

of those points. Take for example a March 25, 1996 E-mail message about the proposed Utah national monument from Katy McGinty that said this:

"I do think there is a danger of abuse of the withdrawal, especially because these lands are not really endangered." There we have it, in Katy McGinty's own words. The administration did not think the land was in any real danger or in any jeopardy.

Okay, so the administration did not really think the lands involved were in any real danger. Let us just ignore that for a moment and pretend that the lands were in some sort of danger and ask ourselves if creating a monument out of these lands was a good idea.

Does it stop coal mining in the area? No. You can still mine. Does it stop mineral development? No. Conoco is drilling oil wells on the Grand Staircase-Escalante right now. Does it stop grazing on the land? No. Does it stop people from visiting the area? No. Quite to the contrary, people are coming by the millions now to see it. Roads are all over the place since Bill Clinton created this to protect the land. What a joke.

What is the administration talking about when they say they needed to create a national monument to protect these lands? The land was not in any danger, and even if it were, a national monument was the least effective tool.

All right, so we have seen the administration did not create the monument because they thought the land was in any danger. Why did they do it then? They thought it would help Bill Clinton with the upcoming presidential election. Katy McGinty wrote to Leon Panetta on September 9, 1996 and said: "The political purpose of the Utah event is to show the President's willingness to use his office to protect the environment."

Clinton figured he could get some extra votes from the environmentalists around the country at very little cost. He figured it might give him an edge in some of the close states. He picked Utah for his stunt because he knew he didn't have a snowball's chance in Hades of winning the state. He was probably still a little sore about the fact that during the 1992 election Utah was the only state where he came in third place. There you are. Free environmental votes in 49 states and the 50th state he didn't have a chance at winning anyway.

Why did he pick the National Monument idea when it actually protected the land less than the other options available to him? . . . Because it was more dramatic. Most armchair environmentalists don't understand the complexities of natural resource law. It just wouldn't have had the same effect if Clinton would have had the Secretary of Interior sit at his desk and say "pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1701 §204(e), I hereby withdraw the Kaiparowits plateau from mineral entry under 30 U.S.C. 22." No, it wouldn't have been nearly as picturesque. The armchair environmentalist would have scratched his head and switched the channel to catch the second half of the Steelers-Broncos game. No, the Clinton administration needed to do something dramatic to get

their votes. Bill Clinton needed to stand there overlooking the Grand Canyon, with the wind blowing through his hair, telling everyone how he was following in Teddy Roosevelt's footsteps and saving the land by creating a new national monument. How profound. How courageous. It kind of brings a tear to the eye, doesn't it. Never mind the fact that creating this monument didn't really achieve any of the administration's stated objectives. Chances were that no one would figure that out until after the election anyway.

Well, people are starting to figure it out now. For instance, last week I read an article in the Salt Lake Tribune where a spokesman for the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance called Clinton and Gore "election-year environmentalists" because CONOCO is being allowed to drill for oil in the monument. Remember, these are the same people that were cheering and crying and hugging each other at the Grand Canyon a year ago. Today they are beginning to realize that they were all duped—that this was nothing but an election year stunt and that national monument status doesn't do anything for their cause.

Many people have asked me why we passed the Antiquities Act in the first place if it allows this kind of abuse. Well, the answer is that the people that passed it didn't anticipate these kinds of problems. The Antiquities Act was passed back when we had very few environmental laws and few ways to preserve our lands.

The language of the Antiquities Act allows presidents to "declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest . . . to be national monuments". The size of such withdrawals would be in all cases "confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected."

Notice two very important points here. First, the Antiquities Act was designed to preserve specific objects. Second, it mandated that the President use the smallest amount of land necessary to preserve those specific objects. Using this criteria, let's look at three national monuments that have been declared by presidents in the past.

How about Devils Tower National Monument, proclaimed by Theodore Roosevelt in 1906? What does it protect? . . . It protects a 865-foot tower of columnar rock in Wyoming. This basalt tower is the remains of an ancient volcanic intrusion. . . . O.K. we have a specific recognizable object that is being protected here. Sounds like it meets the criteria. How much land is included in the monument? 1,347 acres. Sounds pretty reasonable.

How about Statue of Liberty National Monument, proclaimed in 1924 by Calvin Coolidge? What does it protect? . . . Statue of Liberty National Monument protects the famous 152-foot copper statue bearing the torch of freedom. The statue was a gift from the French people in 1886 to commemorate the alliance between France and the United States during the American Revolution. Seen by millions of immigrants as they came to the new world, it has become famous as a symbol of freedom. How much land? . . . 59 acres. Wow. That sounds pretty good.

O.K. Just to be fair, let's look at the new Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, proclaimed in 1996 by William Jefferson Clinton. What objects does it protect? . . .

Hmmmm . . . Come to think of it, I have absolutely no idea . . . Do you? . . . Does anyone? . . . O.K. forget that question for a minute, and let's look at how much land we need to protect these "objects" that no one can name . . . 1.7 million acres . . . One Million Seven Hundred Thousand acres!!!! . . . Wouldn't you say that's maybe just a little bit excessive. That's about as much land as the states of Delaware and Rhode Island combined! There's no way anyone could possibly tell me this is the smallest amount of land necessary to protect whatever those "objects" are that no one can name.

I think that people intuitively know what national monuments are all about. During the past year I've spent quite a bit of time on that land. People kept coming up to me and asking where the monument was. I told them "you're standing on it". They looked at me incredulously and said "what am I supposed to look at?" You see, they know that national monuments are supposed to protect specific objects, and they want someone to show them those objects. I don't know what to tell them? The best I can do is say "Darned if I know. Let me know if you figure it out."

Well, this whole thing is now history. Bill Clinton had his photo-op at the Grand Canyon, bypassed Congressional power over the public lands, got the few extra votes he needed, and won the election. Meanwhile, the land isn't protected, hundreds of thousands of acres of private and state school trust land are hanging in limbo, and we are all wondering how we can stop this sort of thing from happening again.

O.K. . . . so, what can we do to stop this? . . . I have a bill, H.R. 1127, that will be coming to the floor in the coming weeks that I think will go a long way toward fixing the Antiquities Act to prevent Presidential abuse.

H.R. 1127 is a good piece of legislation. During the debate on the floor you are going to hear all kinds of rhetoric about how my bill is anti-environmental. As you can see, that's ridiculous. This debate isn't about the environment. This is about Presidential abuse of power. We shouldn't allow a President to use our public lands as political pawns.

Protect our public lands and protect the democratic process. Support H.R. 1127.

INTRODUCTION OF DEADBEAT PARENTS PUNISHMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction by myself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] of the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act.

The gentleman from Illinois and I are introducing this bill to send a clear and unmistakable message to deadbeat parents who attempt to use State borders as a shield against child support enforcement orders. It says essentially you can run, you can try to hide, but you cannot escape your moral and legal duty to pay child support you owe.

The Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1997 will strengthen penalties for

deadbeat parents in egregious interstate cases of child support delinquency and enable Federal authorities to go after those who attempt to escape State-issued child support orders by fleeing across State lines.

Under the Child Support Recovery Act sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and enacted with broad bipartisan support in 1992, a bill which I cosponsored with the gentleman from Illinois, parents who willfully withhold child support payments totaling more than \$5,000, or owing for more than 1 year, are presently subject to a misdemeanor punishable by not more than 6 months imprisonment. A subsequent offense is a felony punishable by up to 2 years in prison.

The law that we are introducing today addresses the difficulty States frequently encounter in attempting to enforce child support orders beyond their borders. The Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act would augment current law by creating a felony offense for parents with an arrearage totaling more than \$10,000 or owing for more than 2 years. This provision, like current law, would apply where the non-custodial parent and child legally reside in different States.

In addition, the Deadbeats Act would make it a felony for a parent to cross a State border with the intent of evading child support orders where the arrearage totals more than \$5,000 or is more than 1 year past due, regardless of residency.

Mr. Speaker, this House has articulated in the welfare bill that we passed, in the act sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and other legislation, that we expect those who have children in America to take responsibility for those children, to ensure, whether or not the family unit stays intact, that those children have adequate resources to be housed, to be clothed, to be fed, to be nurtured.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot force or mandate by law that parents will love their children. We hope that they will do that. We know that that is critical to a child's welfare. We know as well that the failure of some parents to do that has led to a crisis in this country when it comes to crime committed by children, teenage pregnancy, and other activity that we lament being perpetrated by young people. But, in fact, it is parents who we should expect and, yes, demand that they meet their responsibilities, first to their children, but then as well to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to cosponsor this act with me, and I hope that we have early hearings and early passage of this act.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. TIAHRT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LANDOWNER IGNORED IN MONTANA LAND TRANSACTION

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to visit with my colleagues about the New World Mine. Some of my colleagues may recall that on August 12, 1996, the President announced that he wanted to pay \$65 million to purchase a mining interest that is close to Yellowstone Park.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement, or deal, if you will, was negotiated in secret. It was negotiated in the back rooms, in the corridors, in the boardrooms of the White House and environmental groups and a mining company. Who was left out? Who was not consulted?

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Montana was not consulted, and therefore the citizens of Montana were not consulted. The Montana congressional delegation was left out. Local government officials were never consulted. Land management agencies were not consulted. Congress itself was left out. But most surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, the owner of the land was left out, too.

Mr. Speaker, the President first proposed that we give \$65 million worth of public lands in Montana to this out-of-State, out-of-Nation mining company, and that caused a great uproar in Montana. Montanans feel a great attachment to the land. They hunt on it, they fish on it, they camp on it, and they enjoy it immensely for hiking and berry picking. Many Montanans, Mr. Speaker, make their living off the land.

That uproar caused the President to change his mind. Then he proposed giving \$100 million out of the CRP program, the Conservation Reserve Program, to buy out this mine, and that created even a greater outrage. Environmentalists and sportsmen and farmers said, "No, don't do that, Mr. President."

So then the President asked that we give him a blank check. Mr. Speaker, the House said no. The reason that the House said no is because the President had decided to ignore two very important parties in this transaction. One is the State of Montana and the citizens of Montana but, more importantly, the property owner, Margaret Reeb.

It turns out that Margaret Reeb owns the mineral interest that the President had entered into an agreement secretly to buy out. The problem is that they never contacted Margaret Reeb, they never consulted with Margaret Reeb, and they never entered into any agreements with Margaret Reeb. It would be like, Mr. Speaker, having a neighbor come to you one day and say, "I sold

my house to some people who came along, but the only way they'd buy it is if I sold them yours, too, so I sold them your house, too." That is how Margaret Reeb feels.

The secret deal was made behind closed doors, and it cut out the public. There were no hearings, there was no authority, there was no appropriation. And, Mr. Speaker, the President even cut off the National Environmental Policy Act in the process.

Montana was hurt, too. Four hundred sixty-six jobs, Mr. Speaker, will be lost; \$45 million in tax revenues to the State of Montana; even Park County, MT, lost \$1.2 million.

What should we do? Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post wrote an editorial on September 8. It says this:

The Clinton administration goofed when it ignored a private landowner during negotiations to block a proposed gold mine near Yellowstone National Park. Even a first-year law student would know that to do a land swap, the landowner must be consulted. That the White House didn't do so is inexcusable.

It goes on to say:

But as it explores all lawful alternatives, the Clinton administration should avoid acting heavy-handedly. It was Clinton's minions whose omissions left the landowner out of the loop in the first place. It's now their job to fix the problem.

Mr. Speaker, that obligation is to Margaret Reeb, and that obligation is to the people of Montana. I have proposed an alternative to this mechanism, and that alternative would save taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. It would protect the property rights of Margaret Reeb, and it would deal with the concerns of the people of the State of Montana. I would urge my colleagues to support me in this effort to propose an alternative that is fair and it is responsible, it is fair to the parties who are involved, it is fair to Margaret Reeb, and it is fair to the State of Montana.

GOLD MINE PACT BUNGLED

The Clinton administration goofed when it ignored a private land owner during negotiations to block a proposed gold mine near Yellowstone National Park.

The original proposal, involving a land swap, was put together more than a year ago by the White House, an environmental group and a major mining company.

Crown Butte wanted to develop its New World Gold Mine just 3 air miles from Yellowstone. An environmental impact statement was being prepared because the mine needs the approval of federal agencies. Although the mine's supporters claimed the EIS' publication was imminent, the document actually was behind schedule.

Meantime, the National Park Service vigorously campaigned against the mine on grounds that the operation might harm Yellowstone's ecological balance and potentially disrupt its geological wonders. A rift developed between the Park Service and other federal agencies over whether the EIS would adequately address these concerns.

The White House intervened and offered Crown Butte the chance to swap the controversial property for another parcel elsewhere. That deal later unraveled, so now the