

the debt ceiling. There are other examples pointed out.

This is the ultimate. The faith and credit of the United States, their ability, when checks are presented, including by Social Security recipients, the question of whether they will be honored. What do other people think about this? I know that my colleagues on the other side, they do not like us to call them extremists, but they ought to understand that the public is calling them extremists, because playing around with the debt ceiling is an example of it.

I was reading the article on the House freshman in Business Week, the January 29 edition. It refers to a Business Week Harris Poll where 45 percent of the Americans thought of the first-termers on the Republican side as extremists. That is a huge number. They are doing so because it is based on the reality they see, extreme actions are well as rhetoric.

So, my reaction to the back and forth today, and all the oratory that went on, I know that my colleagues have trouble just giving ground in terms of some of these extreme ideas. I know they want to use every leverage they can, because they hold these views so deeply. But the problem with extreme ideas is that sometimes it causes people to adopt extreme means. In this case, the extremity, the extremeness of the end leads people to justify extreme means.

Mr. Speaker, playing around with the debt ceiling is an extreme means that is going to lead, I fear, if it were ever undertaken, the default, to extreme results.

So, the mainstream of America, which we are part of here, those of us who are pleading that we end the leveraging with the debt ceiling, even talking about it, the mainstream of America is saying resist the temptation. They talk about people who touch a hot stove, they learn having touched it once. In this case, our colleagues on the Republican side touched the stove twice at least in terms of shutting down the Government, and they got burned, but so did America. You would think people would learn. I hope so.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and I would be happy to yield again, talking about measures that go too far, I think part of the problem is who they might be listening to. Again this Mr. Dunlap, and this is a direct quote from Roll Call on Monday, January 29, suggested, just think about this for a second, that they should abolish the Senate, the other body. And if they did that, then they could get somewhere.

Now, a lot of us have problems with the way things are set up. We are not always pleased with the way we make our laws in this country, but I do not think that that remark was made in jest. And I think there are a lot of people that would want to dismantle the very tenets of our Constitution. To me that borders on anarchy. That is not

just reform. That someone would come before them and offer that as a proposal, I find not just to be off the edge, I find that to be about as extreme a recommendation as they could make.

It goes to the very fundamental rights of representation that the small States and the large States have in our country. It goes back to the founding of the Republic. What gives this person the right to speak before this group in this way?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I think she put her finger on it. There is an obligation on the part of some of our colleagues on the Republican side who really do not like this extremism, who have said to a number of us on many occasions privately that it is reckless, and sometimes they used the word "crazy," that they now speak out publicly.

We should not leave here tomorrow or the next day with the debt ceiling issue up in the air. It could have all kinds of results. And, look, it might help us politically, Democrats, if the Republicans playing with fire unleashed an inferno, but I do not want that and my colleague does not want that.

What the Republicans here should do is to say, look, we are reluctant to give up this leverage, if they think it is. It is not, and we are going to cut it cleanly. Cut it cleanly, extend the debt ceiling and let us argue out these important issues. We are in favor of a balanced budget. We are arguing out how we do it. Let that be the argument, not the debt ceiling.

I deeply appreciate the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio yielding to me. I just wanted to come to the floor and to straighten out this issue about Social Security, the debt ceiling that would cause the checks perhaps to be dishonored, not because the Treasury was taking steps. The onus is on our colleagues over there, and I just pray that they will act responsibly and do it this week.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for raising a very important matter that frankly we could have taken care of weeks ago, months ago. We do not have to be constantly operating at the edge.

I think, as the gentleman says, and he is a very moderate individual in his own views, that perhaps people feel so strongly that they think this is their only alternative. But for the sake of the Nation I think it is best to put on the shelf some of the deeper urges we might have and for the sake of the Nation do what is right for all of the people, not just for a small subset or how we might personally feel about something.

□ 1500

OUR COVENANT TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT WHILE PRESERVING LIBERTY AND UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] for 43 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare individual who does not want an effective environmental policy. Sometimes these policies, or the remedies thereof, have been called extreme, just like we heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle. I am one of the freshman Members, but I find it interesting that a party who has lost its vision can use only one word to define the other party, and that is the word "extreme." I beg of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with alternative programs that will benefit the American people.

I just have to say Mr. Speaker, this was not a planned part of my speech, but I do want to say that it is private individuals who risk and who invest who employ Americans. I join the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a woman I admire greatly, about the fact that we do want to keep American jobs here in America. I do agree with her there. But, you know, we either have one of two employers: Either you, the taxpayers, are employing individuals through government, or we have private businesses employing people. I prefer private entrepreneurs in employing people and downsizing government.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare individual who doesn't want an effective environmental policy. We all want to promote the wise use of America's natural resources, but the driving force behind our current policies have little to do with sound science, foresight, or reason. Instead, environmental policies are driven by a kind of emotional spiritualism that threatens the very foundation of our society, by eroding basic principles of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one quote I could center my remarks around today, I think it would be a personal statement made by Thomas Jefferson, who probably was the world's greatest articulator of man's heavenly endowed individual rights and liberties. Jefferson wrote in 1776:

I may grow rich by an art I am compelled to follow, I may recover health by medicines I am compelled to take against my own judgement; but I cannot be saved by a worship I disbelieve and abhor.

Mr. Speaker, the very first clause of the very first amendment to our Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," and yet there is increasing evidence of a government sponsored religion in America. This religion, a cloudy mixture of new age mysticism, Native American folklore, and primitive Earth worship, (Pantheism) is being promoted and enforced by

the Clinton administration in violation of our rights and freedoms.

Proponents of this new-environmentalism are the first to recognize its religious nature. Just to name a few: Sierra Club Director David Brower announced "We are a kind of religion." Scientist James Lovelock, author of the bestseller "Gaia," admits that "Gaia is a religious as well as a scientific concept." Bill McKibbin, author of "The End of Nature," proclaimed that "it is not in God's house that I feel his presence most—it is in His outdoors." According to columnist Alston Chase, nearly all environmental leaders have conceded that environmentalism is a religious movement.

The trouble is that these sentiments are not just expressed by leaders in the environmental movement, but frequently, by government leaders who influence and promulgate the regulations we live under. When Vice President AL GORE was invited to speak at the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine, he sermonized that "God is not separate from the Earth." Espousal of this environmental religion by political leaders and regulators carries profound constitutional implications.

I recently came across the transcript of a speech delivered by U.S. Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt on November 11 to a joint meeting of the National Religious Partnership for the Environment and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It was entitled "Between the flood and the rainbow: Our Covenant to Protect the Whole of Creation." In this speech, Babbitt explains how he became disillusioned with Christianity because the commandment that man should have dominion "over every living thing that moveth upon the Earth" conflicted with his view of nature's supremacy. "I always had a nagging instinct," he explained, "that the vast landscape was somehow sacred, and holy, and connected to me in a sense that my catechism ignored." Babbitt explains how a young Hopi friend taught him "that the blue mountain was, truly, a sacred place," and he became "acutely aware of a vacancy, a poverty amidst [his] own religious tradition."

To fill this vacancy he adopted the new environmentalism, and he has every intention of regulating and enforcing his dream of utopia into reality.

You may ask, what is the harm of public officials maintaining deeply held beliefs? The problem, Mr. Speaker, comes when those deeply held beliefs become the driving force for policy which that nonbelievers face persecution. Mr. Babbitt has made it clear that environmentalism—the religion—is driving this Nation's regulatory scheme. This is a violation of the establishment clause of the Constitution. It smothers our values and it threatens our liberties.

James Madison wrote his great "Memorial and Remonstrance" against a

Virginia tax for the support of an established church. In it, he eloquently argued that a true religion did not need the support of law; that no person, either believer or nonbeliever, should be taxed to support a religious institution of any kind; that the best interest of a society required that the minds of men always be wholly free; and that cruel persecution were the inevitable result of government-established religions.

Madison was right. The backbone of America—workers, small businessmen, and property owners—are becoming victims of this new-environmentalism.

Businesses like Stibnite Mine in my district, whose mining operation was shut down for 2 years waiting for the National Marine Fisheries Service to determine whether they could haul supplies on a Forest Service road.

People like the Yantis family in my district, who were told by the National Marine Fisheries Service that they should just give up their right to irrigate for a fish that is not instream now, but could be one day.

People like a Minnesota farmer who had two 1-acre glacial potholes on his property. To make farming around them easier, the farmer filled one and expanded the other two acres. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers objected, and the Federal Government ordered him to dig out the pothole he had filled and fined him \$45,000.

Whole families throughout the Northwest who have lost their jobs because government restrictions and environmental lawsuits have shut down the region's ability to keep forests healthy.

Farmers in the Bruneau Valley whose livelihoods have been held hostage to a snail the size of a buck shot. The Fish and Wildlife Service has yet to scientifically prove that farming activities have an effect on the snail.

For those who still refuse to see the dangerous character of an established religious environmental movement, let me give you another example:

Wayne and Jean Hage bought a cattle ranch in Nevada in 1978. The former owner had been forced to sell because the regulatory pressure by the U.S. Forest Service had become unbearable. But Hage was confident that he could work with the Forest Service to resolve any problems that might occur. He was wrong. Problems started when, without warning or notification, a nearby Forest Service Ranger Station began to pump water from a critical spring on Hage's property into the ranger's cabin. The Forest Service maintained a fence around the spring so that cattle could not drink, but Hage felt that if the Service needed the water an amicable agreement could be reached. The Forest Service refused to cooperate, and when Hage held a field hearing on the issue, they launched an all-out holy-war against the rancher.

For the sacrilege of questioning Forest Service actions, Wayne was contacted no less than 110 times with violations of bureaucratic regulations.

Most, if not all, were wild goose chases, but each required time consuming and often expensive responses. The Forest Service even resorted to several armed raids on the ranch, confiscating 104 head of cattle and keeping the proceeds of their sale. Hage also faced felony charges for clearing brush from his own irrigation drains. The charges were thrown out by the courts, but this was the last straw—Hage filed a suit for the regulatory and physical taking of his ranch.

Unfortunately, CIGNA Corporation, the lender and lien holder on Hage's property is one of the environmentalist faithful, and has been attempting to foreclose on the property to effectively kill the case. CIGNA is a major corporate donor to the National Wildlife Federation which is acting as a friend of the court on behalf of the Forest Service. This is an organization that instructs environmental activists on how to use Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management regulatory power to "Make it so expensive for the rancher to operate that he goes broke."

Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong with this picture.

Environmentalism need not be a religion. It could—and should—be based on science and logic and aimed at secular goals. But Secretary Babbitt rejects the protection of species for potential cures for disease, or new strains of drought-resistant crops, or bioremediation of oil spills, in favor of uniting "all state, county and federal workers under a common moral goal." He concluded his speech by affirming that "religious values remain at the heart of the Endangered Species Act, that they make themselves manifest through the green eyes of the grey wolf, through the call of the whooping crane, through the splash of the Pacific salmon."

The fact that this moral philosophy makes villains of hard working, productive citizens makes it repugnant to American values. The fact that it dismisses science prevents technological progress. The fact that it violates the Establishment Clause of the Constitution makes it an attack on our form of government. And the fact that it places obstacles in the way of American prosperity makes it a threat to our children's future.

Mr. Speaker, policies inspired by this new green religion are having devastating effects on my State. One example that I think exemplifies this new trend is unnecessary introduction of predators such as wolves and grizzlies against the will of the people and at great expense to the taxpayer.

Many people do not realize that the idea of releasing wolves in Idaho and in the west is not a new one. There were attempts as far back as 1982, when Senator CRAIG held the seat that I hold now. At that time, when the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service introduced this idea, the plan was quickly shelved after then-Congressman CRAIG held hearings in which obvious flaws of artificially introducing the wolves were exposed.

In those hearings biologists admitted that the wolf was recovering naturally in Canada and Alaska, where there are currently as many as 40,000 to 50,000 of the grey wolves. Moreover, the plan was soundly rejected after it became clear what the consequences would be of introducing a dangerous predator into an area that was no longer completely wild, but in fact, where there are activities such as ranching, logging, mining, and recreation.

The mere suggestion of introducing wolves prompted the State legislature to pass a number of bills prohibiting the introduction of wolves unless it was under the terms and conditions of the State. I would like to insert into the RECORD the testimony of State representative JoAn Wood, who came before the House Resources Committee and testified to the long history of Idaho's objection to Federal wolf introductions.

Nevertheless, when President Clinton was elected, Bruce Babbitt, the President's appointed Secretary of the Interior, again resurrected the idea of introducing wolves in the West. This time, instead of trying to establish a sound, practical, scientific basis for the program, the Government promoted wolf introduction as a romantic notion of restoring the western ecosystem to its pre-Colombian state. Indeed, Mr. Babbitt has gone as far as saying that it fulfills a "spiritual" void. Mr. Babbitt proclaimed in his November 11 speech that wolf introduction efforts were driven by the "elevated nature of America's conservation laws: laws with the power to make creation whole * * *" in essence recover "our ancient religious values."

The Department of the Interior also responded differently to the avid opposition to wolf reintroduction by States of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. The Fish and Wildlife Service promised the States that no wolves would be released until an agreement of how these wolves would be managed was in place. The Department of the Interior, in conjunction with the many environmental groups also initiated a large scale nationwide advertising campaign—in places where nobody would have to worry about managing the critters—to sell the romantic notion of returning these animals to the west.

Very little has been mentioned during the governments publicly campaign blitz of the overall costs of the wolf introduction, which includes aircraft, ground vehicles, equipment such as kennels, shipping crates, sophisticated radar tracking devices, radio collars, tranquilizing guns, and extensive staff of biologists, veterinarians, technicians, and administrators—not to mention a massive publicity campaign. Added up, it amounts to about \$1 million per wolf.

I first dealt with Mr. Babbitt's infatuation with the green eyes of the wolf just after I was sworn in to represent the citizens of Idaho's First Congressional District. It was apparent

that after the fiscally austere Republicans won the majority in Congress, Babbitt determined that the release of the wolves must be greatly expedited or his chance "to make nature whole" would once again be jeopardized. We found that his attempts to work out an arrangement with the States were not only completely disingenuous, but merely used as a device to detour the legitimate concerns of the States while he found a way to implement his plan. When Babbitt realized that his costly wolf scheme could come under scrutiny by this Congress, he went into emergency mode, bypassing all the processes, including State laws and section 6(f) of the Endangered Species Act which specifically requires the Secretary to work in coordination with the States in any introduction effort. He did this while ignoring the pleas of Governors and legislators to not proceed, but by actually speeding up the capture of the wolves.

By early January, just days after the new Congress had been sworn in, Babbitt had his wolves ready to be released at Yellowstone and in Idaho. My office received a firestorm of pleas and concerns from constituents and State officials calling for an immediate halt to the releases. In fact, one of my first official acts as a Congressman was to send a letter to the Secretary requesting that he halt any releases, and at the very least let due process take place. Babbitt defiantly responded by immediately releasing the wolves into Idaho—and even forging a highly questionable agreement with the Nez Perce Indian Tribe to manage the wolves.

Despite all, Secretary Babbitt proceeded with the release of his imprisoned green-eyed friends—although I don't know how anyone can consider him a friend of the wolf considering the abrupt way these wolves were tracked down and shot by a tranquilizer gun, forced into a pen, had a collar placed around their neck, taken away from their native habitat, and released into unfamiliar and unfriendly territory. Moreover, problems resulting from the unnatural methods used became evident when wolves which were released into Yellowstone, that were under the care of humans for weeks, refused for a time to leave their newfound comforts and security. Even now the wolves, which in the wild steer clear of humans, are routinely seen—and quite possibly fed—by many of the tourists visiting the park. It is easy to see that the wolf program in Yellowstone Park has done nothing more than create more dependents on the Government dole.

The released wolves faced—and caused—even more dire consequences in Idaho. Shortly after the wolves were released in Central Idaho, a wolf was shot near Salmon after feeding on the carcass of a newborn calf. The body of the wolf was found on the property of a 74-year-old World War II veteran and rancher by the name of Mr. Gene Hussey. The reaction of the Fish and

Wildlife Service was to initiate a full-blown investigation that included a \$500,000 autopsy performed on the dead wolf. The Fish and Wildlife Service obtained a search warrant, and without notifying Mr. Hussey or the local sheriff, proceeded to send several officers to investigate Mr. Hussey's property. In a hearing about this incident held jointly with the Resources and Agriculture Committees, on which I sit, Mr. Hussey testified that on arriving home from his neighbor's house, he discovered several armed Fish and Wildlife officers crawling over his gate—damaging the gate in the process—and refusing to heed his warnings to leave his property until the local sheriff arrived. The predicament escalated to the point that the Federal agents accused this 74-year-old man of throwing rocks at them, and rushed across a stream to confront him about it. In the meantime, the local sheriff, Mr. Barsalou, was speeding to the scene—very concerned about the possibility of a violent confrontation. Fortunately, he was able to arrive in time to defuse the situation.

After some of the problems that we have witnessed with the release of only 14 wolves last year, I am amazed to see the media reporting the program as "remarkably successful." I was even more disappointed to find out that even during the Government shutdown, and before their appropriations were approved, the Fish and Wildlife Service was busy preparing to capture another 30 wolves in Canada for release in Idaho and Wyoming. The Service has spared no expense and has let nothing stop them including inclement weather, lack of appropriations, animal rights protesters, the continued disapproval of the State legislature, and another call by this Congressman to refrain from capturing and releasing more wolves.

Apparently one of Mr. Babbitt's green-eyed friends did not like the whole idea and bit one of his handlers before receiving the unlucky fate of being killed by one of the Fish and Wildlife officials. Of course, if I had just been tracked down from my home, snared, darted, caged, drugged, and jostled, I would have bitten someone too.

The truth of the matter is that there remain many unanswered questions and unaddressed concerns about the wolf introduction program. Despite the fact that the Government continues to disregard the wishes of the local citizens, to implement a program that serves no scientific purpose, creates the potential for more conflicts, and costs taxpayers a bundle, the Government and the national media continue to paint the program as a better than expected success with few hitches. I believe this is because the media, like Mr. Babbitt, are not focusing on the logic or scientific merits of the program, but on how well it has fulfilled their own spiritual expectations.

Some wonder why I have fought so hard against a Federal program that

has little direct impact on most Americans. I fight because I believe that we should be practicing great fiscal constraint, because excessive deficits threaten the future stability of this country. I fight because the taxpayer deserves to know that millions of their dollars are being spent on aircraft outfitted with sophisticated radio equipment which daily track a handful of confused wolves meandering about and stirring up trouble in the mountains of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana.

I also fight because I believe there are deep implications about the wolf introduction program that affects all Americans—and that is the precedent it has set.

Now the Federal Government is finalizing plans to introduce an even more dangerous predator into the Selway-Bitterroot mountain range located in Idaho and Montana—the grizzly bear. Mr. Speaker, only a few years ago—the very idea of introducing grizzlies into central Idaho was considered pure lunacy. Why? Quite frankly, the grizzly bear, a species that now numbers over 100,000 in Canada, Alaska, parts of Montana, and in Yellowstone, simply has a propensity for violence against humans and animals. Last year there were numerous incidents of bear maulings during unprovoked situations. In one case a hiker was merely taking his shoes and socks off to cool his feet in a mountain stream when the odor of his socks apparently caught the attention of a nearby grizzly. And in the State of Wyoming and Montana, there has been an epidemic of nuisance bears which have been killing cattle and sheep, and rummaging around human habitation. Some are even suggesting that the grizzly no longer needs the special protection of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Speaker, the response that I have received from my constituents—even some who do not normally agree with me—has been overwhelmingly against the introduction of the grizzly. I believe that some in the forest industry have been driven by fear or strong coercive tactics into supporting a program that simply will not work. Other than that, the reaction against the idea comes from all types of individuals and for many legitimate reasons. Campers and hikers are concerned for obvious safety reasons, and that many of the trails and areas would be made off-limits. Hunters are concerned about dramatic reductions in game animal population. Ranchers are concerned about the loss of cattle and road closures. Miners are concerned about the possibility of restrictions on their activity as well, and property owners are deeply concerned about bears foraging about their garbage, and around their homes. Overall, people are not only afraid of the potential danger of having the bears in their backyard, but also having severe restrictions in accessing the forests and lands, both for recreational and industrial purposes. In fact the public comments compiled by

the Fish and Wildlife Service show overwhelming opposition to the grizzly introduction plan in the Selway-Bitterroot coming from places as far as California and Colorado.

Moreover, introducing the bear has little scientific merit. The Fish and Wildlife Service has not shown how the grizzly is vital to the survival of the ecosystem of the Selway-Bitterroot. In fact, no solid evidence proves that the bear once roamed there in great numbers. Some have pointed to a supposed journal entry by Lewis and Clark claiming that they shot around 20 grizzly in the area during their travels. Considering that no taxonomy was even in place at the time to distinguish between types of bears, it is ludicrous to use a journal entry almost 200 years ago as a solid basis of the facts. Finally, the small amount of data that does exist from previous attempts to capture and release grizzly into unfamiliar and rugged terrain shows that it is impossible to predict the behavioral response of the bear. I believe it is not worth the cost, both in human and budgetary terms, to find out.

Mr. Speaker, considering the significant amount of opposition to, and the lack of scientific need for the proposed grizzly introduction, we must look again at what is clearly the real impetus behind this idea. Introducing the bears addresses only an emotional attachment to the romance of having grizzly bears roaming the wilderness. It contributes to Mr. Babbitt's realization of the spiritual dream that he envisioned with his Hopi Indian friend so many years ago.

If environmentalists get their way with the grizzlies, there will be a devastating impact on the freedoms and livelihoods of my constituents, and significant ramifications throughout this country. I have seen evidence lately of ambitious goals by the Fish and Wildlife Service and environmental groups to populate regions of the West with thousands of grizzly bears. This would have the drastic consequence of shutting down access to many of our lands and forests to all human activity, including hiking and camping which virtually all Americans enjoy from time to time.

This would be a giant step closer to the utopia religious environmentalists are striving to create—a utopia where human beings have only as much value as the razorback sucker fish, and possibly less.

Mr. Speaker, this religious vision is not shared by every American and no American should be forced to promote a religious vision contrary to their own beliefs. The environmentalists want a new Inquisition to eradicate those with opposing views, and they have the might of the Executive behind them. This threatens, in the most profound way, our entire way of life. It is thoroughly un-American, and I won't stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following documents:

TESTIMONY OF JOAN WOOD, IDAHO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE, JANUARY 26, 1995

Madam Chairman, I am JoAn Wood of the Idaho House of Representatives. I am the ranking member of the House State Affairs committee, Resources and Conservation committee, and presently chairman of the House Transportation and Defense. I was the first committee co-chair of the Idaho Wolf oversight committee.

My purpose here is to establish before the committee the stand the people of Idaho, represented by its legislature, have taken concerning the federal policies of the re-introduction of wolves into our state and region. I am also here as the representative of the state government to demand that, first, the Department of Interior immediately cease and desist the releasing of wolves into central Idaho, which has been done without the consent of the Idaho Legislature or any of its elected official—as required by Idaho State law; and, second, it abandon this wolf re-introduction program entirely, which is both scientifically and economically flawed.

I have a number of items that are pertinent to my testimony that I would at this time ask unanimous consent to be entered into the record.

I would like to refer to a letter and petition signed by elected officials of our state government, including our governor, and over 2/3 of our state legislature to our Congressional delegation stating a request that the delegation demand Secretary Babbitt immediately stop this illegal action. I would like to include this letter in the record.

Let me call your attention to Idaho law, code 36-103, which states that wildlife is the property of the state, and that it "shall be preserved, protected, perpetuated, and managed." We are outraged because of the possible legal liability that has been forced upon our state by the unauthorized release of these wolves on January 14, 1995.

Further, Idaho code 36-715, pertaining to wolf/dog hybridizations, which are not protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA), requires a biological evaluation be performed on wolves to determine species priority before the Department of Fish and Game may take any action in accordance with the U.S. ESA. A request by the legislative committee and the Idaho State Veterinarian to quarantine and biologically test, as required by this law, was ignored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. This was in direct violation of Idaho State law.

Also, this law (36-715) gives direction to our own Fish and Game Department that they not expend funds, transfer assets, or enter into any cooperative agreements with any agency, department, or entity of the United States Government concerning wolves unless expressly authorized by state statute, with the exception that one representative participate in the wolf recovery team. The total recovery cost for this wolf re-introduction program is estimated to be 12.7 million dollars. We are concerned that Idaho may be forced by federal mandate to pick up as much as 25 percent of this cost. This has not been agreed to by the Idaho Legislature. The fear of this forced obligation is born out by a letter received by Idaho Fish and Game Director from Mr. Donald Friberg, Deputy Assistant Regional Director, and a copy of a letter from Minnesota State Director, Richard Wetzel, as to the problems encountered in Minnesota concerning wolf depredation and cost to that program. We received a letter also from the Wildlife federation under the signature of Thomas France Esquire, that once wolf populations are recovered, defenders of Wildlife will make a decision about continuing the compensation in

conjunction with the states and other affected interests.

Further we charge that the agencies involved did not comply with Idaho Code 36-715(b), by not taking into consideration local economies, custom, culture, and private property rights. Proper notifications were not given for hearings on this matter. In addition, suggestions that the government provide funding for compensation to livestock owners for all losses and to all people economically affected by land-use restrictions, among other local economic considerations, given to the Fish and Wildlife Services by the Wolf Oversight Committee, of which I was the ranking member, were completely struck out of the completed wolf plan. I would like to include a copy of the original plan in the record.

As early as 1984, the Idaho Legislature sent House Joint Memorial 11 to the President, the secretary of Interior, and other federal authorities wherein we urged the department of Interior and US FG&W service terminate any plans to plant wolf populations into Idaho. It is obvious that was ignored. Again in 1991, the state legislature sent a memorial (to also be included in the record) to the same federal officials (HJM6) stating the serious negative impact on the resource base of our state. The federal government responded to this memorial by threatening to turn the wolves over to the Nez Pierce Indians, who have no plan or process in place whatsoever to handle the wolves and compliances required by law.

We presented in the 1991 memorial five criteria for cooperation of Idaho oversight if the reintroduction cannot be stopped. I am submitting a copy of Dr. Tod Hoffman's testimony an Idaho Veterinarian and member of the Wolf Oversight Committee as a further witness of my testimony.

In conclusion, we submit to this congressional committee that the U.S. F&W under the direction and authority of the Secretary of Interior comply with 17.81 of the rules and regulations (A) refuted by Dr. Charles E. Kay and also Dr. Edward Goldman, renowned scientists in wildlife biology and ecology. We also request from Congress that you support Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson's legislation to stop any further ESA action in Texas, but Idaho as well.

I am the latest effort by Idaho to petition Congress for relief from these recent unwarranted actions of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Program, and urge for a desisting of the wolf and a stop to this 6.4 million waste of taxpayer money. So far, we have been ignored.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope my state does not have to sue our own Federal Government.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, ID, January 25, 1996.

Hon. HELEN CHENOWETH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CHENOWETH: The state of Idaho is strongly opposed to reintroduction of grizzly bears in Idaho. The state has many concerns regarding reintroduction, however there are two major areas that stand out. First, introduced bears will pose serious public safety concerns for Idahoans and tourists vacationing in our wonderful state. Second, the reintroduction has the potential to affect the social and economic stability of our rural communities by imposing undue burdens and restrictions on Idaho's natural resources based industries.

As you are aware, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is developing an Environmental Impact Statement on the reintroduction of grizzly bears in central Idaho. I urge you to explore every available option to

stop this reintroduction process as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP E. BATT,
Governor.

STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, ID, January 18, 1996.

Mr. ED BANGS,
Wolf Reintroduction Coordinator,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Helena, MT.

DEAR MR. BANGS: I write to reiterate the State of Idaho's objection to the reintroduction of wolves into central Idaho. Last year, the Idaho legislature determined that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's wolf reintroduction program did not adequately respond to the concerns of the people of Idaho. Those inadequacies have been pointed out to you many times.

Since that time, the United States Congress has also indicated its dissatisfaction with wolf reintroduction by holding up the appropriation for the program. I cannot overemphasize my frustration that the Service has decided to proceed with wolf reintroduction despite the State of Idaho's and the U.S. Congress' opposition to the program.

I am encouraged, however, by the statements attributed to you in an article carried in the January 18, 1996, issue of the Idaho Statesman newspaper. In that article, you state that the 1996 shipment of wolves into Idaho may be the last shipment that is necessary to meet the goals of the program. I certainly hope so. I implore you to make this the last year that is marked by the controversy of this ill-conceived program.

Thank you for being responsive to the concerns of the people of Idaho.

Sincerely,

ALAN G. LANCE,
Attorney General.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, ID, January 17, 1996.

ED BANGS
Wolf Reintroduction Coordinator,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Helena, MT.

DEAR MR. BANGS: According to the Gray Wolf Reintroduction Progress Report, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) began capturing gray wolves, to be released in central Idaho, on January 16, 1996. This capture is being commenced even though the USFWS has not been issued the appropriate wildlife importation permits by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Without these permits, the USFWS is ignoring Idaho state laws and its responsibility under the Endangered Species Act to cooperate with affected states to the greatest extent possible.

USFWS management of the wolves released in January of 1995 has been unsatisfactory. The monitoring of the wolves has been inadequate. There have been a number of occasions when some of the wolves could not be located. Additionally, the USFWS has failed to notify Idaho citizens, or state agencies, when wolves were in close proximity to residential areas or livestock.

Until the USFWS adequately addresses the concerns of the state of Idaho, I must reiterate my opposition to the release of any more wolves in central Idaho. Please advise me of the USFWS's intentions.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP E. BATT,
Governor.

IDAHO FISH & GAME,
Boise, ID, 21 December 1995.

ED BANGS,
Wolf Reintroduction Coordinator,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Helena, MT.

DEAR MR. BANGS: In 1995, the Idaho Legislature rejected a wolf recovery and manage-

ment plan that would have allowed the Idaho Department of Fish and Game to assume the lead role in wolf recovery in Idaho. As a result of this legislative action, our Department will not be issuing a special permit for the release of additional wolves into Idaho. Because we remain the agency responsible for the management of elk, deer, and other potential prey of the wolf, we will continue to work with your agency, the Nez Perce Tribe, and other agencies and organizations as wolf recovery proceeds.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

JERRY M. CONLEY,
Director.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2546, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2546) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-455)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2546) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—FISCAL YEAR 1996 APPROPRIATIONS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For payment to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, \$660,000,000, as authorized by section 502(a) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, Public Law 93-198, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-3406.1).

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT FUNDS

For the Federal contribution to the Police Officers and Fire Fighters', Teachers', and Judges' Retirement Funds, as authorized by the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act, approved November 17, 1979 (93 Stat. 866; Public Law 96-122), \$52,070,000.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

For a Federal contribution to Education Reform, \$14,930,000 which shall be deposited into an escrow account of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, pursuant to section 205 of Public Law 104-8, approved April 17, 1995 (109 Stat. 131), and shall be disbursed from such account pursuant to the instructions of the Authority and in accordance with title II of this Act, where applicable, as follows: