

proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3632) to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3632

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 "Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

Section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes" (16 U.S.C. 460bb-1(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The recreation area shall also include the lands generally depicted on the map entitled 'Additions to Golden Gate National Recreation Area', numbered NPS-80,076, and dated July 2000/PWR-PLRPC."

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. 3632 expands the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to include 12 parcels of additional land. Most of the parcels are south of San Francisco near the City of Pacifica, California, and total approximately 1,200 acres.

Mr. Speaker, although the introduced legislation included numerous other parcels of land to be included within the boundary expansion, I have worked with my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) who introduced this measure and agreed that those private property owners who have expressed desire not to be in this legislation are now excluded.

This amended bill reflects this agreement, and we have only included those parcels which wish to be included within the expanded recreation area of the boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the good work he has done on this, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3632, as amended.

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. 3632 is a bill introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). As introduced, it would have expanded the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in California by adding 20 parcels of land totalling approximately 1,216 acres.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is one of the largest urban parks in the world. The lands proposed for addition to the park have been reviewed through various National Park Service planning processes and have been found to be suitable and desirable additions to the park.

□ 1530

We, along with the administration and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) have supported H.R. 3632 as introduced.

However, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment to insert a new boundary map that deletes from the original proposal any parcel where the landowner has not affirmatively agreed to be in the park boundary. We believe this change weakens the legislation. The change made by the committee will preclude the National Park Service from acquiring the deleted parcels, all of which have been found suitable and desirable additions to the park, from their owners if they wish to sell in future. Such a change will necessitate coming back and getting legislative authority in each instance where an affected landowner wishes to sell to the National Park Service. However, we also recognize the lands that would still be added to the park by the amended bill are extremely important addition, and, thus, while we would prefer passage of the bill as introduced, we support H.R. 3632, as amended.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am here briefly to rise and to thank my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER); the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands subcommittee, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), who have been so enormously helpful and supportive of my legislation; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO).

The legislation I am here to say a few words about is H.R. 3632, which expands GGNRA in three counties. It will add immeasurably to the value of this most important area, adding approximately 900 acres in San Mateo, San Francisco and Marin Counties to the existing GGNRA park land.

It is supported powerfully by local government. A significant portion of the lands are donated without any cost to the Federal Government. The Department of Interior and the National

Park Service strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all of my colleagues to vote for this and thank them for approving this legislation.

In the interest of time, I ask that the full text of my statement be included in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the Resources Committee who have been supportive of my legislation, H.R. 3632 the Golden Gate National Recreation Boundary Adjustment Act—Resources Committee Chairman Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and the Ranking Member of the Resources Committee, my fellow Californian, Mr. MILLER. I also want to thank the Chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee Mr. HANSEN of Utah who has been particularly cooperative in working with me on this legislation. The Ranking Member of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO of Puerto Rico, has also been most supportive.

I also want to express my thanks to my neighbors and colleagues from California who have a particular interest in this legislation and who have worked closely with me for the passage of this legislation—Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI of San Francisco and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY of Marin County. H.R. 3632 includes areas that are in their Congressional Districts, and I appreciate working together with them on this bill.

The entire bipartisan Bay Area congressional delegation are cosponsors of this legislation, and I thank them all for their support.

I also want to thank Chris Walker of my staff for his excellent efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) was established in 1972 to protect important natural and cultural resources in the San Francisco Bay area. The park is located in the city of San Francisco and in Marin and San Mateo Counties, and it presently encompasses 76,000 acres of land and water.

The legislation we are considering today—H.R. 3632, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act—revises the authorized boundaries of the GGNRA to include approximately 1,000 acres of land in San Mateo and Marin Counties and the City of San Francisco. The approximately 900 acres of lands in San Mateo County which will be added to the park are adjacent to existing GGNRA lands and will connect existing park lands to nearby headlands, beaches and trails along the Pacific Ocean.

Inclusion of these lands will improve public access to existing park areas, trails and beaches. It also will improve access to the historic Portola Expedition Discovery Site, the "Plymouth Rock of the West," which is the site from which San Francisco Bay was first seen by European explorers in the 18th century. H.R. 3632 also authorizes the inclusion of approximately 100 acres of land in Marin County known as "Marincrest," and approximately 2 acres of land in the City of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the strong and enthusiastic support of local government leaders in the Bay Area. The Pacifica City Council and the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors have adopted resolutions supporting inclusion of these lands to the GGNRA. The Marin County Open Space District adopted a resolution supporting inclusion

of Marincrest into the GGNRA. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has also adopted a resolution supporting passage of the bill.

The U.S. Department of the Interior and the National Park Service have also expressed their strong support of H.R. 3632. In 1988, a congressionally-authorized boundary study by the National Park Service identified 15 tracts of land totaling 1,057 acres of lands in San Mateo County that would be logical additions to the park. The Park Service study concluded that these additional lands would preserve significant natural, scenic and recreational resources and would establish a park boundary that is more logical, recognizable and easier to manage. The Department of the Interior and the National Park Service officially expressed support for this legislation in a hearing before the National Parks Subcommittee of the Resources Committee.

Mr. Speaker, one element of this legislation that is particularly important is that a substantial portion of the lands to be included in the GGNRA will be donated without cost to the Federal Government by the local community and private land trusts and conservation groups. Major donated parcels in San Mateo County include Cattle Hill (261 acres), San Pedro Point (246 acres) and Milagra Ridge (30 acres). In Marin County, the Trust for Public Lands has agreed to donate half the value of the 96-acre Marincrest property. The two parcels in San Francisco will also be donated.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will provide permanent protection for these stunning and critical natural areas. Adding this land to the GGNRA will preserve it for future generations and make existing areas of the park more accessible for all. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the adoption of H.R. 3632.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3632 to expand the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I would like to thank my colleagues, Chairman DON YOUNG, Subcommittee Chairman JIM HANSEN, and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER, for their support of this bill and for ensuring its consideration on the floor today.

As a cosponsor with Representatives LANTOS and WOOLSEY, I would like my colleagues to know that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a vital part of the community and culture in the Bay Area. Not only is it the home of the Presidio, Muir Woods, the Marin Headlands and Alcatraz Island, the GGNRA is the largest urban national park in the world hosting over 19 million visitors a year, the largest visitation of any national park. The park offers visitors a variety of activities from hiking, camping, biking to educational and cultural programs.

H.R. 3632 is modeled after recommendations from a study by the National Park Service to evaluate the desirability of adding lands in Pacifica to the GGNRA. In addition, H.R. 3632 would expand the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to include 1,300 acres adjacent to the existing, including three areas in Marin County, one area in San Mateo County, and a coastline area in San Francisco. The boundary expansion will allow visitors better access to the existing areas of the park and will insure more efficient management of the natural resources in the park.

This legislation has gained large support from the local communities in the Bay Area, the State of California, the National Park Serv-

ice and has the support of the entire Bay Area Congressional delegation.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 3632.

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 (Mr. QUINN). 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. 3632, as amended.

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

AIR FORCE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4583) to extend the authorization for the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4583

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL EXTENDED.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs", approved December 2, 1993 (Public Law 103-163), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 4. LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.

"Notwithstanding section 10(b) of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1010(b)), the legislative authority for the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial under this Act shall expire on December 2, 2005."

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. 4583 extends the authorization for the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

In December of 1993, authorization was given for the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish an Air Force memorial to honor the men and women who have served in the United States Air Force. The memorial was to comply with the provisions of the Commemorative Works Act.

Among other things, the Commemorative Works Acts provides that the leg-

islative authority for the commemorative work will expire at the end of the 7-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of such authority, unless a construction permit has been issued. To date, no construction permit has been issued.

Furthermore, due to unforeseen and lengthy lawsuits, all work, including the fund-raising for the memorial, was put on hold for approximately 3 years. The lawsuits have been settled and work is ready to recommence regarding the memorial. However, due to the delay in the 7-year requirement of the Commemorative Works Act, the authorization for the foundation is about to expire. In fact, the authority will expire on December 2 of this year unless Congress passes a time extension.

With considerable work already accomplished and the lawsuit settled, the memorial needs now to be completed. Thus, the bill would extend authority to the Air Force Memorial Foundation to complete the well-deserved memorial. The authority would extend until 2005, giving the foundation the time to fulfill the final construction and dedication of the Air Force memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy piece of 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. 4583 introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) would extend the authorization of the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish an Air Force memorial.

Public Law 103-163 authorized the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish the Air Force memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs. The foundation has identified a site just across the Potomac River in Arlington, Virginia.

We understand that the Air Force Memorial Foundation has made great strides toward construction of a memorial but has not proceeded to the point of getting a construction permit. Without such a permit, the authority to construct a memorial will expire on December 2, 2000.

Except for its length of 5 years, the extension authorized by H.R. 4583 is consistent with that authorized for other memorials. We hope 5 years is not necessary.

We support passage of H.R. 4583 and look forward to the completion of the memorial.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a former Air Force officer and a distinguished man with a tremendous and