the instinct, the sense that the American people have about the fact that that tyrant is an enemy of the United States and a hater of his own people, is very strong and something that I think that history will see as a distinguishing characteristic of the American people, that ever wise, deeply wise American people.

Of course, the Cuban people will always be grateful for the sense of solidarity that has always come in that distinctive way from the people of this great Nation, the United States of America. I want to thank Assistant Secretary Jeffrey Davidow for stating, and I read it today, his remarks: "The hemisphere cannot reach its potential, cannot become whole, cannot be fully democratic, cannot fully confront the realities of economic globalism or meet the challenges of crime, narcotics, human rights abuses, and other transnational issues, when one nation, Cuba, remains undemocratic."

I thank him for that statement. It rings out as distinctive in this world, which demonstrates consistently such lack of solidarity and such lack of care, such lack of concern, such lack of awareness toward what is happening in the holocaust occurring 90 miles to that unarmed people, the Cuban people.

I think that obviously much more must be said, but, nevertheless, the

statements of Secretary Davidow are to be commended and thanked. We will continue speaking, Mr. Speaker, on the reality of the Cuban tyranny, on human rights violations, on the fact that there is a cover-up going on by the Government, President Clinton, against the drug smuggling activities that the Cuban tyrant has engaged in.

My colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DAN BURTON, and the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and I wrote a letter to General McCaffrey, the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, back in November, with page after page of evidence, and including other unclassified evidence that we have of Castro's participation in the drug trade.

We were very disappointed with his lack of response and also the lack of response of other agencies. There should be no contradiction between what the field people in south Florida tell us, and they have told us on tape of the fact that over 50 percent of the cocaine that comes into the United States in the Caribbean comes through or by Castro's Cuba, and the cover-up that we see time and time again from the top of the DEA and the White House.

That is unacceptable, and we are going to continue to talk about that, and we are going to have another Special Order soon specifically limited to this evidence that is being covered up of Castro's participation in the drug trade.

This is poisoning the youth of America, and for whatever reasons, of appeasement, of not wanting to confront Castro, a fear that he will release refugees, or whatever the fear is caused by, that appeasement is caused by, that simply inexcusable that there is a cover-up of that dictatorship's participation in the drug trade.

So we will have another of these Special Orders in the next weeks, specifically on the evidence of Castro's participation in the drug trade and, thus, the cover-up that is occurring by the administration of the evidence that it knows, it has, of Castro's participation in the drug trade.

Suffice it to say at this point that there is an indictment ready to be filed by the U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Florida charging the Cuban Government as a racketeering enterprise, and 15 members of the hierarchy of the Cuban dictatorship, charging them with cocaine trafficking into the United States, and that because of a political decision, that indictment was put into a drawer and it has been hidden. It has not been authorized to be issued.

In addition to that, a drug trafficker who was arrested last year not only implicated Castro personally in multiple drug deals but agreed to go in under surveillance and do another deal with Castro, and the administration has shut that up as well.

So we will continue to talk about these subjects. The American people deserve it.

THE DANGERS OF THE PROPOSAL OF THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO INTRODUCE GRIZZLY BEARS INTO IDAHO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for approximately 35 minutes, half the remaining time until midnight.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am taken with the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART]. He truly is a freedom-fighter, and I am very pleased that he brought these comments to the attention of the American people.

I want to speak on an entirely different issue, in an entirely different area of the world. I would like to begin my comments tonight, Mr. Speaker, with a joke. Members may have heard the joke. A preacher was being chased down the mountain by a grizzly bear. Just as the bear was about to catch him, the preacher fell to his knees and made a plea to God. He said, Oh, Lord, I implore you to make a Christian out of this bear. Shortly after this prayer, the grizzly bear immediately fell to his knees and proclaimed, Dear Lord, please bless this food I am about to eat.

Mr. Speaker, that was a joke, but, unfortunately, what I am about to share with Members tonight is not a joke, it is reality. I rise this evening to speak about the proposed introduction of these man-eating animals in my State.

Yes, that is true. I would say to my colleagues who are listening, if they have ever wondered why many Members in the West like me have real concerns about the current implementation of the Endangered Species Act, I beseech them to listen attentively to my comments. I think only then Members will begin to understand the sense of sometimes the absurd manner in which this act is being carried out by the Federal agencies. If there ever was an example of how out of touch our extreme environmental policies have become, this is it.

Quite simply, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has actually prepared a plan to introduce grizzly bears, known by their Latin name as *ursus horribilis*, into a huge portion of my district.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain to the Members what the implications are of this proposal to the management policies of a significant portion of the State of Idaho. To help illustrate my point, I would like to draw Members' attention to this rather large map of Idaho that has marked in it the area that the Fish and Wildlife Service has designated as the recovery area for the grizzly bear under their plan to introduce the bear back into the State.

As we can see, this is an enormous area. It is almost 28.5 million acres. It includes 14 counties populated by nearly a quarter of a million people and has at least 13.2 million visitors a year. It is over one-third of the State of Idaho.

The grizzly bear recovery area runs very close to Boise, ID. It includes an area that has our University of Idaho in it. It has many populated areas in this area. Just to give Members an idea about how big this area is, let me give a comparison. In this area we could fit the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island, into this area that we see colored in red on this map, plus have over 1 million acres to spare.

How would the introduction of the grizzly bear affect this massive area? The grizzly bear, in terms of management, is unlike any other species. In short, it is a huge and dangerous animal, and that is a huge and dangerous problem for us. The grizzly bear is, by its nature, a large predatory mammal that, provoked or unprovoked, can move very quickly to viciously attack a human or an animal. In addition, the grizzly has special dietary needs and requires a vast amount of area for its habitat, which can range between 10 square miles and 168 square miles, depending on the availability of food.

The Wildlife Management Institute states in its book "Big Game of North America, Ecology and Management," that, and I quote, "For most species, protection is an uncomplicated and effective method of preservation. When bears are totally protected, however, some individual bears can be aggressive towards people or cause damage to livestock and property, which makes imperative a different form of management."

The book cites several distinct human-related activities grizzly bear management needs to address in favor of the grizzly bear. These management considerations include the construction of town sites and populated areas, which by the way, already exist; campgrounds, which already exist; trails; roads; storage of food or bait, and garbage disposal; the allowance of too many people into prime bear habitat for a multitude of activity, such as simple living, hiking, fishing, hunting, camping, livestock management, and the allocation of space for forage, and other resources in areas heavily used by both bears and humans.

In essence, what introducing the unpredictable grizzly bear under the full protection of the Endangered Species Act means is that this large area that we see blocked in this map will experience a complete change in its lifestyle. People will not be able to behave or work in the way they used to in this area, in this part of Idaho. Roads normally open will be shut down. Hiking trails will be restricted. Camping areas will be closed. Hunting will be restricted. Livestock and logging practices will be dramatically altered.

All in all, in order for the bears to survive and diminish human risk, hundreds of square miles at any given time, depending on where the bear roams, would either have to be shut down or have human activity severely restricted.

Let me quote from a very interesting book about the behavior of grizzly bears, in a book titled "Alaska Bear Tales." The book states that, "A bear's nature is definitely interesting and different. They have their own individuality. No two bears will do the same thing in a given situation, and a bear may not do the same thing twice. But then again, though there will always be exceptions to the last statement, it would serve us well to commit it to memory."

I ask Members, Mr. Speaker, if every individual bear's behavior is so different, how in the world can the bureaucrats begin to come up with any workable management scheme for bears? It is just not going to work.

How does the Fish and Wildlife Service intend to answer that question? Their only answer is, and I will tell the Members straight out, it is by shutting down human activity in the area that we see on this colored map.

□ 2300

The changes would result from the existence of protected grizzly bears that would dramatically alter the management of this area in Idaho and some in Montana. This is an absolute perversion of the Endangered Species Act. This is a perfect example of how the legitimate goals of the act, once supported by almost everyone, have been twisted to fit the whims of a few who have a different view on how our land should be managed. It is a ploy that those who are directly affected by this misapplication of the act have come to resent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to expound further on a very important element of the grizzly bear introduction and that is the danger these predators present to human beings. This aspect brings the grizzly bear introduction into a whole new realm of incomprehensibility of purpose and unmeasured cost.

Mr. Speaker, it is an undisputed fact that the grizzly bears tend to possess a propensity of violence toward humans and animals. As the Fish and Wildlife Service well documents, grizzly bears were almost exterminated from the lower 48 States, and this was not because there was a market for their fur or for their meat, because there was not, but simply because individuals who settled in the Great Plains in Idaho, Montana and California, whose flags bear the picture of an emblem of the grizzly bear, they all sought protection for their families and their domestic animals from what in their minds was the most terrifying of all animals in America.

While settlers may have recognized the majesty of these animals, they realized the horrible threat that they were, and there was no Federal act that stopped them from taking action to eliminate this threat. Thank goodness. Lewis and Clark described in their journals the absolute terror that they and the Indians had for these animals, the extreme frustration that

they felt when they could not successfully kill the animals, even with several shots fired from their 18th century guns.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important in looking at this issue to share just how vicious the grizzly bears are to human beings. Let me warn you, what I am going to speak about is a bit gruesome but it is a real factor in this issue and it needs to be laid out there.

An adult grisly can weigh as much as 450 pounds. It can run up to 40 miles an hour over irregular terrain. It has a keen sense of hearing and an even keener sense of smell. The teeth are large and very, very sturdy, especially the canines, and although they are not particularly sharp, the power of the jaw muscles allow them to readily penetrate deep into soft tissues and to fracture facial bones and bones of the hand and forearm with ease.

The resulting trauma is characteristically a result of punctures with sheering, tearing, and crushing force. Claws on the front pads can be as long as human fingers and can produce significant soft tissue damage in a scraping maneuver that results in deep parallel gashes. The bear paw is capable of delivering powerful forces, resulting in significant blunt trauma, particularly to the head and the neck region, the rib cage and the abdomen.

In many reported cases bears attack and then they begin to back off and wait and watch and again resume mauling the victim, sometimes going for the head, especially if they see movement.

The bears then wait and watch, once again, and then swipe claws across the genital areas to test signs of life. And this is typical. An unarmed person's only defense, say the experts, is to play dead and whatever, the experts advise, do not move. Unfortunately, if a bear is hungry or angered or if you happen to be between a bear and a cub or a pile of food, you may not have time to get down and play dead. When one studies bear attacks, it is easy to see why humans have developed a healthy fear of these animals.

Let me also note that while it is an unusual occurrence, grizzly bear attacks on humans do continue on a regular basis in areas where the bear exists. That is why we do not want it to exist in Idaho.

Grizzly bears have not become kinder and gentler with age. In fact, in the past few years, because more people are recreating in our forests and lands, documented attacks have increased.

Let me share with you some of these recent occurrences. In early September 1996, an individual hunting elk in an area a few miles north of Yellowstone was attacked without provocation. He was with another hunter, questioning the notion that bears only attacked individuals who are alone, and had part of his biceps bitten off.

In Alaska, where grizzly bear attacks occur on a regular basis, recently a

woman and her husband were back-packing in a wilderness area near Fairbanks. The woman was attacked by a grizzly which resulted in her facial bones being smashed, her nose missing, her scalp shredded or gone, massive wounds in her legs and buttocks.

Also an American woman is suing the Canadian Government because of emotional and physical scars left from a grizzly rampage at a Canadian park campgrounds in 1995. A number of unreported bear encounters occurred shortly before the ranger and friends had their tents ripped through and were attacked by grizzly bears early in the morning, and the attack left the ranger with a number of disfiguring scars.

In August 1996, a man on a hiking trip was killed by a grizzly bear in Alaska. The man and his friends had taken all the suggested precautions in going into known bear country, such as wearing bear bells and making noise while they hiked through the brush. The attack was quick and the man was killed very rapidly.

In June 1996, an elderly man hiking a common trail in Glacier National Park while taking a rest was attacked by a grizzly bear leaving a gash in his scalp, a trail of holes down his back, and a broken leg bone. Park officials determined that the man had inadvertently invaded the bear's space and, therefore, it did not need to be relocated or killed.

In August 1996, an experienced back-packer was killed in the Yukon Territory by a grizzly bear. And in October 1995, a man hiking in British Columbia was attacked by a bear after taking off his shoes and socks near a stream. Also in October 1995, two hunters were killed by three grizzly bears in British Columbia and they were carrying out a carcass of elk. You cannot possibly expect to hunt, dress out game, and pack it out without having blood on your hands, blood on your clothes, an immediate attraction for grizzly bears.

In August 1996, a 9-year-old, 550-pound grizzly bear near the Yellowstone area was finally destroyed by park officials after killing dozens of cattle, preying on 10 calves alone in the 2 weeks before it was put to death. Since 1990, there have been 17 grizzly bear maulings in Glacier National Park, 5 maulings in Yellowstone Park.

One very compelling story is that of an 18-year-old boy, living not far from my district in Broadus, MT. His name is Bram Shaffer. He was hunting near Horseshoe Mountain, 10 miles north of Yellowstone, and he was walking along quietly, not calling out and certainly no bear calls, keeping his eyes mostly on the ground, when he stepped out of the stand of trees to find a grizzly bear already charging him. The 18-year-old had time to take four desperate steps, trying to get out of the way, when Bram's head was suddenly in the bear's mouth and then Bram later wrote, she threw me to the ground and started chewing on me like I was a big dog

bone. She had my left thigh in her mouth, and she was shaking me around like a dog would a dish towel.

When it was over, Bram was alone in the woods. It was getting dark and beginning to rain. The temperature near freezing. The bear had bitten a chunk of meat from his right side under his arm about the size of a football. One hand and wrist were chewed up. The scalp was open to the bone. He was covered with blood but worst of all was his left thigh. It looked like someone had taken an axe to it again and again. Most of the big muscle that runs down the front of the thigh was hanging out of his jeans, peeled back from his leg for much of its length.

Most of us would have fainted at that sight but Bram tucked the muscle back in his jeans as best he could and tied it up with his hunting vest. He got up and he found that while he could not bend the leg, he could walk stiff legged using his wounded left knee as kind of a peg. He could not go uphill but he could go downhill and he had his rifle and 9 rounds so he knew he could fire signal shots and he knew they would come looking for him. Even after rescue, many hours later, his nightmare was not over. He waged a war against gangrene. As his doctors explained a bear's mouth is notoriously foul, especially one that had been feeding on intestines. But Bram managed to survive and after three operations expert surgeons managed to save his leg. About 35 percent of his thigh is simply gone. He walks with the help of crutches and will likely have a severe limp for the rest of his life.

Mr. Speaker, when I presented these types of concerns about human risk to the Fish and Wildlife Service at a recent hearing I held in the House Subcommittee on Forest and Forest Health, I was quite dumbfounded at the response that I was given by the officials in charge of this program. I asked them if they knew that there was a known killer in the forest, would they allow that killer to remain there to cause harm to human life and limb?

They, too, recognized the danger of grizzly bears. However, they brushed the threat off as being rare and part of the thrill of being in the wild. They rationalized that putting grizzly bears in the woods only makes it a part of the other natural dangers that anyone must contend with when they venture out into the wide open. Even with their plan they estimate that there could be about one human injury or death each year.

Let me repeat, the Fish and Wildlife Service is planning for about one human injury that could result in death due to the grizzly every single year.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I was mystified by that response. I ask this House, Mr. Speaker, is introducing this predator, one that is not threatened with extinction, worth the cost of even one human life? Is it worth even the cost Bram Shaffer and his family have had to pay for his injuries?

Mr. Speaker, using this same logic introducing the grizzlies into Idaho is like pouring toxic substance into a water supply. It may only kill one in 10,000 or so, but it still is not a good thing to do. And in addition, knowingly doing this makes one liable for serious personal injury claims involving negligent disregard for human life and safety. I would like to share with you how a dangerous instrumentality is defined by law. Keep in mind that these are the types of definitions created through case law that are used when liability cases are considered in court.

The Black's Law Dictionary defines a dangerous instrumentality as anything which has the inherent capacity to place people in peril, either in itself or by careless use of it. Due care must be used to avoid injury to those reasonably expected to be in proximity. And it goes on to say, "in certain cases absolute liability may be imposed."

Mr. Speaker, based on what I have described to you, can introducing the deadly grizzly bear into the human environment be construed to mean anything differently than the inherent capacity to place people who are in the proximity in peril? I think not.

What this clearly means to me is that introducing a dangerous predator in a human environment will undoubtedly open up the prospect of making the Government or its personnel liable in courts from any resulting death or injury. This could potentially be very costly to the taxpayers.

Let me say for the record, Mr. Speaker, not one human death or injury resulting from a grizzly bear attack is acceptable to this Congressman. In fact, it should not be accepted by anyone who values human life. I do not want to have to stand up before a spouse, a parent, a child, brother, or sister who have lost their loved one because of a rare occurring brutal grizzly bear attack and explain that this tragedy would not have occurred had we not introduced this dangerous animal into Idaho in the first place.

□ 2315

In addition, for those who visit and work in this beautiful area, the threat of abrupt death or injury, no matter how unlikely it may seem, will also always be in the back of their minds. When we hike on our trails, when we sleep in our tents or go about our business, we will always have to contend with the possibility that we have accidentally stepped in the pathway between a mother grizzly and her cub, an often fatal error.

Mr. Speaker, with all of the concerns that I have shared tonight, and believe me this is not an easy special order speech to give because it is so unpleasant, but it should come as no small wonder that the opposition in Idaho against this misguided proposal is overwhelming and decisive. In fact, every single elected official in Idaho, and that includes the entire congressional delegation, the Governor, the

entire State House, the Attorney General, every State legislator, with the exception of one who voted against a resolution opposing the grizzly bear introduction, all the county commissioners, the sheriffs, so on and so forth, are adamantly opposed to the introduction of grizzly bears even as an experimental population.

And, remember, Mr. Speaker, they are not in danger of extinction. Even the head of the Idaho Fish and Game Department has publicly stated that, under the direction of the Governor, he will not issue permits to allow the bears into this State, and yet the program goes on. This is utter arrogance, utter nonsense, and a total misexpenditure of the American taxpayer.

In addition, 90 percent of the people who live, recreate and work in the affected area are dead set against this proposal. Campers and hikers are concerned, for obvious safety reasons, and because many of the trails in areas would be made off limits. Hunters are also concerned about dramatic reductions in the game animal population. Ranchers are concerned about loss of cattle and road closures, and private property owners are deeply concerned about bears foraging too close to their homes.

Overall, people are not only afraid of the immediate threat, and I mean afraid of the immediate threat of having bears in their backyards, but also being subject to severe restrictions in accessing the forest and lands both for recreational and industrial purposes.

Mr. Speaker, what part of "no" does the Fish and Wildlife not understand about this crazy program? Amazingly, despite being fully aware of the State's solidarity against their proposal, the Fish and Wildlife Service is moving forward with their plans to introduce these bears. What is even more incredible and even more unbelievable is that the way they are addressing the State's concerns.

The preferred alternative for the introduction of the bear is to turn the day-to-day management of these animals over to the State and community as part of a citizens management committee. I can tell my colleagues the State does not want them. But what that really means is that the management and enforcement of an ill-advised and hazard-filled program will be passed to individuals, some of whom have strenuously opposed the very idea of introduction from the beginning.

On its face, it is utterly preposterous. How will the local citizens feel when their county government has to close numerous roads and trails because it is bear habitat, grizzly bear habitat? Will the local governments be able to handle the cost of litigation coming from groups seeking costs of damages caused by the bear, or from environmental groups who feel that there are not enough restrictions on land use?

How will local law enforcement deal with the dilemma of prosecuting a

rancher who has killed one of the bears to protect his livestock? My colleagues may say the Endangered Species Act allows for ranchers to protect their property or their life. Well, ask John Schuler, a rancher in Montana, who early one February morning was awakened to the unmistakable sound of a grizzly bear in his sheep pens. He got up and went outside and fired a couple of shots and, sure enough, a couple of grizzlies bounded out of the sheep pens, and the sheep were piling up on one end.

Well, John Schuler stayed out there for 2 or 3 hours with the sheep and he did not see any more signs of the grizzly so he decided to go back to get an hour or so of sleep before dawn. As he was going back to his house, suddenly out of the dark rose a grizzly bear with his paws in the air and he growled. John Schuler did what any human being would do with a gun in his hand: He shot the bear.

Well, the bear came down, and there was no stirring or movement, so John Schuler went on and went ahead to his home to get a couple of winks of sleep, deciding he would take care of the carcass, notify the proper agencies in the morning, and so he did. But when he came out in the morning the grizzly bear was gone and all there was was a trail of blood into the woods.

Well, John Schuler got his gun and dogs and went into the woods. He had not been there long when a wounded grizzly bear charged him, bent on killing John Schuler. Well, this time John Schuler shot the bear and made sure that the bear was dead. He notified the agencies and they came out and did the necessary investigation. And lo and behold, Fish and Wildlife Service sued John Schuler for the intentional taking of an endangered species.

One might think that case would be easy to defend. In fact, one of America's finest litigating organizations, the Mountain States Legal Foundation, defended John Schuler. But in the lower court they lost, and that issue is on appeal now. But they lost and John Schuler was fined.

The judge reasoned that when John Schuler shot the bear, when the bear rose up and growled at him when he was going back to his home, the judge reasoned that that was a greeting; a greeting, Mr. Speaker. And what about when the bear came out of the bushes bent on killing John Schuler? Did he not have a right to defend his life? Well, the judge reasoned that the bear was provoked by John Schuler's actions the night before, and so the bear was doing only what bears normally do when they are provoked: They kill humans.

No, we must do something in this Congress to make sure that we begin to put the Endangered Species Act back on a stable and focused plan.

I would like to make one last point, Mr. Speaker, that even makes this whole idea absurd. The introduction of the grizzly bear into Idaho is not even

necessary, as I have said before, for their survival or even the recovery of the species. Let me say that again. For the fourth time, the introduction of the grizzly bear in Idaho is not even necessary for their survival or even the recovery of the species.

The agency has arbitrarily chosen this area to introduce grizzly bears, not because the species is in danger of extinction but because they have determined this area is suitable habitat and historically inhabited by grizzly bears.

Just wait, Mr. Speaker, until they try to introduce the grizzly bear into the Great Plains or California. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, grizzly bears currently inhabit and are beginning to thrive in such areas as Yellowstone Park and the Cabinet-Yaak Mountains in Montana, and are already currently protected by the Endangered Species Act. In addition, the grizzly bear numbers in the tens of thousands in Canada and Alaska.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, where *ursus horribilis* exists, there is no threat of extinction. However, because they are not where the Government thinks they may have possibly existed, and where the Government thinks in their misguided wisdom that they should be now, which according to the Fish and Wildlife Service is most of the Western United States, the Endangered Species Act requires them to expend taxpayer resources to eventually return them to these areas, or so they think the ESA requires them.

This, in my opinion, is not an appropriate utilization of the act or taxpayers' money. In fact, I would like to read from the act itself, the section that delineates the process of introducing experimental populations which the Service is citing as their authority for this proposed action.

It states: "Before authorizing the release of any experimental population, the Secretary shall by regulation identify the population and determine, on the best available information, whether or not such a population is essential to the continued existence of an endangered species or a threatened species."

Mr. Speaker, is the introduction of the grizzly bear into the Bitterroot area in Idaho essential to the continued existence of the grizzly bear as required by this section? Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

Further, it might surprise my colleagues to know that when ESA was reauthorized in 1978, the Congress was concerned about the unnecessary expansion, back then, 9 years ago, the unnecessary expansion of the grizzly bear habitat in the West, and even addressed this concern in the committee report that accompanied the act.

That is surprising, is it not? Allow me to read from the 1978 congressional report.

"The committee is particularly concerned about the implications of this policy where extremely large land areas are involved in a critical habitat designation. For example, as much as

10 million acres of Forest Service land is involved in a critical habitat being proposed for the grizzly bear in the Western United States. Much of the land involved in this proposed designation is not habitat that is necessary for the continued survival of the bear."

We do not have just 10 million acres, Mr. Speaker, that they are proposing here. We can set five eastern States inside this area. Clearly, the agency is ignoring what the congressional intent is and what the Congress specifically addressed in 1978, and clearly Congress had in mind the unnecessary expansion of grizzly habitat when it reauthorized the Endangered Species Act in 1978.

The real question is why the agencies blatantly disregard the explicit congressional intent in this matter and have moved forward in designating this massive area in Idaho and Montana for the grizzly bear, driven on by special interest national environmental groups.

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that any Member of this Chamber, whether they are Democrat or Republican, eastern or western, conservative or liberal, if faced with the possibility of having *ursus horribilis* introduced into their district, I would be happy if they would stand up, as I have, and vigorously object to this. If there is one in this body who feel that they could defend having the bears in their district, please see me and I think we can arrange something. Somehow, I doubt that there is such a Member.

If Members are among those who would oppose this action in their district, then I would implore them, any of the Members of this body, to join me in stopping this completely unnecessary and costly action from happening in my district. They can do so by cosponsoring H.R. 2162, a bill that I have introduced that simply would prohibit the reintroduction of grizzly bears into the Bitterroot ecosystem in east central Idaho.

With my colleagues' help we can stop this nonsense by the Fish and Wildlife Service and work on a more legitimate use of the Endangered Species Act. Continuing these efforts to introduce dangerous predators where millions of people live and work will only serve to give ESA another black eye and turn more people against the environmental policies of this administration.

I hope that in my speech tonight, that I have been able to educate my colleagues with some very strong evidence of how the policies instituted under the Endangered Species Act have completely gone adrift. I also hope that it will drive my colleagues, as it has me, to come together and to rein in this extreme environmental policy that we now see running rampant in some of our agencies, and come up with one that addresses the real needs of our environment, while at the same time respecting the lives and livelihoods of those who are affected by our environmental policies.

It can be done, Mr. Speaker. It must be done. And with all of our help, working together, it will be done.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORBES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of his father's death.

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Ms. EVANS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 7 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of airline cancellation due to inclement weather.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request, of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Mr. HILL, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on July 29.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CLAYTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEFazio.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mrs. CARSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. CONYERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CHENOWETH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. GREEN.

#### SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 833. An act to designate the Federal building courthouse at Public Square and Superior Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Howard M. Metzenbaum United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1000. An act to designate the United States courthouse at 500 State Avenue in Kansas City, Kansas, as the "Robert J. Dole United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1043. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at the corner of Las Vegas Boulevard and Clark Avenue in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution urging the United States Trade Representative immediately to take all appropriate action with regards to Mexico's imposition of antidumping duties on United States high fructose corn syrup; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 2330

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 29, 1997, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4367. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information [No. LS-97-002] received July 23, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4368. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order [FV-96-706FR] received July 23, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4369. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting