

poor, we did not realize we were poor because of the closeness of that family relationship. Through my first eight grades in school, as a matter of fact, we sat down together at meals three times a day, because we went home for lunch rather than stay in school. And then when we went on to high school, we still had meals together two times a day. What an important time that was.

Today, we oftentimes hear people say, well, mother and father both have to work. That is not necessarily so. It depends on the lifestyle you want. Yes, I got my first suit of long pants given to me by neighbors. Only one worked away from home.

So oftentimes we find excuses as to why we do as little as we do to keep families together, but I do not think there are any statistics that would prove otherwise than that a family unit is one of the three or four most important things we have going for us in a free society and without it, that society will fall from within.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 288, to recognize the importance of families and children in the United States, and to express support for the goals and ideas of National Family Day.

You know, its no secret that the family is the most fundamental of society's institutions, for it is within the family setting that character, morality, responsibility, ability, and wisdom are nurtured best in children.

Unfortunately, today, the family institution is being steadily dismantled, even held in disdain by many leaders in the political, academic and media elite.

And the erosion has serious consequences:

In 1950, for every 100 children born, 12 entered a broken family. Today, for every 100 children born, 60 will enter a broken family. Each year, about one million children experience the divorce of their parents. 1.25 million are born out of wedlock, and another 1.4 million are aborted. Child abuse is growing steadily and alarmingly sexual abuse amongst children is growing fastest of all.

In short, Americans are literally turning against their children. But adults suffer as well from the breakdown of the family institution. Studies clearly show that those who divorce suffer shorter life expectancies, poorer physical and psychological health and lowered standards of living.

In addition, research continues on the correlation between a family founded on a lifelong marriage and low incidences of crime, addiction, abuse, illness, and underachievement.

Our country must focus national attention on problems whose roots lie in the breakdown of the family institution and marriage, as well as public policies that contribute to those problems.

On the national level, over the last few years, Congress has begun to evaluate how the federal government's policies have been hostile to marriage and the family.

Last month, the House overwhelmingly passed the Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Act, which will stop the government's practice of excessively taxing couples just because they are married. This will keep the IRS off the

alter and provide more money for families that may mean a new washing machine, extra tuition money for a child, a three bedroom home or fixing the family car—this is real relief for working families.

In 1997, we passed the \$500-per-child tax credit, the most important policy advance for the family. And we enacted adoption and foster care reforms so that children are given permanent homes quickly and not left revolving in the child welfare system year after year.

And in 1996, we reformed welfare ending the cycle of dependency for many. We ended the practice of having the government filling the roles of family, church and voluntary associations.

This year, we will take up important legislation establishing education savings accounts permitting parents to put money aside for a child's education.

But, beyond the beltway, beyond this Capitol, is where most of the changes are occurring—as is often the case.

This is where the real change is taking place—and rightly so.

Abstinence education to address the rising rates of out-of-wedlock births, counseling to address the rising rates of divorce and after-school programs to get kids off the street are happening throughout America.

KidsPeace, a 117-year-old non-profit organization that directly helps over 2,000 children in crisis every day at 25 centers across the nation, and millions more through prevention and public education efforts, recognizes all of these facts and has created National Family Day.

National Family Day is a relatively new, annual event held every March to honor and celebrate the importance of the American family.

This year, it will focus attention on the family meal as a time to build healthy communication and lasting bonds with children.

The amount of conversation and the level of interaction between parents and children has an enormous impact on a child's development. Even in intact families, however, children suffer from a lack of intimate time with their parents. One of the sad consequences of the breakdown of society today is that, to pay the bills or fulfill their higher expectations for material comforts, more mothers work outside of the home. This fact coupled with the numbers of single-parent families and the rising rate of divorce, means there has been a tragic reduction in "family time."

Adequate time with parents is critical for the development of every child, especially for self-esteem and confidence. The reduction of time between parents and children is cause for grave concern. It attenuates the most important relationship to a child and correspondingly derives him of the strength he derives from his parents.

As Harvard University child psychiatrist Robert Cole puts it, "The frenzied need of children to have possessions isn't only a function of the ads they see on TV. It's a function of their hunger for what they aren't getting—their parents' time."

By 1990, parents were, on average, available 10 hours less per week to their children than they were in 1980 and 40 percent less than they were in 1965.

In a 1990 Los Angeles Times poll found that 57 percent of all fathers and 55 percent of all mothers felt guilty about spending too little time with their children. The poll also found

that 73 percent of all married couples would have one parent stay home full-time with the children if money were not the issue.

I congratulate KidsPeace for their efforts to improve the family structure and call on my colleagues and everyone in our country to join with them in supporting efforts which will create stronger families.

□ 1430

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 288.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 288.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

KERN COUNTY CALIFORNIA LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1680) to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1680

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 "Kern County California Land Exchange Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CAMP OWEN AND RELATED PARCELS, KERN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—In exchange for the non-Federal lands and the additional consideration described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Kern County, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four parcels of land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service in Kern County, as follows:

(1) Approximately 70 acres known as Camp Owen.

(2) Approximately 4 acres known as Wofford Heights Park.

(3) Approximately 4 acres known as the French Gulch maintenance yard.

(4) Approximately 14 acres known as the Kernville Fish Hatchery.

(b) *CONSIDERATION.*—

(1) *CONVEYANCE OF NON-FEDERAL LANDS.*—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal lands referred to in subsection (a), Kern County shall convey to the Secretary a parcel of land consisting of approximately 52 acres of Greenhorn Mountain Park in Kern County, California, which is owned by Kern County within Sequoia National Forest.

(2) *REPLACEMENT FACILITY.*—As additional consideration for the conveyance of the storage facility located at the maintenance yard referred to in subsection (a)(3), Kern County shall provide a replacement storage facility of comparable size and condition, as acceptable to the Secretary, at the Greenhorn Ranger District Lake Isabella Maintenance Yard property.

(3) *CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.*—As additional consideration for the conveyance of the Federal lands referred to in subsection (a), Kern County shall tender a cash equalization payment specified by the Secretary, but not to exceed \$100,000. Subject to such limitation, the cash equalization payment shall be based upon an appraisal performed at the option of the Forest Service pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(c) *CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE.*—Title to the non-Federal lands to be conveyed under this section must be acceptable to the Secretary, and the conveyance shall be subject to valid existing rights of record. The non-Federal lands shall conform with the title approval standards applicable to Federal land acquisitions.

(d) *TIME FOR CONVEYANCE.*—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall complete the conveyance of the Federal lands under subsection (a) within three months after Kern County tenders to the Secretary the consideration required by subsection (b).

(e) *STATUS OF ACQUIRED LANDS.*—Upon approval and acceptance of title by the Secretary, the non-Federal lands conveyed to the United States under this section shall become part of Sequoia National Forest, and the boundaries of the national forest shall be adjusted to include the acquired lands. The Secretary shall manage the acquired lands for recreational purposes in accordance with the laws and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System. For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l-9), the boundaries of the national forest, as adjusted pursuant to this section, shall be considered to be the boundaries of the national forest as of January 1, 1965.

(f) *RELATIONSHIP TO ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.*—In connection with the conveyances under this section, the Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions related to environmental liability as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) *LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.*—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by a survey or surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The costs of any such survey, as well as other administrative costs incurred to execute the land exchange (other than costs incurred by Kern County to comply with subsection (h)), shall be divided equally between the Secretary and Kern County.

(h) *TREATMENT OF EXISTING UTILITY LINES AT CAMP OWEN.*—Upon receipt of the Federal lands described in subsection (a)(1), Kern County shall grant an easement, and record the easement in the appropriate office, for permitted or licensed uses of those lands that are unrecorded as of the date of the conveyance.

(i) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any exchange of National Forest System land under this section shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the conveyance and acquisition of land for the National Forest System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1680 introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), provides for a land exchange between the Stanislaus Forest and Kern County, California. It will transfer approximately 70 acres of national forest land that has been used by the county for more than 50 years as a juvenile detention facility known as Camp Owen to county ownership.

In exchange, the county will transfer the undeveloped portion of its Greenhorn Mountain Park, approximately 52 acres, to the Forest Service which manages the adjacent national forest lands. Several other small parcels are also included in exchange, and the county will provide a cash equalization payment to the Forest Service to make up the difference in land values.

The Forest Service and the county have worked hard to resolve their differences over details of this bill. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his work in achieving this agreement, which is reflected in the amendment that was reported by the Committee on Resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill which will ensure that the lands transferred to the county will continue to be used as a juvenile detention facility and school. Valid existing rights will be protected and land ownership will be consolidated, which should improve management efficiencies for both the Forest Service and Kern County. Therefore, I urge support of this bill as amended, and I congratulate my colleague for his work to bring about this agreement on the details of this exchange.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1680. This legislation provides for a land exchange between Kern County, California, and the U.S. Forest Service. The county would receive four parcels totaling about 92 acres of Federal property in exchange for one parcel of about 52 acres of county-owned property.

The county is currently operating a juvenile justice facility on the Federal lands under permit. The county-owned lands, which are wooded, are deemed suitable for inclusion in the Sequoia National Forest. So a land swap in this case makes good sense.

The substitute adopted by the committee has greatly improved this legis-

lation. As amended, the bill now provides for an equal-value exchange and public process in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Formal appraisals are normally required in Federal land exchanges, but in this case the Forest Service is given the option of relying on a preliminary appraisal and may receive a cash equalization payment of up to \$100,000.

While we do not intend that this serve as a model for equalization in other exchanges, the difference in value is estimated to be in the range of \$50,000 and the extra time and expense of a formal appraisal may not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the sponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and the majority for their willingness to make changes in this legislation to accommodate both our concerns and those of the Forest Service. I am pleased to support H.R. 1680 and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a long, twisted road that really should have been a relatively short driveway in achieving today's presentation on the floor of the House. As was indicated, this was an attempt to resolve land use conflicts that developed over half a century. On the Valley floor near the Kern River, which is pretty much barren and rock strewn land, although above 4,000 feet in elevation, about half a century ago the county began developing a youth detention camp along the model with which most of us would be familiar. If one takes youths who really are not bad, but who have an over-abundance of energy, and direct it toward positive and useful activity in a rather hardy environment, then a number of them become very useful and model citizens. This has been successful for more than half a century.

As one might expect, the uses of the camp, which were fairly rustic initially, have developed more into activities that would be meaningful to youth today: the building of a large garage facility in which they can rehabilitate cars; the development of a fish hatchery in which they can involve themselves in useful experiences that actually become quite useful when they are out looking for a job, all of this developed on land that was Forest Service land.

Now, one would never recognize it as Forest Service land, but it was Forest Service land. At the same time, the County of Kern, one of the larger geographic counties in the United States, had, in a mountainous area about 7,000 feet high, county property covered with large conifers that had never been developed, which was immediately adjacent to Sequoia National Forest. It

looked like Forest Service land. It was not used like a county parcel would ordinarily be used because of its remote location and the profile of the land itself.

So we thought several years ago that it would be a very appropriate land swap. The idea that Kern County and the citizens of Kern County, taxpayers, would not want to ask the Federal Government to give us the land, but rather it was quite appropriate to trade that mountainous fir-covered land for the developed land, the county land for the Federal land. We then embarked on a process of trying to get the Forest Service to say yes.

What happened over a number of years was that the Forest Service would not say yes. The Forest Service wanted us to give up the lion's share of the land and they would give us less. Kern County agreed.

The Forest Service did not want any camp sites in that county land up in the mountains, so we shaped it to solve the Forest Service problems. The Forest Service said, even though there is a maintenance yard that has been used as the county and we are willing to give it to them, we want them to duplicate the facilities so that we can have our own. The county agreed.

The Forest Service then said, if there were any environmental problems on this conifer-covered land, we certainly would not want to go through an environmental impact study like anybody else would, so we would like protection. We want to be indemnified from any case that might be brought against us. Kern County agreed.

We finally came to the last piece of the puzzle and that was, notwithstanding all of these concessions, we do not know for sure whether the land in an accessible usable area is of the same value as land that is in an inaccessible area that is not going to be used. So Kern County, to try to end this process of the Forest Service never willing to say yes, said we will place hard-earned county taxpayer money on the table as well.

How much? We do not know for sure. Maybe it was 40 thousand dollars. Maybe it was 50 thousand. The Forest Service could not come up with a firm number. So what Kern County has said was we will double it. We will say not more than \$100,000, assuming it is going to be fifty cents or less on the dollar, to get this agreement culminated so that we can continue to develop this youth camp.

I just want to say that four bills have passed Congress this year in which there have been absolute gifts of Federal land. We have an exchange with money in this bill, and yet it has been more than one Congress before we could reach this position. I just want to thank all of the folks who endured with us this inability of the Forest Service to say yes. We still have the provision in which they may say no, but at least, we are to the floor. At least, it has been a public process. At

least, there has been public input. At least, there is a public record before we go forward in dealing with taking land that belongs to the public and doing something with it.

So notwithstanding the tale that I just told, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are at the point we are today and am very concerned about processes that have occurred in the past and may occur in the future when this administration, under ancient law passed in 1906, called the Antiquities Act, will be able to deal with public lands without the public hearings, without the public process, and without the public's representatives voting on legislation that is the Antiquities Act; and, believe it or not, there is a proposal that will deal directly with the same national forest this bill does, the Sequoia National Forest, with no requirement to follow the public process that this modest little bill deals with, 52 acres. The proposal is in the vicinity of 400,000 acres.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if this process is good enough for me, it ought to be good enough for the President when he makes decisions about the public lands.

So once again, I want to applaud those individuals who have brought the land swap to this position today, and I would urge all of us to be very, very cautious about removing public lands from public use without a public process.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1680, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT NATIONAL PARK SERVICE SHOULD USE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 182) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 182

Whereas the National Park Service was established to promote and regulate units of superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas known as national parks, monuments, and other reservations;

Whereas the purpose of the National Park Service is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife

therein and to provide for the public enjoyment of the same;

Whereas, in order to accomplish and provide for this purpose, units of the National Park System contain structures, roads, and other related infrastructure;

Whereas the National Park Service has repeatedly reported a backlog of projects necessary to maintain these structures, roads, and infrastructure and has asserted that approximately \$6,000,000,000 is required to eliminate this backlog;

Whereas the Department of Defense has the authority under section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, to provide support and services to Federal entities, including the National Park Service;

Whereas the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program is designed to improve military readiness while helping to rebuild the United States through realistic, hands-on training opportunities for military personnel which simultaneously assists with meeting domestic priorities;

Whereas the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program is in keeping with a long military tradition by leveraging real world training opportunities to meet the readiness requirements of military units and individuals while benefitting local communities;

Whereas this support and service provided by the Department of Defense includes equipment and other assistance which would aid in reducing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects identified by the National Park Service; and

Whereas a partnership between the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program and the National Park Service can provide the American taxpayer with added benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should immediately take full advantage of the support and services offered by the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, in addressing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects within units of the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the American public likes the very most is our national parks. We have about 375 units of the Park Service. These are the areas that if we ask the American public what do they like the very most in the world, they will say the parks. They go to all the parks. From sea to shining sea, they see these parks and they love them. In fact, they love them to death. Because of that, we have a tremendous backlog of infrastructure in the parks.

For those folks out West, they fully realize that Yellowstone had impassable roads for a long time. These roads were put there in 1915 by the cavalry. There was not even any base for them. Go down to the Grand Canyon and they