

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask all Democrats and Republicans to sign the campaign finance reform discharge petition. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because there is no issue more important to the future of this country than this particular issue.

I ask Members to ask themselves why it seems that Congress can never get anything done. I ask Members to ask themselves why Congress cannot pass health care reform legislation, child safety legislation, or the many other pressing issues facing this country. Ask why that supplemental funding bill this week was filled with pork barrel spending, rather than dealing with national priorities like education.

A good part of the answer is the way we fund campaigns in this country, the influence of special interests. We passed this bill, we debated it last year. We can pass it again now. We do not need to wait so that it gets tied up in budget negotiations or in politics of next year's elections. We can pass it for the American people today.

THE HISTORY OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the vacuous bleatings of my esteemed colleagues on the liberal side of the aisle who invoke campaign finance reform as their latest slogan.

How truly audacious for the very people who created the current campaign finance reform to now self-righteously proclaim their outrage at the way the government makes crooks out of the truly honest people among us.

Just what is it about the liberal mindset that allows them to avoid responsibility for so many of their bad ideas and failed initiatives?

Consider the history of campaign finance. The liberals imposed absurdly low limits on the participation of Americans in the political process. It is truly amazing how this has resulted in things that were entirely predictable.

What happened? Politicians were then forced to spend almost all their time raising money, and of course money then found other ways into the political process through soft money, through issue advocacy, and, dare I mention, through the Chinese Communist friends of the White House. And of course this money, unlike direct contributions, lacks full disclosure, which is an invitation to corruption.

Why are Democrats not talking about that?

URGING COSPONSORSHIP OF THE BORDER PATROL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT

(Mr. REYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge my colleagues to co-sponsor a bill that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I are introducing today, the Border Control Recruitment and Retention Act.

This bill will correct a longstanding problem within the INS, and begins to address some of the recruitment and retention problems we have heard so much about lately. This bill is not a cure-all. It is, however, a step in the right direction.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on legislation for comprehensive pay reform for the United States Border Patrol. Currently most Border Patrol agents are kept at the GS-9 Journeyman level, with only 30 percent of the work force actually working at GS-11, even though their work is much more comprehensive.

The bill we are introducing today states that any GS-9 with a current rating of fully successful will automatically qualify for GS-11. What does this mean? It means that on the average, Border Patrol agents will move from a salary of about \$34,000 a year to a salary of about \$41,000. It addresses a pay disparity. It is fitting that we introduce this legislation today and push for its passage this year, which is the United States Border Patrol's 7th anniversary.

I believe that this is the least we can do for an agency that is at the front line of the defense for this country.

TO FORMER DEMOCRAT RUDY BRADLEY, WELCOME TO THE GOP

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is a trend going on in America today that is not talked much about, particularly on that side, at least on the national level. It is a phenomenon of party switching, and it is party-switching going in one direction and one direction only, from Democrats to Republicans.

Over 390 elected Democrats have switched to the GOP since Clinton and Gore were elected in 1992. Well, the Republican Party would like to welcome the latest party-switcher, State Representative Rudy Bradley of St. Petersburg, Florida.

Rudy Bradley is the only black Republican in the 160-member Florida legislature, for now. Here we have a lifetime proud Democrat who has finally come to the conclusion that the Democratic Party simply does not reflect his values or the values of his constituents.

He is tired of the Democrats' constant demonizing those who disagree with them. He is tired of rhetoric that says one thing while governing as a tax and spend liberal. He is tired of the attacks on the traditional values that made America great to begin with.

Rudy, welcome to the GOP.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress knows firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process, and what is worse, the American people know firsthand the control that money has over our electoral process.

The money spent on last November's election totaled \$1 billion. This is an outrageous sum that hurts our democracy and it hurts our constituents. If voters are disgusted and turned off by the excesses in campaign financing they will not vote, and make no mistake, voters are disgusted. They are turned off and they are not voting.

Our constituents deserve better. The American people deserve better. Let us ban soft money and stop the attack ads disguised as issue advocacy soft money pays for. Let us strengthen the Federal Election Commission and give it the teeth it needs to enforce campaign finance laws. This Congress must act to restore confidence and participation in our electoral system.

Last month my colleagues and I signed a discharge petition to demand that Congress take up the important issue of campaign finance reform. The very fact that as Members of Congress we must petition our government speaks volumes and is a testament to the control money has over our electoral process.

We must prove to our constituents that we are serious about real reform. We must make sure that our political system represents everyone, not just those that can afford it.

AMERICAN LAND SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 180

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute

rule for a period not to exceed four hours. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 180 be amended on page 2, line 2, by striking "833" and inserting in lieu thereof "883".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike "833" and insert in lieu thereof "883".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 180 would grant H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, a modified open rule, providing 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule provides for a 4-hour limit on the amendment process and provides that the bill shall be considered as read. Additionally, the rule makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments that are preprinted may be offered only by the Member who caused them to be

printed or his designee, shall be considered as read, and may be amended.

The rule further allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 883 was reported by the Committee on Resources. The bill would restore the constitutional role of Congress in managing lands belonging to the United States, preserve the sovereignty of the United States over its lands, and protect State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands adjacent to the Federal lands.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, Congress is vested with the authority to regulate Federal lands. Yet, over the past 25 years, an increasing expansion of our Nation's public lands have been included in various land use programs with little congressional oversight or approval. Two notable programs are the United Nations Biosphere Reserves and the World Heritage Sites, both of which are under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or UNESCO.

There are now 47 UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States. By becoming party to these international land use agreements through executive action, but without congressional authorization, the United States may be indirectly agreeing to terms to international treaties which the Senate has refused to ratify.

By consenting to international land use designations, the United States in effect agrees to impose restrictions on surrounding lands which, in many cases, include a substantial amount of private property. Subjecting private property owners to land use restrictions imposed without their consent, or even the consent of their elected representatives, is a very serious matter. It is a practice which this Congress should emphatically reject.

In response to growing concern about this situation, H.R. 883 would amend the National Historic Preservation Act to require congressional approval before any nominated property may be included in the World Heritage list. It would require the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report to Congress describing what impact inclusion on the World Heritage list would have on the natural resources associated with these nominated lands.

The bill would prohibit the Secretary of Interior from nominating a property for inclusion on the World Heritage list until the Secretary makes findings that existing commercially viable uses of the nominated land or land within 10 miles of the nomination would not be adversely affected by its inclusion.

H.R. 883 would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the

U.S. for designation as a Biosphere Reserve and would terminate all existing Biosphere Reserves unless, one, the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized in law by a date certain, two, the designated Biosphere Reserve consists entirely of land owned by the U.S., and, three, a management plan has been implemented which specifically provides for the protection of non-Federal property rights and uses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law, and would also prohibit including any State, local, or privately owned land in any such designation, unless that designation is approved by those affected parties.

The Committee on Rules has reported a modified rule, as requested by the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Resources, in order to provide Members of the House seeking to amend this legislation with the full and fair opportunity to do so.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 883.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for a modified open rule which makes in order only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and limits debate of the bill to 4 hours. These restrictions are wholly unnecessary. Any time one imposes an arbitrary time limit, one runs the risk of limiting full debate. I oppose the rule in its current form and note that open rules best protect all Members' rights to fully represent their constituents.

Moreover, I have significant concerns about the legislation the rule makes in order. While the bill purports to preserve U.S. sovereignty over the use of Federal lands, in reality, this measure is unnecessary and could hinder United States participation in international efforts to protect and preserve valuable lands throughout the world. Similar dubious legislation has failed in two previous Congresses, and this bill will get the same fate.

The World Heritage Convention and the Man and Biosphere Program will provide the international community with means of recognizing areas with great natural and cultural significance. These honorific programs respect each State's sovereignty and have no legal jurisdiction over countries or communities.

Since 1973, the World Heritage Convention has successfully been implemented by the United States Department of Interior. The Convention was, in fact, a United States initiative under then President Richard Nixon.

A site may be listed as a World Heritage site only if it contains cultural or natural resources of universal value, and if the national government where the site is located nominates and protects the site.

Listing an area as a World Heritage site imposes no change in U.S. law nor any requirement for future changes in domestic law. It does not give oversight, management, or regulatory authority over United States lands to any foreign and national organization.

Nor does the United States Man and Biosphere Program place any U.S. lands or resources under the control of the United Nations or any international body. In fact, this is a domestic Federal program. It, therefore, does not impose any restrictions beyond those already in place under American law.

For over 20 years, under the auspices of four Republican and two Democratic Presidents, these programs have functioned with little or no controversy. The allegations by the proponents of H.R. 883 that these beneficial programs somehow threaten the United States sovereignty are pure fantasy.

However we do have a Federal, foreign encroachment on American lands, and I am referring to the mining and mineral rights that have been leased to foreign corporations with leases that cost about an average of \$2.50 per acre per year. These leases have been in effect since the days of Ulysses S. Grant. If we would like to do something to protect our own lands, and stop cheating our taxpayers. We should change this disgraceful giveaway.

Our national parks do need attention, but Congress certainly could do better than this bill, which is designed to remedy an imaginary problem, the supposed encroachment of foreign domination over our public resources.

Mr. Speaker, another community woke this morning to the horror of a school shooting. It is not as bad as Columbine we are told. We hope that these are not going to be fatal shots. But surely this House can be better spending this time, rather than spending 4 hours on this one House nowhere bill, and be working on after-school programs and try to do something about bringing guns under some control.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill by the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the rule that brings this bill to the floor.

This bill does not prohibit or stop the United States from including land in an international land reserve. All it says is that there must first be congressional approval so that the private property rights of neighboring landowners can be protected.

What this bill is attempting to do is to allow a little more public input into this process and give the people a tiny bit of say about actions that can have tremendous impact on their land.

It really boils down to whether we still have a government of, by, and for the people, or has it become one of, by, and for unelected bureaucrats and elitists who want to control other people's land.

Jeane Kirkpatrick, our former ambassador to the United Nations, wrote to the Committee on Resources these words, "In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?"

Professor Jeremy Rabkin of the Department of Government of Cornell University testified in support of this bill, saying, "The underlying problem is that international regulatory schemes now reach more deeply into the internal affairs of sovereign nations and have therefore begun to threaten internal systems of government," adding that "such ventures are in some ways as much a threat to the stability of international law as they are to our own system of government at home."

Professor Rabkin said we need this bill, not to slow this dangerous trend toward taking government further away from the people, but also, "as a means of reasserting our own constitutional traditions."

Professor Detlev Vagts of the Harvard Law School said international involvement in local and private land use decisions, "pose an import problem" in their "tendency to shift powers and responsibilities from national and sub-national units, with active, reachable legislative bodies to remote international bureaucracies."

I realize that some opponents of this bill do not want to debate this on the merits, so they resort to childish sarcasm and try to make this bill seem less than serious by making fun of it.

But this bill deserves the support of all those who really believe in private property and limited government and the freedom that is protected by those two great traditions on which this Nation was built.

Private property is not only one of the key components of our prosperity. It is one of the main things that set us apart from the former Soviet Union and other socialist Nations.

Today almost one-third of our land is owned by the Federal Government, and another 20 percent is owned by State and local governments and quasi-governmental units. Governments at all levels are rapidly taking over additional land. Perhaps even more of a threat to freedom are the restrictions being placed by government on land still in private ownership.

We heard testimony from Steven Lindsey whose family has operated a ranch on Turkey Creek in rural Arizona since the 1860s. He was shocked to find out one day that a 60-acre private wetland on his property was now controlled by the international RAMSAR Convention agreement in addition to all the endangered species and other regulations he was already under.

□ 1045

Under Ramsar, Mr. Lindsey said, "My rights as a private property owner are threatened and the Ramsar language can be used to violate my property rights and deprive me of the use of my land."

He added these words, Mr. Speaker: "The same government that promised my great, great grandfather and my great grandfather the land through the Homestead Act and pursuit of happiness is now the same government that is helping destroy these dreams."

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a serious bill; and people who truly believe in freedom, rather than big brother repressive government, should support it enthusiastically.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Frankly, this bill is not correctable by amendment. I think the proper disposition of it is to defeat this bill. I think it is, obviously, a great misunderstanding. I think it reflects a fear that has been translated into legislative language which is inappropriate and I think the wrong direction clearly to move, and so I do not know how I could amend it.

In the last session, Mr. Speaker, a lot of concern arose because we proposed some 60 or 70 different amendments to this bill. It touches on about 82 areas in the United States that are classified as World Heritage sites, as Man and the Biosphere program, or as Ramsar sites. There may be more sites in the United States, but those are the three principal treaties that deal with natural and cultural resources of distinction, usually within our parks or in those areas; and Man and the Biosphere programs which focus on special natural environments, other types of environments that are used for scientific research; and the Ramsar sites, which protect wetlands.

There may be other treaties and compacts that are affected, Mr. Speaker. They have not been spoken of or explored in committee. In fact, I think most of the committee meetings have been based on a lot of emotionalism and misconceptions and obviously some distaste for the United Nations, which happens to be associated loosely with some of the designations here and recognitions that have taken place.

Incidentally, when I was looking at the numbers, there are nearly 2,000 sites globally that are recognized under these programs. The United States has very few sites that we have let in the development of these treaties and programs; and, of course, to in fact renege on this presents all sorts of problems to us in terms of our global leadership in terms of the environment.

But that I think is really at the heart of this that there are those that cannot attack these parks, these wildernesses directly, so they choose to wrap themselves in American sovereignty and some displeasure I guess with the U.N., Mr. Speaker, and it is manifest in this bill that we have before us today, H.R. 883.

The rule is really unfair because we had talked and while there was some fear that we might offer 70 amendments, as I said, it is not correctable, but nevertheless the Committee on Rules gets up and suggested that it is offering an open rule, that we can offer any amendments that we want. But then they impose this time limitation on the bill.

I do not think that any of us have any visions of keeping the Congress in session all day tonight and late into the hours, especially a day when many Members would like to travel home to their districts so they can work and be back together with their families and constituents, a goal certainly that I share with them. But, nevertheless, the Committee on Rules arbitrarily sets in place this 4-hour limit.

Unfortunately, in fact I think, Mr. Speaker, that my amendment is the only amendment that will be offered and that we will pursue that and see whether or not the fidelity of this group for American sovereignty carries through to commercial uses of the property for foreign countries and entities that might want to mine, they might want to harvest trees and do other exploitative activities in the land. If there is any enthusiasm for saving American taxpayers and saving their resources for America, we will see whether or not we can sell that particular idea.

But there is no reason for putting a time limit on this bill. I think it is a reflection, unfortunately, of the circumstances and the state of affairs that exists in this Congress today, in fact, in terms of what I say, a lack of trust between us, Mr. Speaker, which I think is unneeded.

And, therefore, I will oppose this rule. I think it is not an open rule. It is a rule which has a time limitation, and I think it is unnecessary and this House should reject the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—years 240, nays 178, not voting 15, as follows:

Weldon (FL)	Whitfield	Wolf
Weldon (PA)	Wicker	Young (AK)
Weller	Wilson	Young (FL)
NAYS—178		
Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Neal
Allen	Hilliard	Oberstar
Andrews	Hinchey	Obey
Baird	Hinojosa	Olver
Baldacci	Hoefel	Ortiz
Baldwin	Holden	Owens
Barcia	Hoyer	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Inslée	Pascarella
Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Bentsen	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Berkley	(TX)	Phelps
Berman	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Bonior	John	Price (NC)
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Boucher	Kanjorski	Reyes
Boyd	Kaptur	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Capps	Kind (WI)	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Kleczka	Rush
Cardin	Klink	Sabo
Carson	LaFalce	Sanchez
Clay	Lampson	Sanders
Clayton	Lantos	Sandlin
Clement	Larson	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lee	Schakowsky
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Pitts	Costello	Sherman
Pombo	Coyle	Slaughter
Peterson (MN)	Crowley	Smith (WA)
Peterson (PA)	Cummings	Snyder
Petri	Davis (FL)	Spratt
Pickering	Davis (IL)	Stabenow
Pickett	DeFazio	Stark
Pelosi	DeGette	Stenholm
Peterson (WA)	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Porter	Maloney (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Portman	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Reynolds	Martinez	Smith (WA)
Riley	DeLauro	Spratt
Rogan	Deutsch	Stabenow
Ramstad	Mascara	Tanner
Regula	Dicks	Tauscher
Hansen	Dingell	Thompson
Hastings (WA)	Dixon	Thompson
Hayes	Doggett	Thurman
Hayworth	Dooley	McKinney
Gutknecht	Royce	Tierney
Hall (OH)	Doyle	McNulty
Hall (TX)	Edwards	Udall (NM)
Bereuter	Quinn	Meehan
Berry	Ryan (KS)	Engel
Biggert	Sanford	Meek (FL)
Bilbray	Saxton	Velazquez
Bilirakis	Scarborough	Vento
Bishop	Schaffer	Menendez
Biley	Scott	Visclosky
Blumenauer	Sensenbrenner	Fattah
Bilirakis	Shadegg	Millender-McDonald
Boehlert	Shaw	Ford
Boehner	Shays	Minge
Bonilla	Sherwood	Frank (MA)
Bono	Shimkus	Frost
Brady (TX)	Shows	Gederson
Bryant	Kolbe	Gonzalez
Burr	Kuykendall	Gordon
Buyer	LaHood	Gutierrez
Callahan	Istook	Smith (NJ)
Calvert	Jenkins	Smith (TX)
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Souder
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Spence
Chenoweth	Jones (NC)	Linder
Coble	Kasich	Stearns
Coburn	Kelly	Stump
Collins	King (NY)	Sununu
Combest	Kingston	Sweeney
Condit	Knollenberg	Talent
Cook	Lazio	Tancredo
Cooksey	Leach	Tauzin
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Deal	Lewis (KY)	McHugh
DeLay	Linder	McInnis
DeMint	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Terry
Dickey	Manzullo	McIntyre
Dreier	McCarthy (MO)	Thomas
Duncan	McCullum	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCrery	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiaht
Emerson	McInnis	Toomey
English	McIntosh	Traficant
Eshoo	McIntyre	Turner
Everett	McKeon	Upton
Ewing	Metcalf	Walton
Fletcher	Mica	Walsh
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Watkins
Fowler	Miller, George	Watts (OK)
Franks (NJ)	Moran (KS)	
Frelinghuysen	Morella	
Gallegly	Myrick	
Ganske	Nethercutt	
Gekas	Ney	
Gibbons	Northup	

NOT VOTING—15

Blagojevich	Evans	Napolitano
Brown (CA)	Foley	Ose
Burton	Gephardt	Salmon
Doolittle	Gilman	Towns
Dunn	Kucinich	Waxman

□ 1111

Messrs. ROEMER, SPRATT and HILLIARD and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TANCREDO and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 140 on H. Res. 180 I was unavoidably detained in an important meeting. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 180 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 883.

□ 1115

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, with Mr. STEARNS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

□ 1115

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, asserts the power of Congress on the Constitution over the lands belonging to the United States, and this is all this bill does.

So that everyone understands, the concern here is the Congress and, therefore, the people. They are left out of the domestic process to designate World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves.

This bill requires the participation, as the Constitution so states, that the Member of the Congress and the citizens of this Nation are in the process.

Many, many Americans from all over, sections of our country, have called my office, I am sure they have called my colleagues also, to say they are concerned about the lack of congressional oversight over UNESCO international land reserves in the U.S. and to express support for this bill. Within the last 25 years, 83 sites in the United States have been designated as Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites or Ramsar Sites, all with virtually no congressional oversight and no congressional hearings. The public and local governments have not been consulted.

The World Heritage and Ramsar programs are based on a treaty. H.R. 883 does not end U.S. participation in the World Heritage or Ramsar Sites. We have domestic laws implementing these programs, and H.R. 883 proposes

to change these domestic laws so that Congress must approve the sites.

The Biosphere Reserve Program is not authorized by even a single U.S. law or any international treaty. That is wrong. Executive Branch appointees, whatever their political party, cannot and should not do things that the law does not authorize, and I ask my colleagues, what is unreasonable about Congress insisting that no land be designated for inclusion in these international land use programs without clear and direct approval of the Congress?

What is unreasonable about having local citizens and public officials participate in decisions on designated land near their homes for inclusion in an international preserve?

If the boundaries of a national park are forced to change, even by a small adjustment, Congress must approve the change. However, a 15.4 million acre South Appalachian Biosphere Reserve encompassing parts of six States stretching from northeast Alabama to southwest Virginia was created by unelected bureaucrats, bypassing the Congress, and this is unconstitutional and it is wrong.

We need to reemphasize the congressional duty to keep international commitments from abridging traditional constitutional constraints. Otherwise the boundaries between our owners' lands and others or even between the government's land and private property are too easily and often ignored.

H.R. 883 will also prevent attempts by the Executive Branch to use international land designation to bypass the Congress in making land decisions and protect our domestic land use decision-making process from unnecessary international interference.

We are going to hear a lot today from the other side and those that oppose it about this bill being driven by the fear of black helicopters and catering to suspicions and conspiracy theories of extremists. We will also hear a lot about the effectiveness and importance of the wonderful programs. We are also going to be told that these programs are honorary and have no effect on the use, management or disposition of public lands. However, the World Heritage Centre says otherwise. The director of the World Heritage Centre told the Interior Department in a letter:

"Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obligates the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage Sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5(A) recommends the State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of the Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary."

Going beyond what Congress has set aside, I submit this decision as a re-

sponsibility of Congress, not some U.N. committee of unelected bureaucrats.

The public and local governments are almost never consulted about creating World Heritage Sites, the Ramsar Sites and Biosphere Reserves. Although proponents of these programs always keep saying the designations are made at the request of local communities, designation efforts are almost always driven by Federal agencies, usually the National Park Service. The Committee on Resources has not found one example where one of these designations was requested by a broad-based cross-section of either the public or local officials. On the contrary, these programs usually face strong local opposition. In my State the Alaska State Legislature passed a resolution supporting H.R. 883, and I will urge my colleagues to listen to the debate, make their decision, but remember their constitutional duty, and that is to make us the designees of lands use.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, when Members are speaking, charts are permitted to be displayed in the House Chamber and the Committee of the Whole; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. With the permission of the House, when the question is raised, that is correct.

Mr. VENTO. And when Members have desisted from speaking, are charts still permitted to be displayed in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The charts are taken out of the well at that time.

Mr. VENTO. Are they permitted to be in the other portions of the House and be displayed at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. They should not be displayed anywhere in the Chamber unless they are being used in the debate.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a provision and the custom of the House is that these matters may be displayed in the Speaker's Lobby; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is permissible, with the Speaker's approval.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the Chairman for his response to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This is not new legislation. It, I think, has, and it is a case, as I said, where we have heard this tune before for the last two Congresses, and the House has passed this after spirited debate, and the fact is that it has gone to the Senate and not received consideration in the Senate; and I think the fact is that listening to the discussion of our distinguished chairman and his debate, and he is very good at debate, but the fact is that the words here do not match the music in terms of what takes place with this legislation.

This is a bad bill. This really cuts the head off of these programs that the

United States has led in creating on a global basis over the last 25 or 30 years under President Nixon, under other Presidents that have served since then, both Democrat and Republican, Carter, Reagan, Ford; pardon me, Ford, and of course Bush and now President Clinton. These programs have been in existence, and these administrations have supported them because it is a good program. It permits the United States to provide global leadership in terms of the preservation and conservation of special areas such as World Heritage Sites, which are protected because of their natural or cultural resources, Man and the Biosphere programs which some 600-and-some sites globally, only about 47 in the United States incidentally, which are used for scientific research, these ecosystems where scientists can gain information, and of course, hopefully, we take that new knowledge and translate it into good public policy on a global basis.

And finally, of course, areas like wetlands areas like the Ramsar sites, which there are over 700 sites globally, only about 15 in the United States, again where we protect and provide areas for protection of various waterfall and other fauna and flora that happen, obviously occur in these areas.

Now my colleague and chairman, the distinguished chairman said that this is unconstitutional. Well, where is the court case? This has been in existence for 30 years. Where the court case that says that this is an action taken by one of these past administrations over the last 25 or 30 years, that says this is unconstitutional?

We had a constitutional lawyer, I believe Mr. Rufkin from Yale, that appeared before us. When he was asked that question, he was not able to come up with one court case, one decision that had been made that said that this was unconstitutional.

This is not unconstitutional. These designations are made in the United States on a voluntary basis, just as they are around the globe. These are voluntary designations. The Congress has exercised its responsibility and done it well in most Congresses with regards to land use questions. In fact, we designated parks, we have designated wildernesses, we have designated and passed on and permit the agencies to designate on their own areas of environmental concern, for instance, in the BLM and many other areas. But the Congress has jealously guarded, and I would jealously guard, the right of Congress to, in fact, identify and to designate these various lands for the purposes that we are entrusted to do so, but the fact is that what we are saying here is that these areas have already been designated.

Now the big complaint here really revolves around Yellowstone and a mine that was occurring outside of Yellowstone but in obviously the watershed of Yellowstone, and the fact of the matter is that area was designated a Man and

the Biosphere area for research, and it was pointed out that if that mine occurred, that it would adversely affect the entire hydrology and watershed and other natural factors in that area. And the fact is that we think and I think that the parks and other lands have an extra boundary responsibility, that they can go and talk about activities outside the boundary of the parks, outside the boundary of a wilderness, outside boundaries. These trans-boundary issues are very important because we have to come to the realization that the de facto wilderness creation or park creation, that the areas that happen at their margin, boundaries, are causing these parks to be and these special areas that we set aside to be adversely effected.

That is what this is about. We already designated them a park. We have already designated wilderness. But not being able to attack the parks and the wilderness and the other conservation areas that we designated directly, they choose to do it through this particular claim of American sovereignty and wrap themselves in that particular issue with, I guess, a strong distaste for the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, this is one thing that the U.N. and UNESCO is doing right. This is one thing where past Presidents, both Democrats and Republicans and their administrations, have strongly supported. There are nearly 2,000 sites that have been designated and recognized by these international bodies just in these three treaty areas or protocol agreements that we have here, just in these three, but there may be others affected by this legislation. In the United States there are only 82 of those.

Our leadership has done a magnificent job here. Let us keep the United States in the forefront of it. Let us reject this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 883 is not new legislation. The Congress first considered this idea in 1996, and then again in 1997. In both instances, the other body refused to consider this measure on the floor and the Administration indicated it would veto the measure if passed. Why? Because they don't have visions of blue helmets dancing through their heads.

H.R. 883 is misguided because it is aimed at the symbols of a federal policy when, what the supporters of the legislation really oppose, is the underlying policy itself. While some of my colleagues and I might like to see us doing even more, this country has set as a national policy goal—the long-term preservation of our environmental resources. The commitment this Nation has made to this preservation/conservation/restoration policy sometimes demands that certain activities which threaten these resources be prohibited, and/or tightly limited by us and no one else. The reality of the circumstance regarding these voluntary agreements is that no blue helmets will come parachuting behind national park lines in black helicopters to seize control of American lands all in the name of preservation or conservation. Besides, after today we may have made a statement as to a crack missile defense sys-

tem to thwart any and all attempts to seize the sovereignty of our great Nation by those international agents of evil.

Any and all land use the restrictions in place are functions of U.S. law, not an international treaty or protocol. Our participation in the World Heritage Convention, the Ramsar Convention and the Man and the Biosphere program is emblematic of this underlying policy and the symbolic value and importance the U.S. places on its natural resources, our natural legacy. The twenty sites we have nominated under the World Heritage Convention are listed because Congress chose to enact policy and law to protect them, and establish special land managers to regulate and enforce such law. To address a specific example that gave rise to this bill, the problem with the New World Mine was that it was, in fact, too close to Yellowstone National Park, not that it was too close to a World Heritage site. If we want to debate the basic principles of environmental protection, that's fine. But, we should not waste our time passing legislation that seeks to abolish the programs which have evolved over 200 years of American land use ethic. Quite simply, this legislation turns logic on its head.

Let's be clear—the goal of H.R. 883 is to abandon these programs, not simply to regulate them. To require an Act of Congress for each and every parcel of land to be considered, is to effectively stop all future nominations and designations.

This legislation sends a signal around the world that our nation, the United States of America, which forged the policy path to institute the World Heritage Convention, is undercutting the values and benefits of international recognition for important cultural and environmental sites. At a time when the United States is thrust into a role as the dominant power and an essential role as a world leader in so many areas—why would we voluntarily abdicate perhaps the most important leadership position we occupy—that of a leader in the effort to make life on this planet sustainable. This would convey to the hundreds of nations part of the conservation treaties and protocol agreements, that domestic political considerations come first. If the U.S. cannot even permit recognition to be accorded, why should other nations?

Why are we pursuing legislation that is misdirected and misguided and based solely on gross misinformation? Each agreement covered by this bill states on its face that it contains no provision that affects, in any way, the authority or ability of a participating nation to control the lands within its border. These programs give the UN no more control over land in this country than the awarding of a gold medal gives the U.S. Olympic Committee control over an American athlete. To claim that these international programs somehow infringe on the sovereignty of this nation is simply factually inaccurate.

Finally, the largest threat to this nation's sovereignty isn't even addressed. Any foreign company or their subsidiary is still given full and free access for any and all of America's valuable natural resources. Each year we watch \$1.8 billion worth of gold and silver stream out of our ports and into the coffers of foreign owned companies. What's worse, while we debate this phantom legislation, foreign nations are cashing in big-time, and

laughing all the way to the bank with our resources. I will introduce an amendment to correct this situation and bring balance back to the management of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of takings, not of private property, but of the stripped international recognition and esteem the citizens of the United States, and the world place on some of America's most stunning and ecologically important natural resources. Teddy Roosevelt ushered in a new era of conservation and respect for the natural heritage of the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century. How ironic it is that nearly a century later this Nation may come full circle and, if this legislation passes, denounce the importance of those very parks and resources on which the heritage of this nation is based.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 883.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 883, and I thank the chairman and the committee staff for getting this bill done in such good form and to the floor so quickly.

I am glad that I am speaking right after the gentleman from Minnesota because he made the statement that we all know this is about Yellowstone National Park, and I represent Wyoming which has the most of Yellowstone National Park, and he said that the U.N. is doing a good job by these designations, that the reason that Yellowstone was designated, because a mine was going to be developed north of Yellowstone that might affect the watershed.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues the rest of the story. For 2 years an environmental impact statement had been going on, and professional scientists were not able in 2 years time to determine whether or not that developing that mine would put Yellowstone National Park in jeopardy.

□ 1130

They were working toward that, but they still had more work to do before they professionally could say that was true.

In 3 days' time, the United Nations came in. Three days later they determined that this indeed was an area in jeopardy, and then it was designated an area in jeopardy. So if that is what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) thinks is a good job, I certainly would have to disagree with him.

I do agree with him, however, on the fact that what this argument boils down to are these transboundary issues. As far back as 1818, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the United States v. Bevins that a State's right to control property within its borders was an essential part of its sovereignty, and I think that H.R. 883 is yet another affirmation of that principle. What was done when this designation was made around Yellowstone was it virtually built a buffer zone around Yellowstone.

It is something the administration had been trying to do for a long time

but they could not get it done legislatively, even though it is clearly legislative responsibility to designate public land use. So they went around the back door and had the U.N. committee in 3 days make that designation.

This is a good bill. This is something that Americans have the right, the Congress has the right and the responsibility to make these designations, and all we are asking is that these designations be approved by the Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in total opposition to this bill because there is absolutely nothing out there that is broken that needs fixing. This addresses a problem that does not exist.

Let me say I know something about this issue because I own land that is designated by this. I own an inholding in the University of California property in Big Sur, California. We are proud of this designation. One cannot get a designation unless the landowner, in this case it would be the Federal Government for National Parks or for Bureau of Land Management lands, or in our case a private owner, has to request the nomination. That is the only way it can come is from the owner of the land to say we would like to participate in the program.

The program is essentially an international way of being able to have a common database about measurement of environmental factors, so that we can see whether there are like kind of factors around the world, there are like kinds of problems or are the problems that are developing in an area significant to that area.

To go out and say that we should have congressional approval for these designations is so ludicrous. I mean, why do we not have congressional approval and oversight for accreditation of universities? That is not done by Congress, or by any government. Why do we not have the AAA, the guides that go around and say that one can sleep in these hotels and motels, we do not have any congressional oversight of that. We do not have any congressional oversight of TV Guide or the motion picture movie ratings. We do not have any oversight of the Good Housekeeping or Consumer Reports Magazine. We do not demand that we have to look at these things.

Why? They are not a problem where one wants to involve congressional action in this thing.

To say that we should have Congress telling our local communities and States that they cannot have their property so designated, I think, is totally wrong. It is a usurpation of local control.

If the chairman would like to have Alaska properties and have Glacier Na-

tional Park and have the Denali National Forest exempted, then he can do that for the State of Alaska, but for California we have community local water districts in Marin County; we have private lands in California; we have State parks in California. All of those requested to be part of this system because we want to be better informed, we want to be educated. We are not part of this flat earth society that is afraid of learning about something.

So this bill would deny our ability to get that nomination because one would have to go through this incredible congressional process. We cannot even pass legislation here to keep the country running. How are we going to make decisions on whether somebody should be able to voluntarily be placed in an international information system?

This is a ludicrous bill. Please defeat it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who just spoke, who is a dear friend of mine, that the landowner in Yellowstone did not request that participation in the World Heritage Program. In fact, she opposed it and unfortunately she was not listened to.

In our hearings in New York, we had people that came to the committee and said that, yes, the Federal Government was trying to implement Heritage sites in their districts and they adamantly opposed it. It is happening right today in Lake Champlain.

So what I am just suggesting is as much as I admire the sincerity of the gentleman, I would like to have him look at some of the records.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson once said "When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it . . . will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." The current system for establishing international land reserves ignores Jefferson's warning by centralizing the power with the President and taking away the authority of Congress, the States and the average citizen.

During the last 25 years, our nation's public lands have slowly been consumed by international land reserves. Most notably 47 United Nations Biosphere Reserves, 20 World Heritage Sites and 16 Ramsar Sites. These reserves were created with virtually no congressional oversight, no hearings, and in the case of biosphere reserves, no legislative authority. I don't know about you Mr. Chairman, but my ability to represent my constituents as a voting member of this body is important to me! We cannot allow this administration to take our vote away. I ask that you support the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, if that is the case then I would suggest within his authority as chairman of the Committee on Resources that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) may want to just limit this then to Federal properties and not to State and local properties or private properties.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I believe my bill does that. It does limit it just to Federal properties.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 883. I do want to say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that I know that there are many places that perhaps are honored to have these designations bestowed upon them. On the other hand, in my district, a designation was going to be thrust upon people without any local input and I think that is what this legislation is trying to clarify.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for his strong leadership on this issue and, in fact, the leadership he shows on many private property rights issues, and the work that he has done on behalf of private property owners.

I would also like to extend a similar thanks to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH), who chairs the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, who has been a devoted champion of private property rights. She recently came to my district in southern Missouri to represent the Committee on Resources and to chair a hearing on the legislation we are talking about today.

We heard from a lot of local people, farmers, county officials, ranchers, small businesspeople, property owners, those people who have the most at stake when international land designation issues arises.

Let me just talk a little bit about what the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I learned during the recent field hearing in the Missouri Ozarks, but I am just going to take a second before that to talk about how I became involved in this issue.

Back in 1996, as I was traveling across my district, in every single little town in the center of my district, which is part of the Mark Twain National Forest, in which there is tourism that really promotes the local economy and some timber sales everywhere, Ellington, Van Buren, Salem, to name a few, people were concerned about these designations and particularly about something called the Ozark Man and the Biosphere program that basically would take 15 Missouri and

Arkansas counties and put them into a biosphere reserve.

Let me say there was no local input involved whatsoever, and that my folks had to scrape and claw their way to find out anything about this. They were simply tipped off one day by a friend on the conservation commission. The amazing thing was, when they went to the agencies, the Department of Interior, specifically to ask about exactly what was happening, the Interior Department said, do not worry about this; it was going to be fine; we have talked to lots of local citizens around the district.

Well, the fact of the matter is, every single county in my district that would be impacted by this had absolutely no public solicitation by the Interior Department, Fish and Wildlife, whomever was involved, whatsoever. Not one county commissioner was called, not one local citizens group, and it was not until we had enough cattlemen's associations, enough farm bureau associations and finally all of the county commissions writing their own resolutions that this was a bad idea that the designation was dropped and these 15 counties in Missouri and Arkansas were saved from having to have a biosphere reserve designation put on them because, quite frankly, my citizens were afraid that once the designation happened then the government would find more and more reasons to seize the contiguous property around, and that would be their private property.

I think this really shows that we have a broken process and that experience makes the case for our bill today. All this bill would do would be to establish an appropriate process for biospheres and heritage area designations and ensure that local input and participation of Congress is involved. I do not think that is asking too much. I think it is very, very reasonable.

I will say, back when the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) and I were in Missouri, we heard from 12 different panelists, one of whom was a county commissioner; one was the former chairman of the Missouri Conservation Commission; several private citizens, but Leon Kreisler, who was a cattleman, and a landowner in Salem, Missouri, said, and I quote, "We feel strongly about property rights not because we share a common desire to abuse our natural resources but because landowners are often best suited to ensure productivity for our families and those of future generations. The Ozarks are a natural wonder and we intend to keep them that way, but national or international designations are not the answer."

Mr. Kreisler makes the point that I would like to reiterate, that our farmers and our ranchers are among the best conservationists anywhere because they depend on the land for their livelihood and they know that if they do not take care of the land then the land is not going to take care of them.

We had also an owner from a sawmill in Potosi, Missouri. He spent 20 years

as an analyst for Price Waterhouse before buying the sawmill.

Needless to say, Carl Barnes, the sawmill owner, talked about the threats from this coordinated resource management system and the threats that this would have upon outdoor recreation because they listed farming and mining as threats to outdoor recreation and our ecosystem health.

The fact of the matter is we can do it all, and I think that we do it all responsibly. We simply need to have this program put in place so that local citizens who live in areas for proposed designations have input, that is all it is, and that Congress have input, too.

I urge a yes vote on H.R. 883.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. This bill would undo some of the most important progress that has been achieved toward protection of internationally important cultural, historical and environmental resources.

What would enactment of this bill mean? Well, for starters, it would mean that the United States has decided to politicize the question of whether our country will continue to take part in the World Heritage Convention, the Man and the Biosphere Program, and the so-called Ramsar Convention regarding wetlands that have particular importance as waterfowl habitat. That might not be objectionable if our participation in these international programs involved any trade-offs in terms of our ability to make decisions about the management of our lands or resources, but the fact is that nothing in these international agreements affects the ownership or the management of any lands or other resources.

Similarly, I could understand the need for this legislation if, as some of its supporters claim, these international agreements have eaten away at the power and sovereignty of the Congress to exercise its constitutional power to make the laws that govern Federal lands, but here we are debating a bill that would be an exercise of exactly that constitutional power, and that constitutional power is fully intact today, fully intact with regard to each and every acre of Federal lands, including all the Federal lands that are covered by these international agreements.

So what is the real point of this bill? As far as I can tell, it is primarily a means for supporters to take a shot at the United Nations and particularly UNESCO, and to demonstrate their solidarity with some who seem to view the U.N. as engaged in a vast multiwing conspiracy to overthrow our constitutional government. I do not

think the U.N. is a threat to Congress' authority over Federal lands or to any other part of the Constitution. I do think this bill, if we take it seriously, is a threat to America's international leadership in environmental conservation and in the protection of historical and cultural resources.

□ 1145

So I think this bill is bad for our country, and I know it is bad for my home State of Colorado.

I want to tell my colleagues about the two Biosphere Reserves that we have, areas that are part of the Man and the Biosphere Program. One is the Niwot Ridge Research area and the other is Rocky Mountain National Park. As it now stands, this bill would kick those areas out of the program unless Congress passes a new law to retain them.

To get a better idea of what that would mean for Niwot Ridge, I contacted Professor Bowman, the Director of the University of Colorado's Mountain Research Station, and he explained to me that having Niwot Ridge in the Biosphere Reserve System, it provided a framework for international cooperation of many important research efforts, including working with the Biosphere Reserve in the Czech Republic to address air pollution problems, which is a matter of great importance not only to us, but to the Czechs. He told me that the biosphere program also had been helpful to people at Niwot Ridge as they worked with the Forest Service to develop a land management plan that would promote multiple use by minimizing the conflicts that we all grapple with here over recreation and scientific and other uses, which is again a matter of great importance to Colorado and all other public land States.

I also talked to the National Park Service about Rocky Mountain National Park, which again is included as a biosphere reserve. They told me that it not only means that there are more research activities at the park, but that it meant a significant increase in park visitation, tourism, which not only provides important educational benefits but is an important part of our economy in Colorado. Kicking these areas out of the program would be bad for Colorado and something that I cannot support.

Exempting the Colorado areas from the bill would be an improvement, but I do not think that alone would make the bill acceptable. We need to reject this bill, move away from the posturing and begin working on the real problems that face us on our public lands.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to support this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I really want to thank the gen-

tleman from Alaska for his efforts in this regard. He has been a champion of private property rights for many years, I have known him for 23 years, and I respect him greatly.

I represent the east side of the State of Washington, one-fourth of the size of our State, and in that portion of the State of Washington there are wonderful open space lands that people inhabit who are very protective of their private property rights.

The right to own property is a core principle on which our country was founded. Over the years, the Federal Government has established programs like the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, without the approval of Congress, Mr. Chairman, and that overrides the intentions of the Constitution and our Founding Fathers.

Under the U.S. Constitution, Congress retains the power to, quote, "make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States." The lands designated under the World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves have been so designated without the approval of Congress.

So this bill restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers by requiring congressional approval for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. It prohibits any Federal official from nominating U.S. property for designation as a biosphere reserve and prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the U.S. for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless the designation has been authorized by law.

It simply says Congress is going to be involved in this, these approvals of the disposition of Federal lands. I think they are common sense changes here that restore the role of Congress in the process of changing designation of lands that are Federal lands, and it restores the intentions of our Founding Fathers, and I hope that my colleagues will support it.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) for their engagement and involvement in this.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. This bill is unnecessary, it is unjustified. It addresses a phantom problem. It would seriously damage our country's continued participation in important international efforts to protect valuable land around the world. But worst of all, it caters to the suspicions and the conspiracy theories of extreme organizations and individuals, and it leads directly to scare tactics such as those used by the American Policy Center in attempts to alarm American citizens and frankly, to raise

money under false pretenses, and this bill ought to be opposed and defeated.

I would like to read from a letter from the American Policy Center which I will include for the RECORD at the end of my statement. This is a letter written by the American Policy Center, signed by Tom DeWeese, the president, urging citizens to send money in to pass this bill, H.R. 883, to "stop the U.N. land grab of American soil," a land grab, Mr. Chairman, that does not exist; urging citizens and this Congress to stop the U.N. from designating any more U.S. soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves. The U.N. does not make those designations, Mr. Chairman.

It identifies a U.N. land grab of American soil; calls for the Congress to stop liberals from terminating the United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. park land. Mr. Chairman, the U.N. does not have influence over 51 million acres of United States national park land. It says that liberals know this bill will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the U.N. control over development of American soil. There are no such international treaties and agreements, nor should there be, nor would this Congress vote for, nor would any President negotiate such international treaties. It is just bogus.

The letter talks about radicals like AL GORE and Bruce Babbitt that enforce treaties in a way that give the U.N. authority over our land and our private property every day. GORE and Babbitt are not radicals and they are not doing any such thing. This letter talks about open warfare in coming weeks to pass this bill. Mr. DeWeese talks about meeting with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and saying that the American Policy Center will back him all the way in the battle to pass this bill.

Of course, then Mr. DeWeese goes to the heart of the matter and asks for any contribution from \$17 to \$1,000 to help the American Policy Center in their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not needed. We should oppose it. It is nothing but scare tactics from the right wing. We should vote "no."

AMERICAN POLICY CENTER,
Herndon, VA.

DEAR FRIEND OF APC: I have just come from an emergency meeting on Capitol Hill, and I have important news for you.

I was meeting with several national leaders to plan a strategy to pass Congressman Don Young's "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act" (H.R. 883).

As I'm sure you remember, we were successful last year in passing this bill in the House of Representatives to stop the UN land grab of American Soil.

But we were stopped cold in the U.S. Senate. We didn't even get a hearing on the Senate version of the Bill. Because the Senate did not act, we have to start all over again and pass it again in the House, while we build strength in the Senate.

We intend to win this time. We intend to pass the Bill in both Houses of Congress and stop the UN from designating any more U.S.

soil as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves.

We believe Congressman Young has the votes to pass it again in the House. In fact, he already has 158 co-sponsors, with more joining each day. He also has the support of new House Speaker Dennis Hastert.

The problem, again, is in the Senate.

Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado has again agreed to introduce the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act in the Senate. The Bill number is S. 510.

But Senator Campbell has only been able to sign on six co-sponsors. Without more support, S. 510 will again die in the Senate.

You and I can't let that happen. Not again. You and I need to storm the Senate. Here's how.

First, I have enclosed a "Legislative Petition" to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. He will be key in the fight to build support in the Senate.

Frankly, without his support there can be no floor vote on S. 510.

That's why it is urgent that you immediately sign and return your "Legislative Petition" to me right away. You and I must flood Lott's office with petitions to prove S. 510 has strong national support.

So please sign you petition and return it to me immediately.

But you and I can't stop there.

Senator Campbell needs more co-sponsors for the Bill. Please call both of your states U.S. Senators and ask them to co-sponsor S. 510. Simply call the Senate switchboard at 202-224-3121, and ask for your Senators by name.

Just as important, however is that you contact you Congressman to make sure he supports Congressman Young's House version (H.R. 883). We must have a strong show in the House as well. If not, all of our efforts in the Senate will be in vain.

So please, call your Congressman at 202-225-3121. Tell him to support H.R. 883.

It is vital that you do all you can—if we are going to stop the UN's land grab of American soil. To win, you and I will have to beat overwhelming odds.

But don't despair. You and I can win this battle.

Remember when the fight to stop the UN land grab started in the 104th Congress?

Democrats refused to even attend hearings. They laughed and called Congressman Young's bill the "black helicopter" bill. They called it "preposterous," "absurd" and "crazy." The very idea that someone was challenging the UN was laughable to them. They're not laughing now.

The liberals know they must stop the bill. And they know the Senate is their last chance. Liberals know this bill will terminate United Nations' influence on 51 million acres of U.S. national parklands.

Liberals know this bill will gut the extremist United Nations' environmental agenda and will lead to the end of international treaties and agreements that give the UN control over development of American soil.

Liberals know this bill forces them to take a side. Do liberals support your right to own and control your private property or not?

The bill exposes the left's property-grabbing agenda. It weakens to United Nations' influence in the world. That's why they know they must stop the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act at all costs.

So, right now, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Nature Conservancy and all of their extremist environmental buddies are charging up Capitol Hill, swarming over Senate offices, using all of their power to keep this Bill from gaining co-sponsors or a floor vote.

They know we can pass this bill. Our position is strong.

The whole purpose of the American Sovereignty Protection Act is to restore the role of Congress where it should have been all along—as the administrator with sovereign control over public lands in the United States.

That authority has been slowly eroded over the years by a series of environmental treaties and agreements that subject our public lands to the influences of UN officials and UN-dictated rules. And with the help of the Clinton Administration.

Those rules not only tell the United States what it must do with public lands—but they also affect private property as well.

Just ask the owner of the gold mine that was located outside Yellowstone National Park. He was on private land—his land. Now he's out of business. Why? Because the United Nations said so.

And these UN treaties, like the Biodiversity Treaty and the World Heritage Sites are incredibly dangerous when radicals like Vice President Al Gore and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt hold power.

They can enforce the treaties in a way that gives the UN authority over our land and our private property. And they are doing it every day.

The House of Representatives recognized the danger and passed Don Young's Bill in the 105th Congress. They know that the threat is real, and we can pass the Bill in the House again in the 106th Congress.

But the real battle is now in the Senate.

And I tell you with complete honesty—we will have to fight like the Dickens to withstand the coming liberal firestorm. The liberals will use everything in their arsenal to stop this Bill. And the Senate is not a friendly place for property owners.

Get ready for open warfare. It's coming. In the next few weeks.

At our meeting today, I promised Congressman Young that APC would back him all the way in the battle to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. And I meant it. That includes leading the fight in the Senate.

Your enclosed "Legislative Petition" is my first step. Please. It is urgent that you sign it and return it to me today. We simply must build pressure on Trent Lott to support the Bill. That's why it's also important that you begin making phone calls to your Senators and Congressman to ask them to co-sponsor and support the bills (H.R. 883 and S. 510).

Over the coming weeks APC will get this message to hundreds of thousands of Americans to build the pressure.

You and I can pass this bill and cut the power of the UN!

But to do it, I urgently need your financial support. Will you help me keep up this fight to save America from the UN land grab?

I've been appearing on radio and television programs and speaking before audiences across this nation to sound the alarm on the UN land grab. The response is incredible. When Americans know the truth—they do the right thing. But they are not hearing most of this story from anyone but the American Policy Center. But, through APC's effort, we are truly awakening a slumbering giant.

Will you help me stay in the fight by sending me your most generous contribution of at least \$17?

Remember, the Sierra Club and their buddies have millions of dollars in their war chest. I have only you. So if you can send a larger donation of \$25, \$50, \$100, \$250, \$500, or even \$1,000, I will be able to counter the liberal barrage, word for word.

You know APC's record and what we can do when our action alert system is firing on all cylinders. But it takes dollars to fuel the engine. I need you now. There really is no

more important legislation before the U.S. Congress than the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The bill truly is the whole ball game for our property rights. Pass it—and the UN is less of a threat. That's why the liberals hate it with a passion.

Now is the time. This is the battle. Please help me win it.

Sincerely,

TOM DEWESE,
President.

P.S. You and I will not fight a more important battle in 1999 than this one to pass the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. It is crucial that I receive your signed "Legislative Petition" right away. Equally important is your financial support to keep APC in the battle. Without you, I can do nothing. Please help. Thanks for all you do.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding and for his work on this legislation. I do rise in support of it.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to what he indicated about this. I agree that there has been, and there always will be, overstatements about the dangers of potential actions that are taken, and in this case the dangers of the Biosphere Program. But the argument has been made that the United Nation's designation is important because it provides some international protections for these worldwide important sites. Well, if it provides some protections, then there is some implied authority, if not direct authority, that is yielded to that international body; otherwise, the designation would have no significance. If it has no significance, then why would anyone oppose this simple legislation.

I have a habit in this Congress of trying to read legislation, and I took the time to read this bill that has been offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), H.R. 883, and it says, "Any designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of UNESCO shall not be given any force or effect unless the Biosphere Reserve is specifically authorized by a law."

Now, the argument is made, well, why should Congress engage in this activity? Well, I voted on naming postal buildings; I voted on naming Federal buildings; we vote on postage stamps. So there is a lot of designations that we do in this Congress.

I believe that private ownership of property is important. I believe that our National Heritage Sites, our parks are very important, and I think that Congress has a role, and when the constituents express a concern about a particular designation, that it is right and proper in this democracy for Congress to address it.

The Ozark Highland Man and Biosphere Plan was advanced in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri without public input. It was withdrawn after property owners, timber producers and other residents in the region learned of and opposed the designation.

I believe the Chairman's bill is reasonable. I believe it is appropriate. I believe it maintains the balance between executive action and legislative authority and certainly, when our constituents have a concern about these types of designations, that it is appropriate that we have congressional oversight and input into that process. So I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in vigorous opposition to H.R. 883, which really ought to be titled the American Land Paranoia Act, because the principal purpose of this act is to sow paranoia among Americans who ought to take pride in our interest in protecting some of our national treasures. I will tell my colleagues that this is not a small matter.

Some may think this is a small matter, we should not worry about it. I want to tell my colleagues a little story. I was up on the border of the State of Washington and Canada about three years ago, four years ago now; in fact it was in what used to be the district of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). I was talking to a fellow who was a businessperson, a nice fellow, a pillar of the community. He lives about 10 miles from the Canadian border. We got in a nice little discussion at a county fair.

He said, "Jay, what are you going to do about those tanks the U.N. has up on those railroad cars just over the Canadian border?" And I kind of chuckled. I said, "Henry, what are you talking about?" He said, "Well, you know, those tanks that the U.N. has across the border that they are going to use to come in to establish this United Nations park in the North Cascades."

I laughed. Then I saw he was serious. He was serious. And the reason he was serious is that the advocates of things like this bill have convinced this gentleman and a lot of people in America that somehow the tanks with the blue helmets and the black helicopters are coming to take away their livelihood, and that is flat wrong. Flat wrong. This is no unconstitutional loss.

Mr. Chairman, we sat in the hearings and I was engaged with the committee on hearings on this. People came forward and they sent to us this law professor or lawyer, I do not know if he is a professor, and he argued for 10 minutes passionately about how this violated the Constitution of America.

Then I asked him a simple question. I said, "How long has this been on the books?" He said, "Well, since the late

1960s." Then I asked him, "Well, have you ever gone to court to ask for this to be ruled unconstitutional, the loss of sovereignty?" He said, "Well, no." The reason he has never done it is he knows darn well it is not unconstitutional.

This is a bunch of flimflam where people are trying to foist these fears on the American people.

The last point I want to make, the World Heritage Convention that is under attack here as some kind of socialist plot was introduced under the administration of Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon came up with this socialist plot, and it is something that has been effective to try to get international attention to help us in this country preserve what we believe are our national treasures.

This is another sad step of my friends across the aisle, frankly, leaving that tradition of Teddy Roosevelt and even Richard Nixon. We ought to keep this thing on the books as it is and reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I am the newest member of the Committee on Resources, and I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from the great State of Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership in introducing this bill.

Under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, quote, "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution is clear. The United Nations, despite efforts by its supporters, is not a governing body superior in authority to this Congress.

I know that comes as a shock to some of my colleagues in this place and certainly some of the supporters from whom I have heard, who believe that the United Nations has some superior claim to the sovereignty of the United States, particularly when it comes to determining what is the appropriate use of the land within our borders. It is, however, not, as I say, not a superior authority to this Congress.

Yet, the U.N. is designating land within our country's borders for special protection without the consent of the House.

There are 83 U.N. sites in America, Mr. Chairman. In my home State of Colorado there are five United Nations biosphere reserves. I can tell the Members, having served in the Colorado State legislature for many years, those sites were designated without the express consent of the State of Colorado and without the Congress of the United States.

I have visited many of these areas. I agree they are incredible and breathtaking. I agree they are a treasure, but

they are the property of the United States, and we must maintain absolute autonomy in our land management decisions.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in opposition to this bill. I would just point out to my colleagues that the only power with regard to the disposition or the use of the lands that are within these designations are inherent in the laws that Congress has passed and delegated to the Park Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM, the Forest Service, or other land managers to manage.

In fact, this is a voluntary thing. All of these designations that are being discussed here, whether it is the Ramsar treaty or the Man and the Biosphere, which happens to be the program associated with the UNESCO program, or the World Heritage Convention and the sites that are identified, only some 15 sites in the United States, are all voluntary.

The laws that govern these sites are the laws of the national and State governments, and the private property rights and laws are completely intact. They are not changed by these voluntary designations. In fact, when making the designations or the recognition of these sites on a global basis, one of the criteria is in fact that the laws and rules are in place that will accord the proper use of these lands. So that is one of the prerequisites.

I would point out that the laws that affected the New World Mine were those that were being applied through the Park Service and the Forest Service in the State of Wyoming, in the State of Montana, and the other States within which Yellowstone lies.

The point is that there is no impact. The impact here, of course, is one of cooperation and collaboration, building on the laws that we have and attempting to encourage other Nations to in fact emulate the stewardship, the conservation, and preservation efforts that we have made in terms of these important sites, because they are important as a natural heritage site or cultural site or because they are important for research or for water fall.

So the only issue here is one where we could say that the Man and the Biosphere program has not directly been authorized by Congress, although we have appropriated money for it.

We have many laws today where the authorization has expired or has not been made, where the Office of Management and Budget, because money is appropriated, the courts have ruled that in fact it has the force and effect of in fact Congress authorizing and lawfully permitting that type of designation, and we have done that for that program, clearly a case we made to bring up an authorization bill and deal with it in that manner.

But that has not been the disposition of the committee. What they have chosen to do, of course, is because, in my judgment, they cannot attack the parks, they cannot attack some of the land uses which they have an issue with directly, they have turned around and wrapped themselves in this question of sovereignty, which there is no constitutional case here. There is no court case here that has been pursued that has been positive that would indicate the statements being made are accurate.

They are not accurate. They have never been tested in court. I think they are inaccurate. They can test such issues in court and get answers back as to whether they are appropriate.

In fact, this has been praised by many. I just picked up a statement here, a press release by Secretary of Interior Don Hodel, most recently, of course, who led the Christian Coalition, but before that he worked in the State of Washington and on Bonneville Power, and was our Secretary of Interior under then President Ronald Reagan.

This letter was dated October 10, 1986, a press release in which he stated how enthusiastic and proud the Department was of the Statue of Liberty which was designated a World Heritage Site. So I think this just sort of indicates across the board how important this is. This is why all of the environmental groups and conservation groups oppose this legislation.

I will offer an amendment in this process, Mr. Chairman, which will address some real concerns, and that is the commercial use by foreign entities of U.S. properties for mining, for grazing, for timber harvesting.

If we are so concerned about the preservation and conservation of these areas, then maybe we should really be concerned about those what we call exploitative activities that go on on these lands by foreign powers, actual activities, rather than these phantom concerns that we have with tanks and other issues that may be in the minds of our constituents. But I am sure that my colleagues have made every effort to dispel these unwarranted fears, and have faced up to the issues of this misinformation campaign that has existed.

I trust they would do that, Mr. Chairman; that they would face up to that type of issue and not let that type of misunderstanding and misinformation spread across the land such fear that would result in imprudent types of actions by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also recite Mr. Hodel, the past Secretary of the Interior.

The last paragraph says, "This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a

United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control." I support H.R. 883 thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this legislation. I find it very difficult to understand the arguments of those who oppose it.

What is wrong with Congress being in control? What is wrong with the people in our districts, if they agree or disagree, having a right to talk to their Congressman?

Don Hodel also said, "During the Reagan administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use."

Why was America founded by Europeans and Asians? Because they wanted additional freedom, they wanted control, they wanted to be in charge, and they certainly do not want people from other countries, and designating is fine, but having other people to have a say about how land is used in our parks, in our public lands, makes no sense in this country.

This is about sovereignty. This is about freedom. This is about America being in charge of Americans; having relations with other countries, but they should not have a say in America, and the American public should have Congress to go back to. That is all we are asking, for Congress to be the final word.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

I have come to the floor many times during my tenure in Congress to discuss this very important issue that H.R. 883 addresses, the constitutional duty that we have as Members of Congress to protect the sovereignty of our lands in every possible way.

Yet, every time this matter is brought before the House, I hear many of my colleagues vigorously argue that this has nothing to do with our constitutional duty to preserve and protect our Nation's sovereignty.

I have also heard arguments today from the floor that we should not be meddling in these kinds of things. I know as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health we even have to have a bill to move a boundary on a wilderness area a half a mile. We have to have a bill to name buildings.

So what would the opposition to this bill have us do, just stay busy naming

buildings and moving boundaries, or protect the sovereignty of this Nation? That is our first and foremost responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, another thing that I have heard from the opposition to this bill is that it does not involve private property. I can tell the Members, it does involve private property when they seized control and took over the New World Mine, a patented mine. That was in fact private property.

In fact, the American taxpayer had to pony up \$68 million to pay off the Canadian leasehold interests for their loss in the property. The woman who owned the property, who had the patent on the mine, still stands empty-handed. This Congress must deal with that problem, too.

Mr. Chairman, this very simple bill enacts three very basic requirements. Number one is it requires the Secretary of the Interior to require the approval of Congress for any nomination of property located in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list.

Number two, the bill would prohibit Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States as a biosphere reserve unless Congress ratifies and enacts the Biosphere Reserve Treaty.

Finally, H.R. 883 simply prohibits any Federal official from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I might remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that while the World Heritage sites have been or the treaty was approved by the Democrat-led Senate during the Nixon administration, nevertheless, the biodiversity treaty has never been ratified by the United States Senate, never. Yet, there is enough land that has been set aside under designations of these two designations to fill up the entire State of Colorado.

I think it is time we act. We have a responsibility to the American people to protect the sovereignty of our land.

Mr. Chairman, these very simple provisions do not represent massive changes in policy, nor are they born out of paranoia. There is nothing that says anything about blue helmets or tanks. They are very important items that ensure our Federal officials properly allocate taxpayer resources, and that we as a Congress maintain the total governance of our lands required under Article IV, Section 3, of the United States Congress.

This section, very succinctly, states that "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." It is very clear. It does not take a rocket scientist to interpret what the Constitution says, and neither does it take a court to interpret this provision for us to act. We

do not need the court decisions for the Congress to act in a responsible way.

Mr. Chairman, there are some who actually believe that the U.N. Biosphere and World Heritage designations, which encompass 68 percent of the land in our national parks, preserves, and monuments, and make up an area the size of Colorado, are benign and have the mere purpose of placing a plaque or a label that these areas can use to attract tourism.

That is utter naivete. However, in the Committee on Resources we have heard testimony from citizens living in Alaska, Arkansas, Missouri, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Wyoming that suggest otherwise. These individuals testified about how these designations affected their property value, their economic activity, and most candidly, their ability to play a role in the designation process. They were left out.

Even the U.N.'s own documentation on these programs describes its proactive role on land policy. One such publication defining the purpose of biodiversity reserves call for extensive land policy initiatives such as "strategies for biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use," and for action plans provided for under Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

I am not going to trade our responsibility to manage our lands under this constitutional provision for Article VI of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and I do not think the American people want us to do that, either.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, to me this type of strategy involves a lot more than just a harmless plaque. Nevertheless, the question every Member of this body should be asking themselves today is not whether or not these designations do in fact intrude on our vested power to govern our lands, but whether we should even take that chance.

Mr. Chairman, if World Heritage areas or Biodiversity Reserves really are harmless or benign, it should be Congress that makes that determination, not our unelected officials. I do not think that Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution advises that in governing our lands that we simply opt out of policies that may appear ineffectual. But instead, it expressly requires that we, the Congress, make all needful rules and regulations.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, the danger can be stated any clearer than it was before the Committee on Resources by the Honorable Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, highly respected U.N. Ambassador during the Reagan administration, when she stated, and I quote, "The World Heritage and Man and Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based in democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans."

Ms. Kirkpatrick went on to say, "What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya, all of which are parties to this treaty, have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park?"

Mr. Chairman, the only relevant argument that the Clinton administration has made against this bill is that it would add unnecessary bureaucracy to the designation process. I do not believe that is the case. I think that this would simply clarify and straighten out a mess that we have found ourselves in in this administration.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that clearly the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is confused about the Biodiversity Treaty, which is not a part of this agreement. We are talking about Man and the Biosphere.

I mean, we would obviously stipulate that the Biodiversity Treaty, the Rio Treaty, is something that the Senate has to consider. But apparently we were misplacing our words.

I would suggest that the national protection and international protection of cultural and national heritage in Article VI, this particular program points out that, and I will quote from this, "Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of States of whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Article I and II is situated, and without prejudice to the property right provided by national legislation, the State parties to this Convention recognized that such heritage constitutes a World Heritage for those whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate."

So the issue that we are dealing here with is not whether the countries are members of this, because we know that there are many nations who are members of these programs. In fact, with regards to the World Heritage Convention, 150 nations are members of that; with regards to Man and the Biosphere, it is 125 Nations; and with regards to the Ramsar Treaty, there are 92 Nations.

As I had spoken earlier, nearly 2,000 sites, some 1,932 sites that I have and still growing, I suppose, and in the United States, we have some 82 of those sites where less than 5 percent of the sites are located in the United States, and it is based upon the existing land laws that the Committee on Resources, the administration, that U.S. law provides, whether through the national government, through the State governments, the property rights are intact.

No one can raise one case where, for instance, the Statue of Liberty has been designated a World Heritage site. What have we lost? What has changed in terms of its administration? Tell me one instance where something has changed that is due to the designation

or the recognition that is accorded to these 82 sites, not one witness that appeared.

The gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) raised the question that there was a witness from Minnesota. Well, unfortunately, I am from Minnesota. We do not have any sites in Minnesota. I would like to have some sites in Minnesota, and I hope someday that we do. But we do not have any in Minnesota. But I guess that witness from Minnesota knew something that I did not.

But the fact is, and this is the sort of, I think, misunderstandings that this legislation is based on, not one of these sites has been brought to our attention where there has been any change in the land management that is due to these cooperative voluntary international agreements.

While I have tried to portray this as not having an impact, obviously our park laws, when I wrote and when our committee writes legislation on parks or on wilderness or on BLM or other types of land classifications, I mean what I say when we designate those sites that they ought to be protected, that there are transboundary issues that are affected. I meant what I said.

But, unfortunately, I think what is unfolding here is an effort to try, through this American sovereignty claim, through criticism and fear of the U.N., to try to turn around and blame the U.N. and these programs, these international programs. We have everything at stake in terms of providing this type of leadership on a global basis, in terms of trying to encourage other nations on a voluntary basis, whether it be China, whether they be democratic governments or governments which we think are not democratic, to in fact pursue the preservation, the conservation of their resources on a voluntary basis. We have had spectacular success.

This is a place, as I said, if it is a criticism of UNESCO in terms of Man and the Biosphere, in terms of research, this is an area that is working. This is one area that we should not be debating or disagreeing about in terms of research and gaining information and knowledge. That is the essence of what the Man and the Biosphere program has. It has nothing to do with the Biodiversity Treaty, as was indicated here, a misstatement I guess on the part of the proponents of this.

The same is true of these World Heritage sites. They deliver tourism. Individuals, just like in a park pass, look at these World Heritage sites, some 506 sites, and they try to go to as many as they can. It encourages tourism in this Nation. We have but 20 of those sites. Obviously our parks are a great attraction and globally known and renowned for the wonderful features that characterize them.

The Ramsar Treaty obviously is one. There may be other treaties that are affected. These are the three that have stuck out that we have discussed, but

almost any other agreements that we come to on a voluntary international basis are struck down and put back before Congress. I think we know what the disposition of that is.

Read the bill. I have read this bill and studied it carefully. It makes an almost insurmountable test in terms of any type of designation of the Man and the Biosphere programs. It goes 10 miles outside the boundary of any of these where there would be a Man and the Biosphere designation and demands that it have absolutely no economic effect.

I would suggest that it would almost be impossible to pass the type of test that has been put in here. But I think it has been put in here for good reason; that is, my colleagues want to kill these programs. They want to cut the head off of the Man and the Biosphere program. They want to stop the World Heritage Convention. They want to stop the Ramsar Treaties, which are the basis, really, just the fragile basis of cooperation that we have on an international basis to provide some conservation and leadership.

Frankly, in my view, we ought to be doing a lot more on an international basis, dealing with water quality, dealing with air quality, dealing with the way that landscapes are treated in terms of how we treat our forests and, indeed, that biodiversity issue treaty that was raised by my colleague.

I certainly am a proponent of trying to work on a global basis to protect these resources and to rationally use them and to, in fact, provide for some policy path that would be reasonable with regards to preserving our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure. It is a bad measure. It is misunderstood and unfortunately a bill the House should not consider at all. I urge defeat of this measure, H.R. 883.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the Biosphere Reserve Program is operating without any congressional authority at all. Our constitutional system is designed to make our government responsible to the people; that is, the American citizens who are the ultimate sovereign authority in our system, a people who must satisfy the concerns of outsiders before they are no longer sovereign. That is why this is called the American Sovereignty Act.

I respectfully request my colleagues to vote for this legislation, get us back in control under our Constitution. That is our role. That is our charge. Not to do so is neglecting our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

SENATE,
STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, MN, May 11, 1999.
Hon. TOM COBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COBURN: As Chairman of the Minnesota Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Environment, I commend your efforts to defund the Man and Biosphere Program (MAB). Since one of the major opponents of your efforts is Congressman Bruce Vento of Minnesota, who represents a compact urban district with little undeveloped land, I would like to tell you about the painful experience northern Minnesota had with the MAB programs in the past.

During the mid-1980's the National Park Service proposed a massive Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve that included lands in my Senate district which were included without notifying me or any other local elected officials. In 1984 the state-sponsored Citizen's Committee on Voyageurs National Park took up this issue after a casual comment from the then Voyageurs National Park Superintendent Russell Berry that our area had been nominated as a biosphere reserve. At a public meeting of that committee on December 1, 1984 in Minneapolis after the nomination was made, Mr. Berry, partially explained one reason for the biosphere reserve by stating "I'd like to be in as strong a position as possible to influence activities outside the boundaries that would adversely affect the Park in the context of things that would be detrimental to the ecosystem within the Park."

Because the park is surrounded by thousands of acres of private property, Mr. Berry intended to use the biosphere as a means to implement land use controls on private property. Since my constituents did not want their constitutionally-guaranteed private property rights further threatened, they strongly opposed this proposal. Consequently, in 1987 the Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve nomination was withdrawn by National Park Service Director William Penn Mott.

Until the MAB program is authorized by Congress and statutory protections for private property are guaranteed, I will support all efforts to defund this program. Without these protections, unelected federal bureaucrats will again use biosphere reserves as a means of implementing federal land use controls on private property.

Since Mr. Vento's district is 300 miles away from the ill-fated Northwoods International Biosphere Reserve proposal, I would encourage you to listen to those who represent people who live and work in the affected area rather than those who recreate in the area on weekends.

Thanks again for your efforts in defense of local control and private property.

Sincerely,

Senator BOB LESSARD.

—

CHESAPEAKE, VA,

May 18, 1999.

Congressman RICHARD POMBO,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. POMBO: Thank you for asking for my comments on the process of UNESCO designation of World Heritage Sites.

During the Reagan Administration, these designations were honorary and benign in nature. However, like so many United Nations programs, this one has fallen subject to inappropriate mission creep. It has become a proxy for international attempts to override national sovereignty and control land use.

The current Administration has submitted a thirteen year old press release to invoke my name in support of the World Heritage Site proposals. This is unfortunate political game-playing and deceptive in that it does

not represent my position. Favorable statements made about an honorary and benign program more than a decade ago are patently not applicable to that program as it is now being utilized.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, as I understand it, will require congressional approval of United Nations World Heritage Site proposals. I believe that this is a necessary and reasonable safeguard for American citizens against overreaching, unelected, unaccountable domestic and international bureaucracies.

This legislation Chairman Young is sponsoring, H.R. 883, will bring welcome relief to property owners threatened by a United Nations bureaucracy that has grown out of control.

Sincerely,

DONALD PAUL HODEL.

—
STOCKTON, CA,
May 13, 1999.
Hon. RICHARD POMBO,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: Thank you for contacting me regarding the House Committee on Resources' March 18 hearing on the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883.

As you know, before President Ronald Reagan appointed me Assistant Secretary for Fish, and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, I served Governor Ronald Reagan as the Director of California's Department of Fish and Game. I am especially proud of the environmental agenda we were able to implement, and the success we had with programs that encourage ranchers, farmers and other private landowners to maintain, develop and enhance wildlife habitat on privately owned land. Those benefits continue to this day, and they serve as excellent examples of public benefits that flow from private land ownership without government intervention or funding.

Before coming to Washington, D.C. in 1980 to serve President Reagan, I gave 20 years of volunteer service on the board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF), including two terms as the Foundation's president-elect (1976-78).

Before my career and commitment to wildlife resources and the environment, I defended America's freedoms, including the right to own private property, when serving 4½ years with the U.S. Marine Corps during WWII, and another three years during the Korean Conflict.

At the March 18 hearing of the House Committee on Resources, I understand that the U.S. Department of the interior witness entered into the official record a 17-year old letter I signed while serving the Reagan Administration as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. I recently reviewed the letter in question, and you should know that it merely dealt with the technical issue of creating a standardized form for recording information on World Heritage Sites. The letter must not be interpreted as anything other than that.

The record of the Reagan Administration and the current Clinton Administration regarding UNESCO's World Heritage, and Man and the Biosphere programs are starkly different. Under the Reagan Administration, these designations were indeed voluntary, non-regulatory, and honorary. This is in sharp contrast with the current Administration that invited the World Heritage Committee to Yellowstone National Park to condemn private property located outside of the Park! The World Heritage Committee delegation present was comprised largely of non-elected bureaucrats from Third World countries. Such an action by the World Heritage

Committee clearly runs roughshod over America's sovereignty.

H.R. 883 is sorely needed to require Congress to oversee non-elected bureaucrats, in both the United States and the United Nations, from threatening our nation's sovereignty and private property rights of American citizens. Former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, stated this best in a May 5, 1999, letter she sent to the House Committee on Resources on this issue. she wrote, *inter alia*: "In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the State Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage, and Man and Biosphere Reserve committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when U.N. bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage Committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is possible) will fall on deaf ears."

I strongly support H.R. 883 and urge its passage. I believe H.R. 883 is desperately needed, and I know that it is in the best interest of our nation and her citizens to require our elected representatives in the United States Congress to properly oversee the actions of non-elected bureaucrats within the United States and the United Nations.

Sincerely,

G. RAY ARNETT,
Former Assistant Secretary
for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

CLARK RANCH,

Paso Robles, CA, 14 May 1999.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POMBO: I greatly appreciate you informing me about the May 12, 1999 letter from Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior Stephen Saunders to House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young regarding H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

The Saunders letter cited a letter I signed 15 years ago as Secretary of the Interior regarding the U.S.'s continued participation in the World Heritage Convention at a time when our nation decided to withdraw from the United States Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). My letter is characterized by Mr. Saunders as showing "a strong bipartisan consensus that U.S. involvement with the World Heritage Convention and other international conservation conventions at issue in H.R. 883 pose absolutely no threat to U.S. sovereignty."

That was true fifteen years ago. It is no longer the case today.

When I was Secretary of Interior for President Ronald Reagan, World Heritage sites were merely honorary designations. They did not threaten private property rights or national sovereignty. They were designed to recognize outstanding natural and cultural resources in America without creating new layers of regulation on private landowners and rural communities.

Unfortunately, this program has been used in some cases by the current administration

to threaten private property owners and national sovereignty. For example, in its efforts to stop a proposed mine on private property outside Yellowstone National Park, the current administration in 1995 invited the World Heritage Committee to the park to evaluate alleged environmental threats caused by the proposed mine. This visit by unelected United Nations bureaucrats created a circus-type atmosphere whereby the World Heritage Committee made the owners of that private property a pariah in the international community. Partially as a result of this visit and a formal declaration later against the proposed mine by the World Heritage committee, the mine was never developed.

I also understand that some in the current administration are attempting to use our membership in the World Heritage Committee to help stop a proposed mine in Australia that is strongly supported by the duly elected government of that country. Such an effort against a sovereign nation would have been unthinkable under the Reagan Administration which honored the sovereignty of democratically elected governments.

My review of H.R. 883 shows it merely provides congressional oversight of the World Heritage Program to prevent an international agency from threatening private property rights and national sovereignty as it did in Yellowstone and is attempting to do in Australia. This legislation will provide the type of adult supervision from elected officials that every domestic and international bureaucracy needs.

I appreciate you alerting me that my 15 year old letter is regrettably being used for political purposes in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. CLARK.

PULP & PAPERWORKERS'
RESOURCE COUNCIL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council (PPRC) strongly urges you to support H.R. 883, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, which soon will be voted on by the full House. This bill provides for Congressional oversight of United Nations Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites in the United States. The biosphere program is not even authorized by Congress, nor is the program part of an international treaty.

PPRC is a "Grassroots" organization representing more than 300,000 Pulp and Paper Workers and some 900,000 Wood Products Industry Workers. Many of our members are unionized workers and we have members in virtually every state of the union. We support natural resource policies that allow our mills to thrive and keep our members and their families employed in well-paying union jobs.

PPRC is very concerned how America's sovereignty over its natural resources is increasingly threatened by international agreements and unelected bureaucrats at international organizations which often are dominated by Third World nations that have poor records in protecting their own natural resources. This was painfully evident when several PPRC officers participated in the World Commission on Forestry and Sustainable Development conferences.

United Nations Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, administered by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), are nominated through a secretive process that excludes local governments, union workers, private landowners and other average citizens. Only high-ranking unelected officials at the State Department, other federal agencies, UNESCO and national environmental advocacy groups are involved in this nomination process.

Our Members, from diverse states such as New York, Arkansas, Kentucky and Minnesota have fought hard to get a seat at the table when biosphere reserves were proposed in their areas. In all cases, officials from federal agencies ardently worked to keep them out. H.R. 883 would open up this process by requiring that all existing biosphere reserves in the United States be authorized by an Act of Congress by 2002 or they would cease to exist. This would empower average citizens to become involved in these designations.

At House Resource Committee hearings in Tannersville, NY, Washington, D.C. and Rolla, MO, PPRC testified in strong support of this legislation. It embodies a basic principle of open government that citizens and communities have a right to know about decisions affecting them before they are made.

Again, the Pulp and Paperworkers' Resource Council strongly supports H.R. 883.

Sincerely,

DON WESSON,
PPRC National Secretary.

MAY 5, 1999.

Hon. Bruce F. Vento,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. VENTO Thank you for your letters of March 24th and April 28th regarding my testimony before the House Resources Committee on the March 18th hearing of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883. In my opinion the important issue here is protection of Americans' rights of democratic process. I sought to emphasize the dangers I see in Congress's waiving of its role and responsibilities over matters which fundamentally affect citizens of the United States and ceding that role and its associated powers to a global organization in which affected Americans have no representation.

As I understand it, the proposed Act does nothing more than affirm Congressional role in the management of our public lands, a role mandated to it by the Constitution under Article IV, Section 3, which states: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." I believe that is a clearly worded duty which Congress is bound by the Constitution to uphold.

Your letter raises several questions concerning my testimony, each of which I have addressed below.

I. Please explain the simultaneous decision to continue our active participation in the World Heritage Convention and the U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program [after your support for the successful U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO], both of which are coordinated at the international level by UNESCO.

The United States' Permanent Representative to the United Nations oversees U.S. participation in many United Nations' programs and organizations, including aspects of U.S. participation in UNESCO. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs, however, were not among them when I held that job.

As you know, the Department of the Interior has primary responsibility for the World Heritage and the Biosphere programs. The Department of the Interior, along with a federal interagency panel controls all aspects of these programs. No member of Congress is included on this panel. Neither was a United States' U.N. Ambassador when I held that position. The Code of Federal Regulations July 21, 1980 public notice of proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations or 1981 states U.S. law at the time I was our UN Ambassador: *'In the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of the Convention, including preparation of U.S. nominations. Recommendations*

on the proposed nominations are made to the Secretary by an interagency panel including members from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior; the President's Council on Environmental Quality; the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of State.¹¹ (Emphasis added). I was never included on the panel as the Department of State Representative. I was never invited to participate in any decisions concerning these programs.

I raised the issue of the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO to make a point: the UNESCO of the 1980's demonstrates quite well both an example of an incompetent and corrupt international organization and the nearly insurmountable obstacles of trying to reform it and hold it accountable. During my tenure as U.S. Ambassador, I sought to limit the proliferation and scope of U.N. based on international organizations which were accountable to no responsible, democratically elected government. This discussion serves to reinforce the point I was trying to make during my testimony, namely that Congress should take an active role in the oversight of programs which impact private citizens in this country.

II. [A]s you know, 7 of the 20 World Heritage Sites in the United States were listed as such during your tenure as our Ambassador to the U.N. In your capacity as U.N. Ambassador, did you oppose these nominations based on the fact that Congress had not specifically authorized these listings? At any point in your tenure, did you attempt to have any existing designations withdrawn on the same basis?

I refer you to my answer above. The Department of the Interior is charged with implementing the provisions of this program, not the United States' UN Representative's office. I had no role and I was not aware of the details of these programs. Now, however, that this issue has ripened, I believe it is time to restore Congress' proper role in this matter.

III. "Your prepared testimony . . . includes the statement, 'International Committees—whatever the substance of their decisions—do not represent the American people and cannot be held accountable by them,' (emphasis added). Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee'?"

Obviously, these committees do not represent the American people. That is not their function. I want to be absolutely clear on this point. Only our representatives on those committees represent Americans. Obviously, the Cuban or Libyan delegates to these committees do not represent the American people and, in fact, often oppose American interests, regardless of the issue. Neither do the New Zealand—to take a country at random—or Brazil. The United States' Congress, on the other hand, is elected and does, in fact, represent the American people. U.N. based committees, unlike Congress, are not accountable to the American people because they have not been elected by or chosen in any way by the American people. They do not represent and are not concerned with U.S. national interests nor the interests of U.S. citizens.

In this democracy, the citizens grant powers to our elected leaders through our votes

from the local and state levels up to the Congress and the Presidency. We give them the power to declare our lands national parks and the right to enact the laws that restrict our use of our properties. We give our duly elected leaders the authority to select the judges who will interpret those laws. Our elected leaders, in turn, respond to our wishes because, just as we have granted them power, so may we take it from them in the next election. Representation and accountability are the foundation of the freedoms we cherish. Having fought and won elections yourself, you know this principle well.

In U.N. organizations, there is no accountability. UN bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters. Many of the States Parties in the World Heritage Treaty are not democracies. Some come from countries that do not allow the ownership of private property. The World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere committees make decisions affecting the land and lives of Americans. Some of these decisions are made by representatives chosen by governments not based on democratic representation, certainly not on the representation of Americans. What recourse does an American voter have when UN bureaucrats from Cuba or Iraq or Libya (all of which are parties to this Treaty) have made a decision that unjustly damages his or her property rights that lie near a national park? When the World Heritage committee's meddling has needlessly encumbered a private United States citizen's land and caused his or her property values to fall, that citizen's appeals to these committees (if that is even possible) will fall on deaf ears.

As for your question "Is it accurate to conclude from this statement that you believe specific Congressional authorization should be required for U.S. participation in any program which involves an 'international committee'?" my answer is, in any U.N. based committee which makes decisions that importantly affect American citizens. Speaking to the issue at hand, which is the requirement of congressional authorization of World Heritage and Biosphere site designations, I definitely believe congressional authorization should be required. Congressional role should be protected, I believe, should be required, in any process, any time the Constitution specifically places a duty on Congress to act. The question presented here is specific. The Constitution mandates congressional responsibility over public land management. The World Heritage and Biosphere programs directly impact the management of public and private lands in the United States. Congress should be involved.

The Constitution grants and requires Congress' broad control over the management of the public lands. The Executive branch, through the Department of the Interior and in conjunction with the World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere programs (the "international committees" created by this Convention) should not be allowed to exercise Congress' constitutional authority.

IV. "Should Congressional authorization be required for any international agreements/contracts which allow use of our national resources and public lands, such as mining or timber harvesting? If it is the case that your support for requiring Congressional authorization is limited only to those areas included in H.R. 883, please explain the specific characteristics of 'international committees' dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?"

First of all, as you know, any U.N. based agreements or contracts which allow use of our natural resources and public lands require various forms of authorization from our elected officials. In this particular case,

the authorization must come from Congress. The Convention itself requires that "the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State governed." [Article II, Section 3] The State in question is the United States and its consent requires the consent of the people through their duly elected representatives in accordance with the Constitution. That means Congress, the body delegated the authority over land management by the Constitution. The "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act" is consistent with both U.S. and international law.

In the second part of your question, you ask what are the specific characteristics of "international committees" dealing with conservation which makes them particularly threatening?" My answer is, those communities which affect substantial interests of U.S. citizens. If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body delegated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefits to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here. They have no interest in how their actions affect private U.S. citizens. I believe Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities for land management to international groups whose members have no concern for protecting individual property rights and American interests.

Sincerely,

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 883, The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. We must preserve and protect our nation's private property rights for our citizens and for our country.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act will require Congressional approval before nominating U.S. property as U.N. land designations for inclusion on the World Heritage List. This legislature will also prohibit U.S. property from being nominated as a Biosphere Reserve and it will terminate existing Biosphere Reserves if they do not meet the proper conditions. Under H.R. 883, Congress will be re-established as the ultimate decision-maker in managing public lands and maintain sovereign control of U.S. soil, not the United Nations. We must pass this legislation and halt designations made without consulting Congress or landowners.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations has identified 92 sites in 31 states and the District of Columbia for acquisition. The fact is, property owners and local governments are routinely shut out of the process and have little recourse if their land is claimed by the U.N. or other international agencies. We must put an end to this uncalled-for seizure of our nation's land and restore control to landowners and local officials.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 883 and continue to protect our nation's soil. We must never allow foreign nations or international organizations to bully American landowners.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act. I and 182 of my colleagues who co-sponsored this bill believe that it is not only common sense, but also Congress' Constitutional duty, to protect the sovereignty of America's people and her land.

¹¹"Proposed U.S. World Heritage Nominations for 1981, Public Notice," 45 FR 48717, July 21, 1980. You will find the same language in each annual notice.

As you have heard, UN Land Designations, World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, take place without the approval of Congress and with little or no Congressional oversight; consequently, the citizens of the United States are excluded from the process. These decisions infringe upon State sovereignty, individual rights of United States citizens, and private interests in real property.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the beautiful forests, monuments, national parks and other lovely places in the U.S. as anyone and am thrilled that others outside the U.S. see the beauty in them as well. However, I feel very passionately that if the United Nations decides to designate the Uwharrie Forest—in the 8th District of North Carolina—as a World Heritage Site, that the people of my district should have the opportunity to address how this designation might affect them. Receiving this designation would mean that United States agrees to manage the Uwharrie Forest in accordance with an underlying international agreement which may have implications on private property outside the forest. At best, a World Heritage Site or Biosphere Reserve designation gives the international community an open invitation to interfere in how the Uwharrie, and land surrounding it, are used.

The voters of my district might decide it would be in their best interest to accept the UN designation. If that were the case, I would gladly honor the will of my constituents. However, it is their community, their lands and their livelihoods being affected, they have the right, and should have the opportunity, to have a say.

The Uwharrie Forest is just one example of a beautiful site in my district. I know each of you can think of several beautiful places in your own districts that would be prime for a UN World Heritage Site designation.

I urge you to give your constituents the chance to be involved in decisions that affect them, their private property rights and our sovereignty as a nation. I urge you to vote in favor of the Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when I was sworn into office, I took an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Each of us has taken that same oath, and I rise to remind us of our oath of office and reflect on the words of the Constitution. Article IV, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states, "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Clearly, the U.S. Constitution gives the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress the authority to make all rules and regulations over Federal lands.

This authority is not given to the President, it is not given to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. No one in the State Department or the Department of the Interior is given this authority. The Constitution does not give this authority to the United Nations, UNESCO or any other body. The authority to establish rules and regulations over Federal lands is reserved to the U.S. Congress and only the U.S. Congress.

What does H.R. 883, this bill, require the Government to follow? The U.S. Constitution. The bill requires the specific approval of Congress before any area within the United States is subject to an international land use nomination, classification, or designation. Is this so offensive?

H.R. 883 requires the consent of Congress before the Secretary of the Interior may nominate any property in the United States for inclusion in the World Heritage list. I believe this is certainly consistent with Article IV, section 2.

H.R. 883 specifically prohibits Federal officials from nominating any land in the United States for designation as a biosphere reserve. Such designations are left to Congress to determine.

The bill requires the Congress to reconsider for designation as a biosphere reserve those sites that have already been designated as biosphere reserves by previous administrations. It restores to Congress the authority to choose to redesignate or not redesignate these sites. This is a process that should have been in place all along.

H.R. 883 prohibits Federal officials from designating any land in the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such designation is specifically approved by law.

I call on all of my colleagues to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the constitutional authority of this body. A vote for H.R. 883 is a vote to preserve the authority of this body. A vote against H.R. 883 is a vote that quite frankly, in my opinion, is inconsistent with Article IV, section 2, and the oath that we have taken.

"The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

The increasing interdependence of the world's economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often dependent on international cooperation, but this cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

This legislation restricts Federal officials from designating lands under the World Heritage List of the United Nations without the express consent of Congress.

Furthermore, it amends the National Historic Preservation Act to restrict United States' lands from being designated as a Biosphere Reserve.

It gives Congress the necessary authority to approve all land designations and change any existing designations. These measures are key elements to ensuring that America remains in full control of American land.

It is critical for the United States to ensure that our lands are not subject to special international restrictions without careful consideration of the implications before a designation is made.

There is no denying that our world is becoming increasingly interdependent.

Economic stability, environmental quality, and peace and human development are often depending on international cooperation.

This interdependence, however, cannot preempt the United States from meeting our obligations to our own citizens.

I cannot support policies that place limitations on our ability to manage our own affairs.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 883.

This bill asserts that Congress under the U.S. Constitution has the power over federal lands. The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act would give Congress the authority to review, not attack, existing Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site designations, in order to decide if such designations are necessary.

I find it troubling that initiatives such as the United Nations Biosphere Reserves, World Heritage Sites and Ramsar Sites have been designated with virtually no Congressional supervision. Also, I find it disconcerting that all of these designations have had virtually no input from state and local officials.

Private property rights are a cornerstone to the American heritage. Our founding Fathers protected the rights of land owners. Many people in the United States have found that their private property rights are being restricted because they live in proximity to biosphere reserves. Restrictive regulations that govern these reserves are the brainchild of the United Nations, not the United States government.

Land management decisions should be made and reviewed by Congress, not arbitrarily by bureaucratic officials in the Executive Branch or international agencies.

What do my colleagues from the other side fear from Congress doing their job? Why do they fear individuals, local, state and federal entities being involved in the process? Congress should not relinquish their duty of maintaining and protecting federal lands. We must ensure the rights of American private property owners at the federal and international level. I urge the passage of this important legislation. Vote yes on H.R. 883.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for 4 hours and is considered read.

The text of H.R. 883 is as follows:

H.R. 883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations governing lands belonging to the United States is vested in the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution.

(2) Some Federal land designations made pursuant to international agreements concern land use policies and regulations for lands belonging to the United States which under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution can only be implemented through laws enacted by the Congress.

(3) Some international land designations, such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Cultural Organization, operate under independent national committees, such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee, which have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress.

(4) Actions by the United States in making such designations may affect the use and

value of nearby or intermixed non-Federal lands.

(5) The sovereignty of the States is a critical component of our Federal system of government and a bulwark against the unwise concentration of power.

(6) Private property rights are essential for the protection of freedom.

(7) Actions by the United States to designate lands belonging to the United States pursuant to international agreements in some cases conflict with congressional constitutional responsibilities and State sovereign capabilities.

(8) Actions by the President in applying certain international agreements to lands owned by the United States diminishes the authority of the Congress to make rules and regulations respecting these lands.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To reaffirm the power of the Congress under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution over international agreements which concern disposal, management, and use of lands belonging to the United States.

(2) To protect State powers not reserved to the Federal Government under the Constitution from Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(3) To ensure that no United States citizen suffers any diminishment or loss of individual rights as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements for purposes of imposing restrictions on use of those lands.

(4) To protect private interests in real property from diminishment as a result of Federal actions designating lands pursuant to international agreements.

(5) To provide a process under which the United States may, when desirable, designate lands pursuant to international agreements.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN WORLD HERITAGE SITE LISTING.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (Public Law 96-515; 94 Stat. 2987) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence, by—

(A) striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Subject to subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), the Secretary”; and

(B) inserting “(in this section referred to as the ‘Convention’)” after “1973”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(d)(1) The Secretary of the Interior may not nominate any lands owned by the United States for inclusion on the World Heritage List pursuant to the Convention, unless—

“(A) the Secretary finds with reasonable basis that commercially viable uses of the nominated lands, and commercially viable uses of other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands, in existence on the date of the nomination will not be adversely affected by inclusion of the lands on the World Heritage List, and publishes that finding;

“(B) the Secretary has submitted to the Congress a report describing—

“(i) natural resources associated with the lands referred to in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the impacts that inclusion of the nominated lands on the World Heritage List would have on existing and future uses of the nominated lands or other lands located within 10 miles of the nominated lands; and

“(C) the nomination is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act and after the date of publication of a finding under subparagraph (A) for the nomination.

“(2) The President may submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a proposal for legislation authorizing such a nomination after publication of a finding under paragraph (1)(A) for the nomination.

“(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall object to the inclusion of any property in the United States on the list of World Heritage in Danger established under Article 11.4 of the Convention, unless—

“(i) the Secretary has submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a report describing—

“(A) the necessity for including that property on the list;

“(B) the natural resources associated with the property; and

“(C) the impacts that inclusion of the property on the list would have on existing and future uses of the property and other property located within 10 miles of the property proposed for inclusion; and

“(2) the Secretary is specifically authorized to assent to the inclusion of the property on the list, by a joint resolution of the Congress after the date of submittal of the report required by paragraph (1).

“(f) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit an annual report on each World Heritage Site within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the site:

“(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the site.

“(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the site.

“(3) A list and explanation of all non-governmental organizations that contributed to the management of the site.

“(4) A summary and account of the disposition of complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the site.”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION AND TERMINATION OF UNAUTHORIZED UNITED NATIONS BIOSPHERE RESERVES.

Section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 403. (a) No Federal official may nominate any lands in the United States for designation as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve—

“(b) Any designation on or before the date of enactment of the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of an area in the United States as a Biosphere Reserve under the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect, unless the Biosphere Reserve—

“(1) is specifically authorized by a law enacted after that date of enactment and before December 31, 2000;

“(2) consists solely of lands that on that date of enactment are owned by the United States; and

“(3) is subject to a management plan that specifically ensures that the use of intermixed or adjacent non-Federal property is not limited or restricted as a result of that designation.

“(c) The Secretary of State shall submit an annual report on each Biosphere Reserve within the United States to the Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy

and Natural Resources of the Senate, that contains for the year covered by the report the following information for the reserve:

“(1) An accounting of all money expended to manage the reserve.

“(2) A summary of Federal full time equivalent hours related to management of the reserve.

“(3) A list and explanation of all non-governmental organizations that contributed to the management of the reserve.

“(4) A summary and account of the disposition of the complaints received by the Secretary related to management of the reserve.”.

SEC. 5. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN GENERAL.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 404. (a) No Federal official may nominate, classify, or designate any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States for a special or restricted use under any international agreement unless such nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such a nomination, classification, or designation.

“(b) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of lands owned by a State or local government shall have no force or effect unless the nomination, classification, or designation is specifically authorized by a law enacted by the State or local government, respectively.

“(c) A nomination, classification, or designation, under any international agreement, of privately owned lands shall have no force or effect without the written consent of the owner of the lands.

“(d) This section shall not apply to—

“(1) agreements established under section 16(a) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4413); and

“(2) conventions referred to in section 3(h)(3) of the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 712(2)).

“(e) In this section, the term ‘international agreement’ means any treaty, compact, executive agreement, convention, bilateral agreement, or multilateral agreement between the United States or any agency of the United States and any foreign entity or agency of any foreign entity, having a primary purpose of conserving, preserving, or protecting the terrestrial or marine environment, flora, or fauna.”.

SEC. 6. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 401(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1(b)) is amended by striking “Committee on Natural Resources” and inserting “Committee on Resources”.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for

voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

On page 9, line 13, strike "2000" and insert instead "2003".

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical amendment which simply extends the time for grandfathering existing Biosphere Reserves by 3 years to 2003. I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment. Perfecting this bill is a very tall task, but the gentleman has made one modest effort to do so.

As long as the gentleman continues to yield, I point out that I understand that I will offer just one amendment, as I had indicated to the gentleman. I was not aware that of course the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has an amendment, and I understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has an amendment. I was not aware of those amendments yesterday at the Committee on Rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, neither was I. So the gentleman is true to his word.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have no objection to trying to improve this bill. It needs significant improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. VENTO:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"SEC. 7. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE DISPOSAL, MANAGEMENT, AND USE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES.

Title IV of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 470a-1 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

SEC. 405.—No Federal official may enter into an agreement with any international or foreign entity (including any subsidiary thereof) providing for the disposal, management, and use of any lands owned by the United States and located within the United States unless such agreement is specifically authorized by law. The President may from time to time submit to the Speaker of the

House of Representatives and the President of the Senate proposals for legislation authorizing such agreements."

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I guess according to the rule we are not going to read the amendment, but this amendment is an important amendment that deals with the key component of the pending legislation.

This legislation specifically requires to approve the recognition of any U.S. lands for conservation purposes as a result of an agreement with a foreign entity. However, at the same time, the legislation does not require similar congressional action when U.S.-owned lands are leased, oftentimes at a loss to American taxpayers, to foreign-owned countries for such things as drilling, mining under the 1872 mining law, timber harvesting, or other types of commercial endeavors.

My amendment establishes a parity in that process. My amendment would suggest that commercial users and development of U.S. lands by foreign companies and their U.S. subsidiaries may only be established when specifically authorized by law. My amendment would not prevent such activities from occurring. It would simply require Congress to approve such actions.

The Vento amendment in which I am joined by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Resources in this amendment is a responsible provision that responds to the abuses which are now occurring and which neither Congress nor the administration can legally stop.

Many of my colleagues may recall the public outcry when it was revealed that the concession facilities at Yosemite National Park were going to be managed by a Japanese conglomerate, Matsushita. No legal recourse was available to block that action.

A similar outrage was voiced when the Secretary of Interior was required under Federal law to lease lands containing more than \$10 billion in gold to a subsidiary of a Canadian-owned corporation who paid less than \$10,000 for that particular \$10 billion gold mine.

Nothing has been done to prevent a repeat of this type of continued rip-off. A foreign firm can still operate the concession for the Statue of Liberty or any other of our national parks. Foreign firms can continue to exploit American resources while at the same time at the expense of the American taxpayers.

We now have an opportunity to change that policy. The Vento amendment will not prevent these activities from moving forward, Mr. Chairman, it would simply require the Congress to consider the national consequences and specifically authorize these actions.

If we are going to require Congress to approve actions to recognize U.S.-owned lands for conservation purposes of all things to save migrating waterfalls, for instance, on a global basis or

to recognize our World Heritage sites, some of our outstanding crown jewels, our parks, our natural or cultural areas in the parks, or simply for Congress to approve when we are going to agree with the cooperative research like under the Man and the Biosphere program, then Congress should also approve actions by foreign firms or individuals to in fact use exploitative activities on U.S. lands.

I understand those activities, the U.S. lands, of course, are going to be used for mining, for timber harvesting, for grazing, water rights, a variety of other things, but the issue is that, if it is going to be done by foreign entities, we hand over the ownership, this has real impact, this particular amendment. Unlike this bill which simply relies upon the existing laws, the fact is this has real impact in terms of trying to limit these types of activities.

So I want to add this particular amendment to this for that reason, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the black helicopters are circling over our lands.

And the agents of foreign powers are indeed locking up our public lands, intent upon not only controlling them, but ultimately, America's very natural resource heritage.

But to be sure, the pilots of these helicopters are not wearing the blue helmets of the United Nations.

Rather, they are wearing the corporate emblems of companies based in South Africa, Australia, Luxembourg and Canada.

These foreign agents are not from the United Nations. Their weapons are not world heritage sites or international biospheres.

Indeed, the true threat comes from foreign conglomerates, multi-national mining firms, who swoop down upon our public lands and extract gold and silver with no rents or royalties paid to the American people.

The UN Charter, in this instance, is not the issue.

It is our very own Mining Law of 1872 which continues, with reckless disregard to our economy and our environment, to turn over federal assets to the control of foreign nationals.

And so, I rise in support of the Vento-Rahall-Miller amendment to this bill, the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

For if we are to protect the sovereignty of our American lands from foreign powers, then we must include commercial developments undertaken by foreign powers in the legislation.

This is what this amendment is all about.

Our lands, our resources, owned by all Americans, are being claimed by foreign entities.

The hardrock minerals on these lands are being mined with no return to the public.

And these lands are being privatized by foreign entities for a mere pittance—\$2.50 an acre.

Allowed under the Mining Law of 1872? Yes.

Should these practices continue to be condoned in 1999. No. Of course not.

So the real issue here today is not what the proponents of H.R. 883 make it out to be.

It is not about the UN. It is not about black helicopters descending upon an unsuspecting populace.

It is, in these times of budgetary constraint, about the relinquishment of our lands, and our minerals, to multinational conglomerates for fast food hamburger prices.

Cast a vote for America.

Vote yes on Vento-Rahall-Miller.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly accept the amendment.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 9, line 6, after "in the United States" insert "(other than an area within the State of Colorado)"

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would exempt all the Biosphere Reserves in Colorado from the provisions of the bill that would end the participation of U.S. sites in the Man and the Biosphere program unless we pass and the President signs a new law to continue their participation.

As I noted in general debate, currently there are two of these reserves in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Research Area and Rocky Mountain National Park. They include lands within the Second Congressional District which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, these areas are not involved in some conspiracy. They are not part of any sinister foreign plot to undermine our Constitution or our way of life. On the contrary, they are places where good things are taking place.

In the Niwot Ridge area, scientists associated with the University of Colo-

rado are doing important research about air pollution and other environmental issues in cooperation with scientists from other countries, such as the Czech Republic. This is important work, work that needs to continue; and my amendment would allow that to happen without interruption.

As for Rocky Mountain National Park, all I can say is that this is one of Colorado's brightest gems, one of the things that makes us proud to be Coloradans. Rising up from the edge of the Great Plains, it straddles the Continental Divide and includes snow-capped peaks, high-altitude tundra, and a diverse array of other land forms and a splendid diversity of vegetation and wildlife.

As Coloradans, we are glad to share its beauty with the Nation and we invite the world to experience it. And the world is doing just that, at least in part, because of its designation as a Biosphere Reserve. The National Park Service tells me that many visitors say that they learned of the park because it was included in the Man and the Biosphere program and that is what made them want to visit it.

As one who believes there is a benefit to every visitor to special wildlands like Rocky Mountain National Park, I am convinced that that is reason enough to keep the park in this program. But it is also true that tourism is a very important part of Colorado's economy, and that is another reason to keep the park in the program, which my amendment would do.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. Adoption of my amendment will not make this a good bill. Even if this amendment is adopted, that alone will not be sufficient for me to be able to support the bill. But this amendment will protect Colorado from some of the worst consequences of the bill, and to that extent I think it is very, very important.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the Udall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

These Biosphere Reserves were designated without congressional authorization and without consulting the public or State and local governments. This amendment invades the responsibility, again, of the Congress under Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution, making all laws concerning disposal or regulation of lands belonging to the United States with Congress.

Under H.R. 883, existing Biosphere Reserves would have until December 31, 2003, to get authorization. They are not automatically disenfranchised. If the Colorado Biosphere Reserve had the strong local support claimed by the gentleman that offered the amendment, then there would be no problem of getting the passage of this legislation in this Congress.

If I am still chairman of that committee, I will commit to the gentleman that I will support it if his people want

to have it in that district. If they do not, it would not occur.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of my good friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). The sites that he identifies that presently exist in Colorado, the Niwot Ridge Reserve and specifically also the Rocky Mountain National Park, are being designated sites under the Heritage Act.

Specifically, the Rocky Mountain National Park, of course, has been around for a long time and has been the protected environmental jewel in the crown of Colorado for a long, long time. It is peculiar, to say the least, that some other kind of designation, some United Nations designation, would help continue or would help preserve the environmental uniqueness of this particular property, or anything else in the State of Colorado, for that matter.

My colleague talks about the many tourists that flock to the State to see these places, especially Rocky Mountain Park. He is certainly correct in that; and, of course, they come in droves. In fact, one of our problems in Colorado is that oftentimes we have far too many people trying to get into these particular areas and preserves, into Rocky Mountain National Park; and our problem is trying to deal with the numbers coming in and the impact that that has on the Rocky Mountain Park and on many things that we are trying to protect.

When I was in the committee, Mr. Chairman, and we were debating this bill, it was a very interesting situation that occurred, in that in the State of Wyoming there was an attempt on the part of some people in the State of Wyoming to develop some mining adjacent to Yellowstone National Park, and all the processes were underway. The environmental impact statements had been ordered and were underway.

We had spent years actually in the process of identifying the problems and trying to come to a solution as to whether or not it was appropriate to let this mine go forward. All of a sudden, within I think it was a short period of time, a week or less, that we were going to actually get the final go-ahead on this project in Wyoming, the head of the Park Service stepped in and called upon the United Nations to come out to this particular area and give it a designation that would, in fact, prohibit any future development. And when that happened, the administration intervened and everything stopped.

Now, this is the kind of thing I am concerned about in the State of Colorado, and this is why I certainly oppose the amendment of the gentleman that would exempt Colorado from the protection provided by this particular bill. We need this protection just as much as any other State in the Nation because the same thing could happen in Colorado.

We think we know about how to preserve and protect the land that we have under our control in the State of Colorado and with the Department of Parks and Recreation. We do not need the United Nations to tell us how to manage that land. We do not need the imprimatur of the United Nations on Rocky Mountain Park in order to encourage tourism to Colorado. We can do it without them.

In fact, oftentimes, as in the case I just stated, this United Nations designation becomes much more problematic from the standpoint of the proper regulation of the land within any State, in this case Colorado.

So I certainly rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from the Second Congressional District.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of getting involved in this Colorado feud, obviously this does not improve the bill enough, but I think it is a modest step, and I want to support the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) whenever I get a chance, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is that most of the land designations, I would suggest to my colleague from Colorado, whether it is Park Service Organic Act or the Frasier Experimental Station or the others, inherent in them, in these designations of wilderness, is the concept of doing scientific research. I mean, that is what the Organic Act has, that is what the Wilderness Act of 1964 has in it. That is one of the purposes.

And so, insofar as the Man and the Biosphere program that my colleague was alluding to, and I guess I saw four sites that were affected by that. My colleague said there were two. The gentleman had earlier said there were six. I found four. So there are some sites in Colorado that may not be well understood where they are. But one is the Frasier Experimental Station, as my colleague probably has noticed. Another was the Rocky Mountain National Park, a wonderful area.

Now, I suppose the problem of getting people in and out, that that was such a big problem, I think that is a good problem in terms of Rocky Mountain. And I hope we can solve some of the transportation problems that exist around those parks, but I would not suggest that to solve that we take away the designation of the park, and I am sure my colleagues from Colorado would not suggest that, either.

In any case, that was the purpose. The purpose of this is, and just as a way of using this amendment to point out, that most of the laws that are applicable that are engaged in the agreements we have are already in place. We already passed judgment on these issues. We did it once.

Now, some of my colleagues may want to do it again. Some may have objections. Obviously, we continue to hear about the Ozarks issue, a large area that was proposed as a biosphere. But in that case, whatever system was in place, however cumbersome it was,

it worked. They did not designate that particular site.

With regards to Yellowstone, I think it is important to recognize, and the gentleman from Colorado, our friend and colleague, brought up the issue of Yellowstone again, as did our colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), that in fact it was designated a World Heritage Site long throughout the process of the mine evaluation, EIS.

What happened is that the committee decided that if that mine was going to go in, it became a Heritage Site at risk, endangered type of site. And of course the committee can make that declaration. It had absolutely no effect on the decision that was made, other than it might have persuaded the Park Service or others to pay a little closer attention.

I mean, we cannot take away free speech in this process. We cannot take away free thought in terms of what is going to happen. We cannot do that with legislation here. In fact, we as a Nation enshrine the concept of free debate and free thought with regard to these issues. And it is as if this legislation is trying to reach out and prevent somebody from making a judgment about the U.S. and how we manage our lands. We cannot do that.

For instance, if somebody is mismanaging lands in other areas, we obviously are going to speak about it, whether it is Amazonia and/or other parts of the world, other rain forests. So we are going to speak out about it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

I just wanted to make a couple other comments in response to the points that my colleague from Colorado made, as well as my colleague from Minnesota.

It seems, as I hear this debate today, all roads lead to the New World Mine. We keep coming back to that particular situation. And I think there is a continued debate about what happened there, and we ought to continue to figure out ways in the long run to mitigate those kind of situations when we have a big mining project on the edge of a national park that is so important to us, the Yellowstone National Park.

But I am offering my amendment in the spirit of let us not let that conflict and that situation affect what is going on in Colorado. There are important research projects occurring at Niwot Ridge and occurring in Rocky Mountain National Park. I do not see what the problem is that we are fixing in Colorado. In fact, I think we are creating a problem by doing this.

So I urge adoption of my amendment. Let us not hurt Colorado and some of the other States that are involved in these projects, this important Man and the Biosphere project, because of what happened in one case in Yellowstone National Park.

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I of course rose in support of the amendment. But I use this as an indication of what is generally wrong with the entire thought process and what is going on with this particular legislation. I do not think it is repairable by this amendment or others that might be offered. It is a flawed bill. These discussions and debates ought to be going on in subcommittee rather than the sort of exaggerated statements that we had. Unfortunately, they did not. So we are on the floor. I would think that there would be more important business that could and should be considered by this Congress on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I just would conclude with a comment, a quote actually from Jeane Kirkpatrick that I think encompasses everything we have tried to establish here on our side about our concerns with regard to this amendment in particular and to the concerns of our opponents to this bill in general:

If American citizens have an interest in the conservation of a particular area, that decision should be made by Congress, the body designated responsibility by the Constitution for making these decisions in full view of the American public. And if each decision requires consideration of costs and benefit to the property rights of individual voters affected, so be it. UNESCO committees are not competent to address the complex private property and public interest issues presented here.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the quotes from the former U.N. representative Jeane Kirkpatrick. Seven World Heritage sites were designated while she was in that role. So apparently, as with Mr. Hodel, he has now since then, being strongly in support of them in the 1980s when they were in control or in power, now have found reason to oppose these sites. But I think actions speak louder than words. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

Page 9, line 16, after "management plan" insert the following: "that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and".

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for affording me the opportunity at rather a late moment to introduce my amendment. My good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) just said that all roads in this bill and this debate and this discussion seem to lead to the New World Mine. The reason I am happy I am able to introduce my amendment is because I think it will serve a number of purposes. But one point that can definitively be made is that that is not true, that all roads are not leading in this matter to the New World Mine, that it has impact on the individuals, of people throughout this Nation and in particular in my district.

We have heard eloquent debate on both sides of the issue, speakers who have spoken of the need for greater local input and greater input from individuals, and those who have said or who have perceived that these issues involve just the use of public lands. That is not true at all. My amendment expands the existing provisions of H.R. 883 by requiring the Secretary of Interior as part of the management plan to also ensure that the biosphere designation does not affect the revenue of State and local governments, including and probably most importantly the revenue for public education programs.

Mr. Chairman, as we have heard, the manner in which international land use agreements have been carried out can tend at times to infringe on the authority of our local municipalities and individuals. My amendment would help protect State and local governments from experiencing a decrease in real property values. As those in many struggling local townships and counties in upstate New York which I represent know all too well, depressed property values serve to depress property tax revenues, the major source for education funding in this country. Today, there are 47 U.N. Biosphere Reserves and 20 World Heritage Sites and there is not an argument on this side of the aisle that there is not some legit-

imacy and need for these agreements. But many of these international agreements were established without local input and certainly without congressional input or approval. This is not government of the people, for the people, by the people, it is detached internationalism in the eyes of many. Most U.N. designations, including the ones in my district, encompass privately held lands, not just public lands.

Most of all, there have been instances where no communication with local officials and community residents took place about the effects of designating these lands. These are the people that it affects the most. These are the people in most instances who have rightful ownership of the property that is being affected, who define their freedom in fact by virtue of that ability to own these lands. The current process of selecting U.N. Biosphere Reserves with no recourse for those local residents and their elected officials affected must end.

In the 22nd Congressional District of New York, which I represent, there is now one of the largest U.S. Biosphere Reserves housed in the Adirondack Mountains. The private landowners and townships in the Adirondacks had no idea that the Adirondack Park Agency, a quasi-State agency, quietly approved the U.N. biosphere designation and residents were helpless to impact on that, to stop it, to comment on it. In fact, that designated area encompasses 7 million acres of privately held land. It encompasses territories outside the purview and jurisdiction of the Adirondack Park Agency. Yet it has become part of that designated area.

Let me tell my colleagues from experience, the U.N. biosphere is an unwanted cloud now that hangs over a good part of the Adirondack region. My congressional district is one with the greatest interest in seeing that this practice is reined in, that the input and the voice of the local individual be heard. It is unfair that my constituents are not included in any discussions that directly affect them and that I as their representative in Congress have practically no avenue to express their concerns.

The Secretary of Interior must be required to make the case of U.N. designation to State and local governments as well as this Congress and our Federal bureaucracies should be held accountable to this Congress for any of the effects that international agreements will cause. It is imperative that we protect the rights of our private property owners and the legitimate interests of local governments and their citizens. This bill accomplishes those objectives and my amendment I believe strengthens it by elevating the interests of State and local governments and the effects of U.N. designations on their ability to collect revenue. It is important to the private property owners, it is important to the citizens of those regions, it is important to public education in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and support this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak today in support of this important legislation, H.R. 883—the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act.

My district in upstate New York has one of the largest U.N. Biosphere Reserves in the United States, thus I have a direct interest in H.R. 883 and strongly support its passage.

H.R. 883 clearly addresses the concerns many of us have had with the U.N. Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Sites programs.

As we know, the U.N. Biosphere Reserve program has been operating with essentially no public or congressional oversight for the past 25 years. And without such oversight often, no one is accountable.

These designations can have a marked impact on the properties in and around the biosphere region, yet, in most cases, neither local government nor property owners are ever consulted regarding the designation or site consideration.

As an example, in my congressional district, the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve was created in 1989 at the request of a quasi-governmental agency—the Adirondack Park Agency.

This was done without hearings or formal input from local citizens of the Adirondacks; thus the residents were left feeling helpless and in the reality had no impact upon it. The result was a very bitter feeling and rightfully so over an unwanted imposition on private landowners.

Given negative effect on property values, and compounded by the cavalier attitudes of those handing down designations and the blatant disregard for local authority, I would submit that with congressional oversight and public input, many of these U.N. sites would not have been approved in their current form.

The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act unequivocally states that no land in this country can be included in international land use programs without the clear and direct approval of Congress.

H.R. 883 is a first step in the right direction in returning power to the local citizens as well as the elected Representatives in Congress.

Most importantly, this bill reasserts the constitutional rights of property owners to make property decisions, within local zoning authority, without interference from the United Nations whose mandate does not necessarily include concern for our town halls, school houses, or individual property owners in any given area.

What recourse do affected landowners have against the United Nations bureaucracy?

Absolutely none.

This bill changes that. I urge your support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York spoke of 7,000 acres of land that apparently falls under a biosphere, some other impact.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, seven million acres.

Mr. VENTO. Seven million acres.

Mr. SWEENEY. In the Adirondack region of New York State that are privately owned.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate that and am happy to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Did the gentleman have any instance where there was some problem that arose out of that designation with regards to private property owners?

Mr. SWEENEY. There have been a number of instances where private property owners in the use of their property, in the valuation of their property and their ability to develop and cultivate that property have been infringed upon based upon the designation. I think the gentleman misses the point, that the most predominant frustration that those constituents of mine have—

Mr. VENTO. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, we have been through this with others that have claimed that but we have yet to substantiate any of those types of claims. So if the gentleman could help substantiate that, I think it would go a long way towards solving a problem. Because right now the way the bill stands, I think it is purporting to solve problems, in my judgment, that do not exist. On the amendment that the gentleman has, he suggests to insert after "management plan" on line 16, and it is amendment No. 4, I believe; is that correct?

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VENTO. The gentleman says that after "management plan," he wants to put in language that specifically ensures, and I am quoting from the gentleman's amendment, "that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs, and."

What if the revenue increases? What if it decreases? According to this amendment, you would have to demonstrate that you would have a static situation, that there would be no increase and no decrease in revenue. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment. Is the gentleman aware of the effect of his amendment?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is not the effect at all. I think the effect is one that is a basic premise of citizenship, and that is the right of citizens to know the impact that their government or any other entity might have on their particular property.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, it is not just a question of knowing this. It is this is one of the requirements. It says that "any designation under this law, the Man and Biosphere Program, shall not have, and shall not be given, any force or effect," and then you are putting down, "that specifically ensures that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public education programs."

So it can have no effect, no effect going up, no effect going down. That is what it says. That would completely vitiate the ability to, and this is almost an impossible test in this bill in any case.

So I might say, I do not know, this is sort of what I would call piling on in

football. I would have long ago blown the whistle. This is what the amendment has. I understand that the gentleman may not have had that intention. But we are not going on the basis of intention. We are going on what is written in the law.

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield further, this is not an issue of remedies, it is an issue of notice. I think it is fundamental in the proposal that any U.N. Biosphere area be designated, that this Congress and the individuals and the constituents in that area affected have the right to know of the effect of that designation.

My amendment simply calls for the providing of that notice. It says nothing to the effect of imposing any sanction or remedy.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman will look at his amendment again. It says that specifically ensures, the plan has to ensure that the designation does not affect State or local government revenue, including revenue for public. So it does not affect it. What does he mean by does not affect it? He means it goes up or down, does he not? What happens to revenue?

Mr. SWEENEY. If the gentleman will yield, it requires the Secretary of Interior to report back to Congress of the cost effects, the property tax in particular, effects on any of those affected individual properties.

Mr. VENTO. What if the values go up as a result of this designation?

Mr. SWEENEY. That should certainly be part of the debate that we have at that time on any of those designations.

Mr. VENTO. It would be invalidated based on that. I just think it is an inartfully drawn amendment. As I said, I think the amendment just represents piling on. For that reason, I do not intend to support it. I think it is not well drawn, and I wanted to point out the effect of that. I think the test here in this bill would make it nearly impossible to have this voluntary scientific cooperation in the process. I do not know the purpose of this. This amendment obviously is not drawn well. But unfortunately under the rule that the gentleman perhaps voted for, I did not, we had to preprint everything in the RECORD ahead of time and we are all limited in time here. You do not really have the right to perfect your amendment or correct these types of problems, another little issue the gentleman ought to take up with the Committee on Rules under a so-called open rule.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA TO AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Young of Alaska to amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. Sweeney: Insert "adversely" before "affect".

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, it is my intent to offer this amendment, which I have just done, I do think it is germane, to try to improve the amendment of Mr. SWEENEY, which I do believe his amendment is clear, but the gentleman from Minnesota has raised a question. I want to make sure that this now is perfectly clear, for adverse effect only.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, will be postponed.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation and in support of the Vento and the Udall amendments that have been offered and against the Sweeney amendment that has been offered in the committee today.

First and foremost, let me say that I think this is a very unfortunate piece of legislation. It plays into some conspiracy theories that somehow, when we receive the honor of the designation of World Heritage area or the Biosphere Reserve Program or were part of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, that somehow this is land use planning by the United Nations. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in these designations that changes any Federal, State, local laws or regulations pertaining to these lands or changes the manner in which private property owners can use their lands, but what it does do is it provides an honor for some of the great natural assets of the United States and some of the great historical assets of the United States that leads to increased tourism, improved economics, and recognition of what this Nation has done in setting aside some of the great national parks and public spaces in the entire world, and I think we ought to welcome that kind of designation.

I also want to say that it is very clear when we consider the Vento amendment that much more harm has been done to public lands and done to private lands because of the acquisition of these lands by foreign entities that then come in here and take the resources from those lands, whether it is mining or whether it is timber or grazing or other proposals like this, where then we end up spending hundreds of millions if not billions of taxpayers' dollars cleaning up after these entities, making up for erosion, making up for the destruction and the deterioration of those natural assets.

That is why I think that the Vento amendment is very, very important for its adoption today because we should not just have a willy-nilly process where people come in, buy these assets, exploit the resource and then leave it to the American citizens to pick up the cost of their bad policies, their bad management and mistakes in the use of those lands and those resources.

So I would hope that Members would vote against this bill on passage, and I would hope that they would support the Udall and the Vento amendments, and I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) very much for his managing this bill on the floor today, and his involvement in this issue over the last several years in trying to put this argument into perspective and show how foolish it is and how much it is based upon fallacy and misrepresentation of facts.

Also, I think he said something in the Committee on Rules the other day that is very important, that success with this legislation is really about the first step in removing the designations from our great wilderness areas, from our parks areas, from our national monuments, because the same people who support this legislation in fact oppose the designation and the protection and the acquisition of these great lands for the use of the people of the United States, for all of the people of the United States. As much as those people support it, we have a small group of people in the Congress and in this country who insist that somehow these lands really do not belong in the public domain in spite of the fact that millions of Americans will pick up their families, their children, and they will travel across this country to visit the Statue of Liberty, to visit Liberty Hall, to visit the Grand Tetons, the Grand Canyon, Bryce, Yosemite and so many other great monuments and great natural assets in the national park systems of this country.

There is still a few in this Congress who want to believe that we should roll back designations. This legislation is the first step in that process, and this Congress ought to reject that effort.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support in this

battle, and I think we are winning it and we should win it.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in our country is not with the designation and the parks that are embraced by our people. They are, in fact, among the most popular and the most strongly supported by the public. The parks really represent what is right with our country. It is one of the best ideas we have ever had. And it is not, Mr. Chairman, I might say, the scientists that are doing research on natural resources that are at risk. These are not the problems in terms of our public lands and in our communities, in terms of scientific research that is being done in these parks or in these areas. That is not a problem, but this bill purports to solve that problem. It solves the problem of the designation of our parks, recognition of our parks. It tries to solve the problem of scientific research, to strip away the ability to do collaborative research. That is what the essence of these treaties and agreements exist.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. So it is not the scientists that are doing research that are the problem, and in fact we can on a global basis cooperate and encourage other nations to work with them and do the type of scientific research that is necessary. We can study all we want within the United States, but we have got 1,900 other sites around the world that this permits us to study in, and other sites that it permits us to recognize as natural or cultural.

So this is an assault on parks. It is an assault on research. That is really what it purports. The problems here are the mines, they are the clear cuts, they are the destruction of rain forests, the burning of rain forests. They are the uncontrolled types of mining that goes on in other nations. That is where the problems exist largely, and we ought to be coming to grips with those: the drift nets in the oceans, the destruction of the biosphere.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the first efforts, the first timid efforts of this Nation and of this global community to try to deal even with the recognition of parks in a honorific way and the research of scientists, this bill attacks. I think it is a misunderstood bill, I think it is a bad bill, I think it is bad policy, and I hope the Congress will reject this, the House will reject this, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me just say, as my colleagues know, it is with great pride that the

American people point to their national park system, it is with great pride that the American people know that the Statue of Liberty stands in New York Harbor and sends a beacon to the world about the tenets and the values of this Nation, and it is a great pride that those assets, the Grand Canyon, the Everglades, the Statue of Liberty and others, when the rest of the world honors, honors the decision that people in this country made about setting aside those public lands for public use, and it is a great honor that the millions of Americans choose to visit those parks each year to enjoy them, to participate in them, to learn from them. But it is also a task of this Congress and of the world community to make sure that we learn more about those parks that we are able to maintain.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we are able to maintain and protect those parks, and this Congress has a rather checkered past on that. But if we put it to the American people, they would vote to spend billions of dollars to maintain and protect the great parks of this Nation.

It is an honor to this Nation that people come from all over the world to visit these parks, that nations come to us and send their representatives here to learn how to do the same thing in Asia and Africa and Europe, all over. All over the world people want to emulate what Theodore Roosevelt started and what we have protected on a bipartisan basis.

Now we have a group of people who decided that they are going to roll that back, they are going to take away that designation, they are going to remove this honor from the American people. The pride of this Nation, the beacon we send to the rest of the world; they now have decided that they want to remove this honor and start that process of denigrating these most valuable and cherished public lands in our Nation. The pride of our Nation as we send out messages to the world about conservation, about the protection of public lands, about the values of this country.

This legislation is absolutely looney, it is absolutely looney. It is based in some unknown conspiracy, unsubstantiated, based upon the fact that some people believe that day in and day out they see black helicopters swooping in to protect the national parks of the United States.

No, Mr. Chairman, that is not how it is done in this country, it will never be done that way in this country, and this legislation should not try to validate those kinds of crazy conspiracy theories.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard one of the greatest presentations of looney tunes I have ever heard. Very frankly, this is nothing to do with the parks. We do not invade the parks, we do not invade any of the other areas. We are trying to reestablish the congressional activity in designating land and not letting the U.N.

I have to remind people the U.N. organizations are not accountable. U.N. bureaucrats are far removed from the American voters, and remember, many of the U.N. delegates that make these decisions do not believe in privately-held property. Their countries are owned by dictators or owned by governments that do not have private property, and when they make decisions, the United States, under our Constitution affecting private property rights, that is wrong.

All my bill does is have the Congress get back involved in the designation of lands. If they are so heavily supported, those outside the parks, then I suggest respectfully they will be easily passed in this Congress. It does not affect any of the parks or any of the reference here or any of the Heritage Sites such as the Statue of Liberty. My bill does not affect that. All we do is put the committee, this Congress, back into the process of designating the lands.

UNESCO,

Paris, France, March 6, 1995.

Hon. GEORGE T. FRAMPTON, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks,
U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of
the Secretary, Washington, DC, USA.

DEAR MR. FRAMPTON: I am writing to you with respect to a letter from a group of North American conservation organizations, addressed to Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, and dated 28 February, 1995. The World Heritage Committee is the executive body of the Convention and is elected by its 140 States Parties. I note that a copy of this letter was sent to your office. The letter concerns the possible listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Committee had been made aware of some of these concerns in a brief report by the United States Delegate to the July 1993 meeting of the World Heritage Bureau.

The fourteen organizations signing this letter are as you know among the most prestigious and influential in the field of natural resources conservation. We believe that the concerns they raise about the threats to Yellowstone must be carefully examined and addressed.

Included with their letter was a briefing book containing copies of correspondence from the Governor of Wyoming and Senator Baucus of Montana, each raises serious questions about the potential damage to Yellowstone National Park, in particular from the proposed mining operation. Similar letters of concern are provided from professional geologists, geomorphologists and hydrologists who have investigated the proposed mining operation. This correspondence is sufficient to raise considerable concern about the long-term sustainability of the World Heritage values of this World Heritage site.

From the report it appears that while a draft Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared, it did not resolve several major questions and many issues remain

under review. Thus it would appear premature to reach any conclusions at this time.

With respect to the List of World Heritage in Danger, there are no specific criteria. The Committee has the authority to place a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger when it is of the view that the World Heritage values for which the site was inscribed are seriously threatened.

The procedure for listing normally involves a monitoring report by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), in consultation with the State Party and the management authority responsible for the site. IUCN reports to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee which meets in July and the Bureau makes a recommendation to the Committee, which usually meets in December of each year.

While we have taken note that the conservative organizations have requested that the World Heritage Secretariat involve itself in the EIS process, we simply are not staffed to do so. We would, however, be pleased to address these organizations on any aspects of the operation of the World Heritage Convention. We could also request IUCN as our technical advisors, to review the Environmental Impact Statement. We are confident that as the State Party responsible for the implementation of the Convention the essential professional skills are available to you.

It is important to note that Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention obliges the State Party to protect, conserve, present and transmit to future generations World Heritage sites for which they are responsible. This obligation extends beyond the boundary of the site and Article 5 (A) recommends that State Parties integrate the protection of sites into comprehensive planning programmes. Thus, if proposed developments will damage the integrity of Yellowstone National Park, the State Party has a responsibility to act beyond the National Park boundary.

Examples of the need to act beyond park boundaries are found at the Everglades National Park, Glacier National Park and Glacier Bay National Park, all World Heritage sites. In two of the sites the Government of British Columbia acted to close major mining operations rather than risk possible damage to downstream World Heritage values in both Canada and the United States.

Clearly if there are threats to World Heritage values the State Party has a responsibility to act. If enabling legislation is not adequate, new legislation should be considered, as was the case in Australia with respect to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage site.

The World Heritage Committee has the authority to act unilaterally in placing a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, in the past the Committee has demonstrated a clear desire to work in consort with the State Party. In this respect we would appreciate receiving a comprehensive report on the situation in time for the meeting of the World Heritage Bureau to be held in Paris in early July. Such a report would enable the Committee to give serious consideration to the listing of Yellowstone National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should such a decision be warranted, at its nineteenth session to be held in December 1995.

The United States has an exemplary record in support of and in accordance with the principles and requirements of the World Heritage Convention. We look forward to continuing this cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

BERND VON DROSTE,
Director, World Heritage Centre.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 13

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the United Nations has designated 67 sites in the United States as "World Heritage Sites" or "Biosphere Reserves," which altogether are about equal in size to the State of Colorado, the eighth largest state; and

Whereas art. IV, sec. 3, United States Constitution, provides that the United States Congress shall make all needed regulations governing lands belonging to the United States; and

Whereas many of the United Nations' designations include private property inholdings and contemplate "buffer zones" of adjacent land; and

Whereas some international land designations such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Culture Organization operate under independent national committees such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee that have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress; and

Whereas these international designations as presently handled are an open invitation to the international community to interfere in domestic economies and land use decisions; and

Whereas local citizens and public officials concerned about job creation and resource based economies usually have no say in the designation of land near their homes for inclusion in an international land use program; and

Whereas former Assistant Secretary of the Interior George T. Frampton, Jr., and the President used the fact that Yellowstone National Park had been designated as a "World Heritage Site" as justification for intervening in the environmental impact statement process and blocking possible development of an underground mine on private land in Montana outside of the park; and

Whereas a recent designation of a portion of Kamchatka as a "World Heritage Site" was followed immediately by efforts from environmental groups to block investment insurance for development projects on Kamchatka that are supported by the local communities; and

Whereas environmental groups and the national Park Service have been working to establish an International Park, a World Heritage Site, and a Marine Biosphere Reserve covering parts of western Alaska, eastern Russia, and the Bering Sea; and

Whereas as occurred in Montana, such designations could be used to block development projects on state and private land in western Alaska; and

Whereas foreign companies and countries could use such international designations in western Alaska to block economic development that they perceive as competition; and

Whereas animal rights activists could use such international designations to generate pressure to harass or block harvesting of marine mammals by Alaska Natives; and

Whereas such international designations could be used to harass or block any commercial activity, including pipelines, railroads, and power transmission lines; and

Whereas the President and the executive branch of the United States have, by Executive Order and other agreements, implemented these designations without approval by the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Department of Interior, in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Panel for World Heritage, has identified the Aleutian Island Unit of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge,

Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Denali National Park, Gates of the Arctic National Park, and Katmai National Park as likely to meet the criteria for future nomination as World Heritage Sites; and

Whereas the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves in Alaska without the specific consent of the Alaska State Legislature; and

Whereas actions by the President in applying international agreements to lands owned by the United States may circumvent the Congress; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young introduced House Resolution No. 901 in the 105th Congress entitled the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1997" that required the explicit approval of the Congress prior to restricting any use of United States land under international agreements; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young has reintroduced this legislation in the 106th Congress as House Resolution No. 883, which is entitled the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act";

Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature supports House Resolution 883, the "American Land Sovereignty Protection Act," that reaffirms the constitutional authority of the Congress as the elected representatives of the people over the federally owned land of the United States and urges the swift introduction and passage of such act by the 106th Congress; and be it

Further resolved that the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any sites in Alaska as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves without the prior consent of the Alaska State Legislature.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. BRIAN PORTER,
Speaker of the House, Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR SPEAKER PORTER: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) "Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act' in the United States Congress." Legislative Resolution No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, May 11, 1999.

Hon. DRUE PEARCE,
President of the Senate, Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol, Juneau, AK.

DEAR PRESIDENT PEARCE: I am transmitting the engrossed and enrolled copies of the following joint resolution, passed by the Twenty-first Alaska State Legislature, to the Lieutenant Governor's Office for permanent filing: CS for House Joint Resolution No. 15(RES) "Relating to support for the 'American Land Sovereignty Protection Act'

in the United States Congress." Legislative Resolution No. 13.

Sincerely,

TONY KNOWLES,
Governor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended.

Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 262, noes 158, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—262

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Forbes	Barrett (NE)	Bartlett	Gibbons	Miller, Gary
Ackerman	Coble	Ford	Bartman	Gillcrest	McCrery	Moran (KS)
Allen	Condit	Frank (MA)	Bateman	Gillmor	McHugh	McHugh
Andrews	Conyers	Franks (NJ)	Berry	Goodlatte	McInnis	McInnis
Baird	Cook	Frelinghuysen	Biggert	Goodling	McIntosh	McIntosh
Baldacci	Costello	Frost	Biley	Goss	McKeon	McKeon
Baldwin	Coyne	Ganske	Blunt	Graham	Mica	Mica
Barr	Cramer	Gejdenson	Boehner	Granger	Roukema	Roukema
Barrett (WI)	Crowley	Gephart	Bonilla	Green (WI)	Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher
Bass	Cummings	Gilman	Bono	Hansen	Rothman	Rothman
Becerra	Cunningham	Gonzalez	Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Roxbal-Allard	Roxbal-Allard
Bentsen	Danner	Goode	Bryant	Hayes	Wexler	Wexler
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Gordon	Burr	Hayworth	Weygand	Weygand
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Green (TX)	Burton	Herger	Wicks	Wicks
Berman	Deal	Greenwood	Buyer	Hilleary	Packard	Packard
Bilirakis	Defazio	Gutierrez	Callahan	Hoeckstra	Peterson (PA)	Peterson (PA)
Bishop	DeGette	Gutknecht	Calvert	Hostettler	Portman	Portman
Blagojevich	Delahunt	Hall (OH)	Canady	Hulshof	Radanovich	Radanovich
Blumenauer	DeLauer	Hall (TX)	Cannon	Hutchinson	Reynolds	Reynolds
Boehlert	Dicks	Hastings (FL)	Chabot	Hyde	Riley	Riley
Bonior	Dingell	Hefley	Chambliss	Isakson	Rogan	Rogan
Boswell	Doggett	Hill (IN)	Chenoweth	Istook	Rogers	Rogers
Boucher	Dooley	Hill (MT)	Coburn	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen
Boyd	Doyle	Hilliard	Collins	John	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)
Brady (PA)	Duncan	Hinchey	Combest	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)	Ryun (KS)
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Hinojosa	Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Sanford	Sanford
Brown (OH)	Edwards	Hobson	Cox	King (NY)	Scarborough	Scarborough
Camp	Ehrlich	Hoeffel	Crane	Knollenberg	Schaffer	Schaffer
Campbell	Engel	Holden	Cubin	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner
Capps	English	Holt	Davis (VA)	Kuykendall	Sessions	Sessions
Capuano	Eshoo	Hooley	DeLay	Latham	Shadegg	Shadegg
Cardin	Etheridge	Houghton	DeMint	LaTourette	Shaw	Shaw
Carson	Evans	Hoyer	Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Shays	Shays
Castle	Ewing	Hunter	Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sherwood	Sherwood
Clay	Farr	Inslee	Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Shuster	Shuster
Clayton	Fattah	Jackson (IL)	Dreier	Linder	Simpson	Simpson
Clement	Filner	Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Lucas (OK)	Skeen	Skeen
			McCollum	McCollum	Smith (MI)	Smith (TX)

Souder	Thomas	Watts (OK)	Cardin	John	Pallone	LaHood	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Stump	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)	Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Latham	Pickett	Smith (WA)
Sweeney	Thornberry	Whitfield	Castle	Jones (OH)	Pastor	LaTourette	Pitts	Souder
Talent	Thune	Wicker	Clay	Kanjorski	Payne	Lazio	Pombo	Spence
Tancredo	Tiahrt	Wilson	Clayton	Kaptur	Pelosi	Lewis (CA)	Portman	Stearns
Tauzin	Toomey	Wolf	Clement	Kennedy	Phelps	Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Young (AK)	Clyburn	Kildee	Pomeroy	Linder	Quinn	Stump
Terry	Watkins		Conyers	Kilpatrick	Porter	LoBiondo	Radanovich	Sununu

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbray	Foley	Salmon	Crowley	Klink	Ramstad	Manzullo	Riley	Tancredo
Borski	Horn	Stark	Cummings	Kucinich	Rangel	McCollum	Rogan	Tauzin
Brown (CA)	Largent	Towns	Danner	LaFalce	Reyes	McCrary	Rogers	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Moakley		Davis (FL)	Lampson	Rivers	McHugh	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Dixon	Napolitano		Davis (IL)	Lantos	Rodriguez	McInnis	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry

□ 1334

Messrs. MCCOLLUM, BATEMAN, DREIER, RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. BLUNT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. QUINN, HEFLEY, BOYD, HILL of Montana, BASS, SUNUNU, LoBIONDO, WAMP, WELLER, HOBSON, UPTON, CUNNINGHAM, SHIMKUS, STEARNS, CAMP, COBLE and HUNTER, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 141, the Vento amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to House Resolution 180, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 231, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Borski	Camp	Franks (NJ)	Jones (NC)	Johnson (CT)	Johnson, Sam	Abercrombie	Baker	Barton
Ackerman	Becerra	Boucher	Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kasich	Jones (NC)	Jones, Sam	Ackerman	Baldacci	Bass
Allen	Bentsen	Boyd	Canady	Gallegly	Kelly	Johnson	Kasich	Aderholt	Baldwin	Bateman
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)	Cannon	Ganske	King (NY)	Jones	Jones, Sam	Allen	Ballenger	Becerra
Baird	Berman	Brown (FL)	Chabot	Gekas	Kingston	Kasich	Kasich	Andrews	Barcia	Bentsen
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)	Chambliss	Gibbons	Knollenberg	Kelly	Kelly	Archer	Barr	Bereuter
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Capps	Chenoweth	Gilcrest	Kolbe	King	King	Armey	Barrett (NE)	Berkley
Barcia	Bonior	Capuano	Coble	Gillmor	Kuykendall	Kingston	Kingston	Bachus	Barrett (WI)	Berman

LaHood	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pickett	Smith (WA)
LaTourette	Pitts	Souder
Pastor	Pombo	Spence
Payne	Portman	Stearns
Kljorski	Lewis (CA)	Tancredo
Kaptur	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Clement	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
Kildee	Linder	Terry
Kilpatrick	LoBiondo	Sununu
Conyers	Lucas (KY)	Sweeney
Costello	Lucas (OK)	Talent
Coyne	Rahall	Tancredo
Cleczka	Ramstad	Tauzin
Klink	Rangel	Deutsch
Kucinich	Reyes	Dixon
Danner	Rivers	Brown (CA)
Davis (FL)	Rodriguez	Largent
Davis (IL)	Roemer	Moakley
DeFazio	Rothman	Foley
DeGette	Roukema	Napolitano
Delahunt	Lee	Towns
DeLauro	Royal-Allard	
Deutsch	Rush	
Dicks	Sabu	
Dingell	Sanchez	
Doggett	Sanders	
Dooley	Sawyer	
Doyle	Schakowsky	
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	
Ford	McDermott	
Frank (MA)	McGovern	
Frost	McKinney	
Gejdenson	McNulty	
Gephardt	Meehan	
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	
Green (TX)	Menendez	
Gutierrez	Millender	
Hall (OH)	McDonald	
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	
Hill (IN)	Minge	
Hilliard	Mink	
Hinchey	Mollohan	
Hinojosa	Moore	
Hoeffel	Moran (VA)	
Holden	Morella	
Holt	Murtha	
Hooley	Nadler	
Hoyer	Neal	
Inslee	Oberstar	
Jackson (IL)	Obey	
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Olver	
Jefferson	Ortiz	
	Owens	

NOT VOTING—11

Brown (CA)	Largent	Stark
Dixon	Moakley	Thornberry
Foley	Napolitano	Towns
Graham	Salmon	

□ 1344

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. MORELLA changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 15, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—407

Abercrombie	Baker	Barton
Ackerman	Baldacci	Bass
Allen	Baldwin	Bateman
Andrews	Ballenger	Becerra
Baird	Barr	Bentsen
Baldacci	Barrett (NE)	Berkley
Baldwin	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Barcia	Bartlett	Berry

Biggert	Frelinghuysen	Luther	Sandlin	Stabenow	Velazquez
Bilirakis	Frost	Maloney (CT)	Sanford	Stearns	Vento
Bishop	Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Sawyer	Stenholm	Visclosky
Blagojevich	Ganske	Manzullo	Saxton	Strickland	Walden
Bliley	Gejdenson	Martinez	Scarborough	Stump	Walsh
Blunt	Gekas	Mascara	Schaffer	Stupak	Wamp
Boehlert	Gephhardt	Matsui	Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Waters
Boehner	Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano	Sweeney	Watkins
Bonilla	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions	Talent	Watt (NC)
Bonior	Gillmor	McCullum	Shadegg	Tancredo	Watts (OK)
Bono	Gilman	McCrary	Shaw	Tanner	Waxman
Borski	Goode	McDermott	Sherman	Tauscher	Weiner
Boswell	Goodlatte	McGovern	Sherwood	Tauzin	Weldon (FL)
Boucher	Goodling	McHugh	Shimkus	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Boyd	Gordon	McInnis	Shows	Taylor (NC)	Weller
Brady (PA)	Goss	McIntosh	Shuster	Terry	Wexler
Brady (TX)	Graham	McIntyre	Simpson	Thomas	Weygand
Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	McKeon	Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McKinney	Skeen	Thornberry	Wicker
Bryant	Greenwood	McNulty	Skelton	Thune	Wilson
Burr	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Slaughter	Thurman	Wise
Burton	Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)	Tiaht	Wolf
Buyer	Hall (OH)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)	Tierney	Woolsey
Callahan	Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Smith (TX)	Toomey	Wu
Calvert	Hansen	Mica	Smith (WA)	Traficant	Wynn
Camp	Hastings (FL)	Millender-McDonald	Snyder	Turner	Young (AK)
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Souder	Udall (CO)	Young (FL)
Canady	Hayes	Miller, Gary	Spence	Udall (NM)	
Cannon	Hayworth	Miller, George	Spratt	Upton	
Capps	Hefley	Minge			NOES—15
Capuano	Herger	Mink	Bilbray	Jackson (IL)	Morella
Cardin	Hill (IN)	Mollohan	Blumenauer	Klink	Schakowsky
Carson	Hill (MT)	Moore	Castle	Kucinich	Scott
Chabot	Hilleary	Moran (KS)	Cubin	Markey	Shays
Chambliss	Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Filner	Meehan	Thompson (CA)
Chenoweth	Hinchey	Murtha			NOT VOTING—11
Clay	Hinojosa	Myrick	Brown (CA)	Granger	Morella
Clayton	Hobson	Nadler	Cox	Largent	Salmon
Clement	Hoeffel	Neal	Foley	Moakley	Stark
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Gonzalez	Napolitano	Towns
Coble	Holden	Ney			□ 1352
Coburn	Holt	Northup			
Collins	Hooley	Norwood			
Combest	Horn	Nussle			
Condit	Hostettler	Oberstar			
Conyers	Houghton	Obey			
Cook	Hoyer	Olver			
Cooksey	Hulshof	Ortiz			
Costello	Hunter	Ose			
Coyne	Hutchinson	Hyde			
Cramer	Inslee	Owens			
Crane	Isakson	Oxley			
Crowley	Istook	Packard			
Cummings	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone			
Cunningham	Jefferson	Pascrall			
Danner	Jenkins	Pastor			
Davis (FL)	John	Paul			
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Payne			
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce			
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi			
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)			
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)			
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Petri			
DeLauro	Kaptur	Phelps			
DeLay	Kasich	Pickering			
DeMint	Kelly	Pickett			
Deutsch	Kennedy	Pitts			
Diaz-Balart	Dicks	Pombo			
Dickey	Dingell	Pomeroy			
Dicks	Dixon	Porter			
Dingell	Doggett	Portman			
Dixon	Dooley	Price (NC)			
Doggett	Doolittle	Pryce (OH)			
Doolittle	Doyle	Quinn			
Doolittle	Dreier	Radanovich			
Doolittle	Duncan	Rahall			
Dunn	Dunn	Ramstad			
Edwards	Edwards	Rangel			
Ehlers	Ehlers	Regula			
Ehrlich	Ehrlich	Reyes			
Emerson	Engel	Reynolds			
Engel	English	Riley			
English	Eshoo	Rivers			
Eshoo	Etheridge	Rothman			
Etheridge	Evans	Rodriguez			
Evans	Everett	Roemer			
Everett	Ewing	Rogan			
Ewing	Farr	Rogers			
Farr	Fattah	Rohrabacher			
Fattah	Fletcher	Lee			
Fletcher	Forbes	Levin			
Forbes	Ford	Lewis (CA)			
Ford	Fossella	Lewis (GA)			
Fossella	Fowler	Lewis (KY)			
Fowler	Frank (MA)	Linder			
Frank (MA)	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski			
Franks (NJ)	Lucas (KY)	LoBiondo			
Lucas (KY)	Lowey	Lofgren			
Lowey	Lucas (OK)	Lucas (OK)			
Lucas (OK)	Lucas (OK)	Lucas (OK)			

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 883.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the plans of the Committee on Rules in regard to H.R. 1401, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 and the Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Today the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) informed the House of the Committee on Rules' plan regarding these bills in two "Dear Colleague" letters.

The Committee on Rules will be meeting the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may restrict the offering of amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services on May 19. A copy of the bill and report will be available for review in the office of the Committee on Armed Services on Monday, May 24. The bill is also expected to be available for review on the Committee on Armed Services' web site this evening.

Any Member contemplating an amendment to the bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules in H-312 of the Capitol no later than Tuesday, May 25 at 5 p.m.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Rules is also planning to meet the week of May 24 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration for Fiscal Year 2000 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered the bill reported Thursday, May 20, and is expected to file its committee report on Thursday, May 25, 1999.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol no later than 12 p.m. on Tuesday, May 25. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the Committee on Appropriations in room H-218 of the Capitol.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 883) to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands, pursuant to House Resolution 180, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.