

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

had a culinary water system problem that they had to rely upon the people in Arizona. Keep looking around and a few years ago we had a backlog of infrastructure that was probably around \$15 billion.

□ 1445

We did not know how to take care of this problem. Well, here are the people demanding that they go into these parks, and they want them to be beautiful. They want the roads to be right, they want the restrooms to work, they want the ranger to stand there and explain things to them that they want to hear. They want to go home and they want to have their pictures developed and they want to see these beautiful, gorgeous parks where they enjoyed the 3 weeks that they got off, or whatever it was.

Well, the question always comes up to this committee, and has as long as I have been on the committee, which is 10 terms, of how do we take care of these parks and the infrastructure?

A couple of terms ago we started the Demonstration Program, really a good idea, which meant that now people going in the parks would spend a little more than that \$10. In Yellowstone you could go in in 1915 for \$10. In 1996 you could go in for \$10. Where is the best deal in the world? It is right there. Take the wife and the kids and go out to dinner and a show and you will spend \$100, you get to see these gorgeous parks for \$10.

So we started this Demonstration Program which in effect said to the superintendent, up the ante a little bit. Let us pay a little more for it. The criticism of that has been infinitesimal, it has been minimal, almost nonexistent, because people have said that is the best deal in America, is our national parks.

Still, Mr. Speaker, we go back to the issue, how do we take care of the infrastructure of the parks? Admittedly the Demonstration Program worked pretty well.

Well, we had an interesting thing happen about 1993. A colonel that was the head of the Corps of Engineers came over to my office and he said, "Congressman, I would like to answer a question for you of how we could take care of the national parks."

I said, Yes, sir, boy, we want to hear that.

He said, Well, the Corps of Engineers go all over the world, and they build roads, and they build bridges, and they build hospitals, and they are doing things in Indonesia, Somalia, South Africa, you name it. So we take this Corps of Engineers and we put them in C-141s and we take the patrols, we take their bulldozers and we take their engineers and we go over and build a road for them.

Well, that is a good humanitarian thing to do, and I guess we all feel good about it.

He said, But, Congressman, our guys would rather stay in the United States.

They would rather go up and build that road in Yellowstone, because mom and the kids can come up for those 3 weeks and they can enjoy it. So at one time the engineers from the State of Utah are there and a month later the people from Arizona are there and a month later the people from Minnesota are there and they do the road.

What do they do? We are paying for it anyway because we are training these youngsters, we are training these officers and enlisted men to understand this. So they do the engineering. They are going to do it anyway, whether it is Somalia or it is Yellowstone. They are going to do the work, whether it is there. The money will come out for it. But the difference is the American taxpayer now is the beneficiary of their good work.

So we thought that was a great idea. I talked to the Director of the National Park System. He said it is a wonderful idea. Then it kind of got bogged down in a few things, and we determined we could not do a bill that straight.

So this bill that we have before us today kind of encourages that, and says to the Department of Defense, look, folks, come on and help us out in some of these parks.

Look at the advantage of this, Mr. Speaker. For one thing, the Corps of Engineers does the engineering, they bring their tools in; they do the work. And what does the Park Service pay for? The Park Service pays for the material, the road base, the cement, the things like that. So you cut your costs rather substantially.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, look at this. Where are our parks? They are not in the middle of areas like Washington, D.C. or Salt Lake City. They are way out there somewhere. People have to drive to them. So how do you get people to come in and say yes, we will bid on this. They bid all right, but they really bid high prices and you will pay four or five times more than you will in a metropolitan area.

Then you have that Davis-Bacon Act staring you in the face, and I will not get into that, even though I have strong feelings on it, that also comes back and hits us right between the eyeballs. So this costs a lot of money.

But what about the American taxpayer? He wants a nice park. They want to enjoy it. They want to go in there, and they want someone to revel in it. And they do go to our national parks in America. The best liked thing which is done in the U.S. Government is the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, this is kind of an easy little bill, but it encourages the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Defense, to work with the Park Service, save us some money, make our parks better, so that the American people can enjoy these parks.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, House Resolution 182 is a good idea. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that would help solve

a big problem the National Park Service has in trying to maintain our national parks while also taking advantage of an assistance program already established in the Department of Defense. This would be especially effective in national parks that are isolated and do not have commercial contractors reasonably available.

As we all know, one of the primary purposes of the National Park Service is to provide for the public enjoyment of our national parks. In order to accomplish this, units of the National Park Service have understandably constructed buildings, roads, and other related infrastructure and facilities. However, for many years now the National Park Service has repeatedly reported a backlog of projects necessary to maintain facilities, structures, roads, and other infrastructure within our parks. In fact, the Park Service has asserted that upwards of \$8 billion is required to correct this backlog.

Separately, the Department of Defense has the statutory authority to provide support and services to other Federal agencies and entities, including the National Park Service. This support comes in the form of the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program which is designed to improve military readiness while providing hands-on training opportunities for military personnel. This support service includes equipment and other assistance which could substantially aid in reducing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects identified by the National Park Service. Furthermore, the men and women in the Army involved in these projects and who need the training would do it here in this country, and would not have to travel half way across the world. They also would be much closer to their families. In fact, many families might want to travel to parks where their loved ones are working.

In short, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 182 uses assistance from the Army to help solve the maintenance problem in our national parks thereby, benefiting the American taxpayer in this country instead of deployed overseas somewhere.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 182. This is a good idea and good for all Americans.

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, House Resolution 182 expresses the sense of the House that the National Park Service should immediately take full advantage of a Department of Defense readiness training program in addressing the backlog of maintenance within units of the National Park System.

House Resolution 182 is being brought to the House under unusual circumstances. The resolution was discharged from the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and marked up by the Committee on Resources just last week. We had no hearings on the measure in the committee, despite the fact that this proposal has been pending before the committee

since May 1999. We did not receive the views of the administration or other interested parties on this measure. As a result, we do not know what this defense program does or could do, nor to what extent this program has been previously used by the National Park Service or other land management agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) has described this as a non-controversial measure to encourage the use of an existing defense program in making needed repair to the infrastructure of our national park units. We have no objection to this nonbinding resolution, but we would like to have it understood that such assistance is to be carried out in conformance with the applicable laws and regulations and with the recognition of the high value placed on preserving and protecting national park resources.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 182.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MIWALETA PARK EXPANSION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1725) to provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent land.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1725

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 "Miwaleta Park Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND, DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall convey, without consideration, to Douglas County, Oregon (referred to in this section as the "County"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land (including improvements on the land) described in paragraph (2) and consisting of—

(A) Miwaleta Park, a county park managed under agreement by the County on Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) an adjacent tract of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$; SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 27, T31S, R4W, W.M., Douglas County, Oregon, described as follows:

The property lying between the southerly right-of-way line of the relocated Cow Creek County Road No. 36 and contour elevation 1881.5 MSL, comprising approximately 28.50 acres.

(b) USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After conveyance of land under subsection (a), the County may manage and exercise any program or policy that the County considers appropriate in the use of the land for park purposes.

(2) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the land conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used for park purposes—

(i) all right, title, and interest in and to the land, including any improvements on the land, shall revert to the United States; and

(ii) the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the land.

(B) DETERMINATION ON THE RECORD.—Any determination of the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be made on the record.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary and paid for by the County.

(d) IMPACT ON FERC WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance of land under subsection (a) shall have no effect on the conditions and rights provided in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Withdrawal No. 7161.

(2) CONFLICTS.—In a case of conflict between the use of the conveyed land as a park and the purposes of the withdrawal, the purposes of the withdrawal shall prevail.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—Except as provided in subsection (c), costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be borne by the party incurring the costs.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

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, I rise in support of H.R. 1725, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. Speaker, a significant amount of effort has gone into the preparation of this bill, and I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for their diligence in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Miwaleta Park, located in Oregon, is a 30-acre area jointly managed by the Bureau of Land Management and Douglas County. The title to this park and surrounding area is currently held by the BLM. Under H.R. 1725, the title, and all rights and interest of this land, would be transferred to Douglas County for the purpose of building a public campground.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H.R. 1725, and ask for the endorsement of all Members to pass this needed legislation.

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, H.R. 1725 authorizes the conveyance of approximately 29 acres of public land to Douglas County, Oregon for park purposes. Currently 25 acres of the land proposed to be conveyed are used as a county park, Miwaleta Park, under an agreement between the county and the Bureau of Land Management.

The county has been working with the Bureau of Land Management to develop a campground on four adjacent acres, but this development has been complicated by the site's location within a Late Successional Reserve designated by the Northwest Forest Plan. However, the Bureau of Land Management has completed an environmental assessment that concluded the county could proceed with the proposed campground development.

Douglas County and the Bureau of Land Management had previously discussed conveying the land in question under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, but that procession was abandoned because current law does not allow Oregon and California lands to be transferred or leased. The land transfer contained in H.R. 1725 is an alternative to other administrative processes available to deal with these lands.

We should note that the legislation the House is considering today is different from a related Senate bill, S. 977, that the Senate passed late last year. We hope that the remaining issues between the two versions of the legislation can be satisfactorily resolved so that this legislative initiative can be finalized and sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for his help with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and difficult process for Douglas County to improve and obtain the properties adjacent to their park in order that they might provide for camping facilities and might make this area more desirable for hundreds of families each year.

The Miwaleta Park is adjacent to a reservoir. It is heavily recreated now, and we have problems because of dispersed camping in the area. This park is actually going to, with the development of facilities by the county, ameliorate existing problems that we have with the dispersed camping and trash