

WASTE AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, when I was first elected to Congress, my incoming class decided to concentrate on the concept of exposing waste, fraud and abuse in national government. I wish I was still doing that because with all due respect, I have struck the mother lode of waste, fraud and abuse.

Tomorrow we will debate on this floor under a rule a perfect example of abusing taxpayers, fraud on taxpayers, and wasting of taxpayers' money.

Less than 10 years ago, Secretary Babbitt established an organization called the National Land Conservation System. He said it was his idea, his hope, to move from what he called the "Bureau of Livestock and Mining," which was actually his legal responsibility, to what he wanted to be, a bureau of landscapes and monuments. He wanted this organization to emphasize and recognize the crown jewels of the Bureau of Land Management.

One has to ask: How does one actually recognize and emphasize the crown jewels of the Bureau of Land Management?

In hearings, we asked the bureau spokesman if before this entity was established, was the Bureau of Land Management incompetent in handling these goals, or of emphasizing and recognizing these lands. And the answer was, obviously, no.

So the question once again is: Why do we want tomorrow to codify and make permanent this entity which is at best redundant and is at worst simply a waste of taxpayers' money, because you see, this new entity doesn't appoint anyone. It doesn't fire anybody. It doesn't write or remove regulations. It doesn't administer or regulate. It doesn't do anything except cost the taxpayer \$50 million a year to run it.

The best argument that the proponents of this bill will have is that it doesn't change anything. In essence, it does nothing to an entity that does nothing; so why do it.

Another of the great arguments is it won't cost us a dime, except when the sponsor was asked in his State newspaper whether this new system would have more funds and regulations, his response was, "Well, you've got to establish the system, and then you go to step two."

In what actually is being purported as something that doesn't really change anything, my fear is this bill might actually do something.

The Department of Interior tentatively supports this proposal because it says it helps them to maintain the basic difference between a national park and a national monument on BLM land as opposed to a monument or park on National Park Service land. And the key element in the difference between

the two is the concept in the BLM of multiple use on the public lands.

And yet when our side tried to introduce an amendment in the committee to make sure that multiple use was one of the key values of this new system, it was defeated on a party-line vote. And when we went to the Rules Committee to try to bring this issue to the floor, it was once again defeated on a party-line vote.

The only difference between BLM and National Park Service is this concept of multiple use, and yet this is one issue that is specifically eliminated from the bill that will be in discussion tomorrow. This bill is supposed to take the status quo and make it permanent; and yet all of the problems inherent in the status quo are not solved by this particular bill. We have great issue with private in holdings on these lands, none of which is addressed.

We tried to make sure that those people who like to recreate on these lands, that no boating, no shooting areas would be diminished if this went into effect, and once again that issue was rejected on a party-line vote and not even allowed to be discussed on the House floor.

□ 2045

We talked about potential border security, and an amendment will be granted tomorrow that says we will do nothing to change what we are doing on border security on these lands which are part of our border, and that is, indeed, one of the problems because it's not the status quo we want. It is change that needs to be done.

This area is sometimes called sarcastically the Trail of Amnesty, where it's estimated that every year a quarter of a million people will go through, those who are most of the worst in the human traffickers, the drug dealers and some of our gang members.

There is one ranch that is near this area; already in a short period of time has been burglarized 16 times even though he has iron bars on the window, a security system. When he's on horseback riding his ranch he finds needles, baby clothes, two skulls, four dead bodies. No Country for Old Men looks like a soap opera compared to this territory.

It is not the status quo we need to do. It is change that is essential. And once again, nothing like this happens. When we write fuzzy and vague language we invite lawsuits against the Federal Government.

We'll have an amendment tomorrow to try to eliminate or at least limit the kinds of potential lawsuits we have. We will see what happens because, once again, that was rejected in the committee.

This national land conservation system should not be codified and made permanent; if anything, it should be eliminated as a \$50 million example of waste, fraud and abuse. The dream of Secretary Babbitt is really an expensive millstone around the neck of all taxpayers in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANCREDO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CANNON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)