

When the House, on October 2, 1982, considered the conference report to S. 1018, the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS engaged in a floor colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX. Mr. BROOKS expressed his concern that certain areas in Texas affected by the bill were in fact developed according to the Interior Department's criteria and that their inclusion in the bill was an error.

As a result, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee sent two staff members to look at the areas on site. They reported that the areas are developed and that corrective action is appropriate.

The Senate amendment substitutes revised maps, High Island Unit TO2A and Bolivar Peninsular TO3A, both dated December 8, 1982, for inclusion in the coastal barriers resources system. It is a good and appropriate amendment. I know of no controversy and urge the House to concur in it.

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation by the chairman.

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1952, which would reauthorize the Sikes Act, was originally passed by the House of Representatives on September 21, 1981. As passed by the House, it reauthorized such sums as may be necessary to carry out conservation programs on military reservations and other public lands during fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985. It also amended the act to encourage the relevant departments to expand their efforts to protect wildlife and to make the lands involved available to the public for hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreational experiences and clarified certain ambiguities in the act.

The Sikes Act has been in effect since 1960. It authorizes the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs of fish and wildlife conservation and rehabilitation on military reservations in accordance with cooperative plans agreed to by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the appropriate State agency. It also directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, in cooperation with State agencies, to plan, develop, maintain, and coordinate programs for the conservation and rehabilitation of fish and wildlife on Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service lands and on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On June 9, 1982, the Senate passed the legislation with a series of amendments. In these amendments, the Senate specified Sikes Act authorization levels for the various agencies to facilitate congressional oversight. They also authorized the Fish and Wildlife Service to use existing funds to undertake a study of nongame wild-

life. Finally, they attached an amendment that extended the authorization for the striped bass study under the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act.

On September 30, 1982, the House accepted the Senate provisions on the Sikes Act authorization levels and the nongame study, but rejected the amendment relating to the striped bass study because it was contained in legislation previously passed by the House. We also included an amendment to clarify the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out "sting" type undercover operations to apprehend large-scale, commercial violators of wildlife laws. Recent operations of this nature have revealed a multimillion-dollar illegal trade in wildlife products run by hardened criminals who are often involved in other illegal activities. This amendment clarifies fish and wildlife authority for: First, agents to deposit advance funds in commercial banks or other financial institutions without disclosing their identity; second, use of proceeds of undercover operations to offset necessary and reasonable expenses incurred in such operation; and third, reimbursement to current appropriations of money expended to purchase evidence which is later recovered.

This amendment in no way affects congressional control, through the appropriations process, of the amount allotted each year to undercover operations and funds recovered from such operations will continue to come back into the Treasury. It simply clarifies the authority for existing procedures which assist the agents of the Fish and Wildlife Service in carrying out these difficult and dangerous, but highly successful undercover activities.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just returned this legislation to us for the second time with two amendments. The first amendment would simply include the Department of Commerce enforcement agents in the provision of the bill that applies to undercover wildlife enforcement activities. National Marine Fisheries Service agents share jurisdiction of many important wildlife statutes with Fish and Wildlife Service and need the same clarification of authority to carry out their sting operations.

The second amendment relates to a colloquy that I had on the floor of the House with Congressman JACK BROOKS when the Coastal Barrier Resources Act was passed at the end of the regular session. Mr. BROOKS requested that we examine an area in Texas to see if it was properly classified as an "undeveloped barrier island" and thus ineligible for Federal funds. Pursuant to this colloquy, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries sent two staff members to the area. They discovered that parts of two areas were indeed incorrectly designated. The

Senate amendment makes changes in the Barrier Island maps to correct this error.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see there is nothing earthshaking here. This bill has become a vehicle for several housekeeping amendments to allow the Federal agencies over which our committee has jurisdiction to operate more effectively. I urge my colleagues to support it.●

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on this authorization, is the authorized money within this particular bill within the budget?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is authorization only. There is no money in the budget to my knowledge for this particular purpose.

Mr. WALKER. So that the money that we are authorizing here would be over and above the budget; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I would say to the gentleman that according to counsel, what money has been spent under this has come under other authorities which is within the budget. In other words, for example, the military has been authorized from time to time through Executive order or otherwise to spend some money in conservation practices on military bases. This carries no appropriation whatsoever.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, there is no budget add on, no appropriations add on involved in this authorization?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I can answer to both questions, definitely "No."

Mr. WALKER. With regard to the coastal barriers, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. EVANS) I think, was one of the people who was interested in that particular legislation. I do not see him on the floor right now.

Have these changes been cleared with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. EVANS)?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. We have cleared this with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. EVANS), and he has no objection.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES)?