

105 million acres. That is more than the entire State of California. All this land was withdrawn from multiple use without any input from the people of Alaska, any input from the public, any input from Members of Congress.

I ask you, can you understand why we are sensitive? With all these actions held over Alaska's head, we were forced to cut the best deal we could. Twenty years later, the people of our State are still struggling to cope with the weight of these decisions. When they say you forget history, why, I say you are doomed by it, doomed to repeat it if you do not remember. So as long as we stand in this Chamber people will not be allowed to forget what happened when the public and the Congress are excluded from the public land management decisions.

When my friend from Arkansas says that this does not belong in this legislation, that it does not belong because it is not an emergency, he is absolutely wrong. It is an emergency. This is an action arbitrarily proposed by the Secretary of the Interior now. It is contrary to law, and it has to be stopped.

Mr. President, again, the fact is if R.S. 2477 was not in existence on October 21, 1976, it will not and it cannot by definition be created now. We have no problem with that. We want that to be the case. What we do not want is the Secretary to arbitrarily suddenly come to the conclusion that if vehicle travel has not proceeded over these routes prior to October 21, 1976, there is no justification for inclusion.

So in closing, Mr. President, I wish that we did not have to address this issue at this time, but it is an emergency for the Western States. It belongs on the first legislative vehicle that we can get the attention of the Congress relative to taking action. I thought we put this to an end in a bipartisan manner last year when we enacted a permanent moratorium on future actions by the Department, but that was not good enough for the Secretary. So behind closed doors this Secretary has sought to disregard the spirit and the intent of our previous action.

We have no other alternative, Mr. President, but to pursue this in a manner to continue to have available the viability of historical transportation routes that were in existence across our State, so that we can bring our State together, recognizing the huge amount of Federal withdrawal that is evidenced on this chart by the colored areas that represent all Federal withdrawals as compared to the white areas which simply address the State holdings. So one can readily see the necessity of having the option to establish, if you will, access routes across traditional trails that existed that were dog sled routes, or footpaths, that were used for commerce prior to that 1976 date. We simply have to have the assurance that that will remain as the law of the land and we can continue to allow, after our short 39 years of exist-

ence as a State, the development of our State, we can be bound together. That is why it is an emergency and that is why I commend my good friend and senior Senator for putting this in this legislation because there is no question it is an emergency of the highest nature in the State of Alaska and certainly affects the other Western States as well as we have seen the withdrawal of 1.6 million acres under the Antiquities Act in Utah by this administration.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska, Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. I want to remind the Senate now, and I will do so later just prior to the vote, in this year's Interior appropriations bill, signed by the President last fall, after serious negotiation with the administration, conducted by the previous chairman of this Appropriations Committee, at my request this section was put in that bill, section 108:

No final rule or regulation of any agency of the Federal Government pertaining to the recognition, management or validity of a right-of-way, pursuant to Revised Statute 2477, 43 U.S. Code 932, shall take effect unless expressly authorized by an act of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

Now, that was the compromise last year as we began this fiscal year. We believe it is an emergency when we return to Washington to find that the Secretary of the Interior has issued a policy, a statement, edict, fiat, whatever you want to call it, but he has in effect changed the law, in his opinion, purported to change the law in a way that he believes is not covered by that very strong statement:

No final rule or regulation of any agency of the Federal Government pertaining to the recognition, management or validity of a right-of-way, pursuant to Revised Statute 2477. . . shall take effect unless expressly authorized by an act of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

That is this Congress. We have very clearly said, and the President of the United States agreed, that any change regarding the validity of rights-of-way shall be authorized by an act of Congress, and yet if we do not take this action that is in this bill that policy statement will guide all members of the Interior Department with regard to approval of the applications of Western States for rights-of-way under the law, a law that was agreed to in 1976 and expressly reserved all existing rights-of-way.

I think it is a very clear issue, notwithstanding all of the flak that is out there in these direct mail pieces that are stimulating every newspaper from here to Washington State. It is just too bad that editors have not learned how to read because if they would read what the law is, I do not see how they can come to the conclusions that they do in some of the editorials I have read today. I hope the Members of the Sen-

ate are not swayed by those editorials because they certainly are not based upon the law or the facts of the situation.

Mr. President, I will suggest the absence of a quorum awaiting my friend. We do have some matters that we can take care of. I might state for the information of the Senate that we have an indication from the Parliamentarian that only 33 of the 109 amendments that were filed are proper under cloture. Members should consult, if they wish to do so, the staff of either side to find out the situation with regard to their amendment. Senator BYRD and I have agreed that if we can we would like to cooperate with Members on matters that are true emergencies, particularly for those people who are from the disaster States, and there are 33 of those, Mr. President. But we are compelled to rely upon the actions of the Parliamentarian under the rule unless we can find some way to accommodate the changes that would be necessary to validate the amendments involved. So I urge Members of the Senate to determine whether the amendments they have filed prior to cloture are now valid after cloture.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

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

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

## RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 10 minutes after 2.

There being no objection, at 1:42 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:10 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GREGG).

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

### AMENDMENT NO. 145

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on amendment No. 145 by the Senator from New York.

There are 5 minutes equally divided. Who yields time?

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM of Florida, Senator WYDEN, and Senator LAUTENBERG be added as co-sponsors.

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

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, make no mistake about it, I support the provisions that have broken the chain of

welfare dependency, welfare that became a narcotic, and it trapped people. I think that our reform of the welfare system was good, intended and long overdue.

However, there have been some unintended consequences that are devastating. I do not believe we ever wanted to take 500,000 basically senior citizens and say that "you're going to be cut off," senior citizens who are here in this country legally, receiving SSI benefits, who abided by the rules, and now simply terminate them.

Let me give you a profile of these legal immigrants who received their notice of termination. Seventy-two percent of them are women. They are over the age of 65. Forty-one percent of them are over the age of 75. And almost 20 percent, or close to 100,000, are over the age of 85.

Are we really going to say that we are going to take close to these senior citizens, the vast bulk of them women, who have infirmities, who have problems with the language, and say, "Come August 22, you are off the roll notwithstanding that you came here legally, notwithstanding that you met all of the requirements"?

What our amendment does is simply say we are giving, to October 1, the continuation of assistance. And, hopefully, many of these people who have these infirmities will be able to qualify as citizens. It will give us additional time to deal with what otherwise would be a catastrophe for many of these people.

Mr. President, young, able-bodied recipients should be required to report to a job. They should be challenged. There should not be an automatic pass to welfare assistance. But certainly not the aged, the infirmed, those who need help.

We are a country of compassion. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which is sensible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time in opposition?

The time will run.

The time allocated has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 145.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Abraham	Chafee	Feinstein
Akaka	Cleland	Ford
Baucus	Cochran	Frist
Bennett	Collins	Glenn
Biden	Conrad	Gorton
Bingaman	Coverdell	Graham
Bond	Craig	Grams
Boxer	D'Amato	Grassley
Breaux	Daschle	Hagel
Brownback	DeWine	Harkin
Bryan	Dodd	Hatch
Bumpers	Domenici	Helms
Burns	Dorgan	Hollings
Byrd	Durbin	Hutchinson
Campbell	Feingold	Hutchison

Inouye	Lugar	Santorum
Jeffords	Mack	Sarbanes
Johnson	McCaIn	Sessions
Kempthorne	McConnell	Shelby
Kennedy	Mikulski	Smith (OR)
Kerrey	Moseley-Braun	Snowe
Kerry	Moynihan	Specter
Kohl	Murkowski	Stevens
Kyl	Murray	Thompson
Landrieu	Reed	Thurmond
Lautenberg	Reid	Torricelli
Leahy	Robb	Warner
Levin	Roberts	Wellstone
Lieberman	Rockefeller	Wyden
Lott	Roth	

NAYS—11

Allard	Faircloth	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gramm	Smith (NH)
Coats	Gregg	Thomas
Enzi	Inhofe	

The amendment (No. 145) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCAIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we had 5 minutes before that vote. I ask unanimous consent that there be 1 more minute added so that we have 4 minutes on this one.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York. I think every Senator would like to hear the Senator from New York on this one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR DOMENICI

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am just going to be a few seconds. Twenty-five years ago, a young man came to the Senate. He, indeed, has enriched the Senate with his leadership, with his integrity, and with his very presence. The fact of the matter is, he is the son of Italian immigrants and comes from the great State of New Mexico. It is Senator PETE DOMENICI's 65th birthday. Senator DOMENICI, happy birthday.

[Applause.]

Mr. DOMENICI. I want you all to know that is why I was so careful to protect senior citizens in the budget deal.

[Laughter.]

Thank you all very much. It is great to be with you. I love the Senate. I hope I am doing my share, like all of you are, to keep this a great institution and an important part of American history and our future. Thank you very much.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 64

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment No. 64 is now in order. There are 4 minutes of debate equally divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, in 1866, Congress passed a mining law called Revised Statute 2477. Here is what it said:

The right-of-way for the construction of public highways across public lands, not reserved for public uses, is hereby granted.

That was the law until 1976 when we repealed it. And we repealed it because there are literally thousands and thousands of potential rights-of-way, which the States could claim for purposes of building a highway across Federal lands. In 1988, Donald Hodel, who was the Secretary of the Interior at the time, established a policy. Listen to this:

Under that policy, a right-of-way could be established by mowing high vegetation, by moving a few rocks, by filling in low spots.

The State of Alaska has passed a law making every section-line in the State a right-of-way, over 900,000 miles. Here is the kicker, Mr. President. These rights-of-way would cross national parks, wilderness areas, national monuments, and other protected areas. These highways cross all of those areas that we have since taken out of the public domain and made national parks and other reserved areas.

If we don't pass this amendment, every State—but particularly Alaska, Utah, and Idaho—will have the right to build roads on every one of those claimed rights-of-way, according to the language of the Stevens amendment. This issue is not an emergency. To hold the people in the Dakotas and Arkansas and other States hostage for something as foolish as this is, would be foolish in the extreme.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. Alaska has not even been surveyed yet. There aren't many surveyed section-lines in my State yet, except in very few portions of the State. The Nation's national parks have coexisted safely under Revised Statute 2477 for over 100 years. Our wilderness areas have not been paved, despite all the threats we have had. We have had 30 years of the Wilderness Act under Revised Statute 2477 and there has been no complaint at all.

Last fall, we put in the appropriations bill for the Interior Department this section:

No final rule or regulation of any agency of the Federal Government pertaining to recognition, management, or validity of a right-of-way pursuant to Revised Statute 2477 shall take effect, unless expressly authorized by an act of Congress subsequent to enactment of the date of this act.

That was agreed to by the administration. The President signed that bill. It came about after negotiation with the President, as a matter of fact.

Now, by edict, the Secretary of the Interior has determined a new policy will go into effect and he will make