

(1) FINAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning after completion of 6 months of the second year of the pilot project, the Secretary shall compile a science-based assessment of, and report on, the effectiveness of the pilot project in meeting the stated goals of this pilot project. Such assessment and report—

(A) shall include watershed monitoring of lands treated under this section, that should address the following issues on a priority basis: timing of water releases, water quality changes, and water yield changes over the short and long term in the pilot project area;

(B) shall be compiled in consultation with the Quincy Library Group; and

(C) shall be submitted to the Congress by July 1, 2002.

(2) LIMITATIONS ON EXPENDITURES.—The amount of Federal funds expended for the assessment and report under this subsection, other than for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A), shall not exceed \$150,000. The amount of Federal funds expended for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed \$75,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002.

(m) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section exempts the pilot project from any Federal environmental law.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendment numbered 2 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which may be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 858), to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR OFFERING OF AMENDMENT IN LIEU OF MILLER OF CALIFORNIA AMENDMENT TO H.R. 858, QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of business in House Resolution 180 be modified so that it shall be in order for Mr. YOUNG of Alaska to offer the amendment now at the desk in lieu of the amendment numbered 2 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Mr. MILLER of California, and that the amendment be

considered under the same terms as would otherwise be applied to amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 858.

□ 1241

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 858) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, all time for debate had expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to Members that there is a little confusion going on right now, but there has been some discussion in trying to reach an agreement with the administration. I have letters from the administration saying that they basically support the implication of this legislation, from Mr. Glickman, the Department of Environmental Quality. What we have been trying to do for the last hour is to work out some mutual agreement where I personally believe that we can, in fact, send this bill to the Senate and have the Senate take it up without any amendments and send it to the President.

Now, there may be some that may not agree with what has been done on both sides, but it is my belief it is the best way to try to solve these problems. Because I am a realist, and I recognize there are those that oppose this bill, especially the national environmental community, I understand that and I understand that there are those in the Senate who have the power, because their rules put holds on bills and nothing occurs, I think it is very important to get this pilot project on its way to become a law.

I have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for the last hour, and we have been saying things to one another and discussing this, what we can accomplish. I am resentful of the administration, because I just got their letters about 10 minutes, 15 minutes ago. I think this is inappropriate on the part of the administration when this is their brainchild, when they thought this would be the way to go.

We have done everything possible to make this work. It is my belief, the way that this has been made up, that we have an opportunity now to really solve what was in my substitute but was a definition that appeases not only the administration but the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and others that are involved.

Now, I will not say that we did not have the votes. I believe we had the votes to pass it in the House big time, and I understand that, but there is also a chance in the way this works, if we want to get this program in place, on time, working for the people, the Quincy Library Group and the people in that arena, we must try to solve the problems here on the floor of the House to give them that opportunity.

If these amendments destroy the intent of the bill and if it does not work, then we can always review it. We can come back and find out what is happening. But it is an attempt to make sure that we have a fledgling duckling turn into a beautiful swan. It is an opportunity to make this work.

I know there is some question about what we are doing here, and I apologize to those people, but this is the way this program works. This is a democracy. This is a legislative process, putting a package together that becomes a reality.

So with that, I would like to thank the gentleman from California and those involved. I would like to suggest respectfully, for those that are unaware of what we are doing, that this is really, I think, our opportunity to fulfill not only an obligation, although we can win on this floor, but we can go forward and have an opportunity on the Senate side and get this to the President of the United States and make sure that these local people are heard and done correctly.

If it does not work, we can come back and revisit it again. I do believe it will work.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for offering this amendment. I think, in fact, as I said, there is very little disagreement about the intent and the purpose of this legislation and what all of us would like to see carried out. The gentlewoman from Idaho, the subcommittee chair, has worked long and

hard on this legislation, has accepted many changes by the various concerned parties to this legislation, as has the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] who represents this area and has championed this legislation, this approach, I think also has accepted many changes to this legislation that I believe is consistent with the idea that we would try to empower local communities to have a say in the planning of forest practices and forest managements that are consistent with the best interests of those communities while, at the same time, being consistent with the overall system of general forest health.

I think the suggestions put forth now by the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska, now ensure that we have legislation here that can be considered on a very timely basis in the Senate and be sent to the President's desk so, in fact, the Quincy Library Group pilot project on this 2½ million acres can go forward and it can go forward with every Member being assured that it is in compliance with the laws and it is in compliance with the intent and the purposes of the Quincy Library Group.

It is not easy to fashion these kinds of amendments when we are dealing with resource issues. When I used to be chairman of the committee, I used to tell people that wanted to get on the committee that we do not deal with anything abstract in this committee. We are either moving a boundary 10 feet north or 10 feet south, and trees either end up vertical or they end up horizontal. This is not an abstract committee.

So I want to commend the gentleman and the other Members on the other side for their effort in offering this amendment, and it is my intention to support the amendment, to support the legislation, and to work hard to see that it becomes the law of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, amendment numbered 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

No further amendment is in order, except the amendment enabled by the recent order by unanimous consent which may be offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. PILOT PROJECT FOR PLUMAS, LASSEN, AND TAHOE NATIONAL FORESTS TO IMPLEMENT QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP PROPOSAL.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal" means the agreement by a coalition of representatives of fisheries, timber, environmental, county government, citizen groups, and local communities that formed in northern California to develop a resource management program that promotes ecologic and economic health for certain Federal lands and communities in the Sierra Nevada area. Such proposal includes the map entitled "QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP Community Stability Proposal", dated June 1993, and prepared by VESTRA Resources of Redding, California.

(b) PILOT PROJECT REQUIRED.—

(1) PILOT PROJECT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Agriculture (in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), acting through the Forest Service and after completion of an environmental impact statement (a record of decision for which shall be adopted within 200 days); shall conduct a pilot project on the Federal lands described in paragraph (2) to implement and demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities described in subsection (d) and the other requirements of this section, as recommended in the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal.

(2) PILOT PROJECT AREA.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot project on the Federal lands within Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest in the State of California designated as "Available for Group Selection" on the map entitled "QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP Community Stability Proposal", dated June 1993 (in this section referred to as the "pilot project area"). Such map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS, RIPARIAN PROTECTION AND COMPLIANCE.—

(1) EXCLUSION.—All spotted owl habitat areas and protected activity centers located within the pilot project area designated under subsection (b)(2) will be deferred from resource management activities required under subsection (d) and timber harvesting during the term of the pilot project.

(2) RIPARIAN PROTECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Scientific Analysis Team guidelines for riparian system protection described in subparagraph (B) shall apply to all resource management activities conducted under subsection (d) and all timber harvesting activities that occur in the pilot project area during the term of the pilot project.

(B) GUIDELINES DESCRIBED.—The guidelines referred to in subparagraph (A) are those in the document entitled "Viability Assessments and Management Considerations for Species Associated with Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forests of the Pacific Northwest", a Forest Service research document dated March 1993 and co-authored by the Scientific Analysis Team, including Dr. Jack Ward Thomas.

(3) COMPLIANCE.—All resource management activities required by subsection (d) shall be implemented to the extent consistent with applicable Federal laws and the standards and guidelines for the Conservation of the California Spotted Owl as set forth in the California Spotted Owl Sierran Province In-

terim Guidelines or the subsequently issued final guidelines whichever is in effect.

(d) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—During the term of the pilot project, the Secretary shall implement and carry out the following resource management activities on an acreage basis on the Federal lands included within the pilot project area designated under subsection (b)(2):

(1) FUELBREAK CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of a strategic system of defensible fuel profile zones, including shaded fuelbreaks, utilizing thinning, individual tree selection, and other methods of vegetation management consistent with the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal, on not less than 40,000, but not more than 60,000, acres per year.

(2) GROUP SELECTION AND INDIVIDUAL TREE SELECTION.—Utilization of group selection and individual tree selection uneven-aged forest management prescriptions described in the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal to achieve a desired future condition of all-age, multistory, fire resilient forests as follows:

(A) GROUP SELECTION.—Group selection on an average acreage of .57 percent of the pilot project area land each year of the pilot project.

(B) INDIVIDUAL TREE SELECTION.—Individual tree selection may also be utilized within the pilot project area.

(3) TOTAL ACREAGE.—The total acreage on which resource management activities are implemented under this subsection shall not exceed 70,000 acres each year.

(4) RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT.—A program of riparian management, including wide protection zones and riparian restoration projects, consistent with riparian protection guidelines in subsection (c)(2)(B).

(e) COST-EFFECTIVENESS.—In conducting the pilot project, Secretary shall use the most cost-effective means available, as determined by the Secretary, to implement resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—In conducting the pilot project, the Secretary shall use—

(A) those funds specifically provided to the Forest Service by the Secretary to implement resource management activities according to the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal; and

(B) excess funds that are allocated for the administration and management of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest.

(2) PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may not conduct the pilot project using funds appropriated for any other unit of the National Forest System.

(3) FLEXIBILITY.—Subject to normal reprogramming guidelines, during the term of the pilot project, the forest supervisors of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest may allocate and use all accounts that contain excess funds and all available excess funds for the administration and management of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest to perform the resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(4) RESTRICTION.—The Secretary or the forest supervisors, as the case may be, shall not utilize authority provided under paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) if, in their judgment, doing so will limit other nontimber related multiple use activities for which such funds were available.

(5) OVERHEAD.—Of amounts available to carry out this section—

(A) not more than 12 percent may be used or allocated for general administration or other overhead; and

(B) at least 88 percent shall be used to implement and carry out activities required by this section.

(6) AUTHORIZED SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to implement and carry out the pilot project such sums as are necessary.

(7) BASELINE FUNDS.—Amounts available for resource management activities authorized under subsection (d) shall at a minimum include existing baseline functioning levels.

(h) TERM OF PILOT PROJECT.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot project during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the later of the following:

(1) The date on which the Secretary completes amendment or revision of the land and resource management plans for Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest pursuant to subsection (j).

(2) The date that is five years after the date of the commencement of the pilot project.

(i)(1) CONSULTATION.—Each statement required by subsection (b)(1) shall be prepared in consultation with the Quincy Library Group.

(2) CONTRACTING.—The Forest Service, subject to the availability of appropriations, may carry out any (or all) of the requirements of this section using private contractors.

(j) CORRESPONDING FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Regional Forester for Region 5 shall initiate the process to amend or revise the land and resource management plans for Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest. The process shall include preparation of at least one alternative that—

(1) incorporates the pilot project and area designations made by subsection (b), the resource management activities described in subsection (d), and other aspects of the Quincy Library Group Community Stability Proposal; and

(2) makes other changes warranted by the analyses conducted in compliance with section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)), section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604), and other applicable laws.

(k) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 28 of each year during the term of the pilot project, the Secretary after consultation with the Quincy Library Group, shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the pilot project. The report shall include at least the following:

(A) A complete accounting of the use of funds made available under subsection (g)(1)(A) until such funds are fully expended.

(B) A complete accounting of the use of funds and accounts made available under subsection (g)(1) for the previous fiscal year, including a schedule of the amounts drawn from each account used to perform resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(C) A description of total acres treated for each of the resource management activities required under subsection (d), forest health improvements, fire risk reductions, water yield increases, and other natural resources-related benefits achieved by the implementation of the resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(D) A description of the economic benefits to local communities achieved by the implementation of the pilot project.

(E) A comparison of the revenues generated by, and costs incurred in, the implementation of the resource management activities described in subsection (d) on the Federal lands included in the pilot project area with the revenues and costs during each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1997 for timber management of such lands before their inclusion in the pilot project.

(F) A schedule for the resource management activities to be undertaken in the pilot project area during the calendar year.

(2) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—The amount of Federal funds expended on each annual report under this subsection shall not exceed \$50,000.

(1) FINAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning after completion of 6 months of the second year of the pilot project, the Secretary shall compile a science-based assessment of, and report on, the effectiveness of the pilot project in meeting the stated goals of this pilot project. Such assessment and report—

(A) shall include watershed monitoring of lands treated under this section, that should address the following issues on a priority basis: timing of water releases, water quality changes, and water yield changes over the short and long term in the pilot project area;

(B) shall be compiled in consultation with the Quincy Library Group; and

(C) shall be submitted to the Congress by July 1, 2002.

(2) LIMITATIONS ON EXPENDITURES.—The amount of Federal funds expended for the assessment and report under this subsection, other than for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A), shall not exceed \$150,000. The amount of Federal funds expended for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed \$75,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002.

(m) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section exempts the pilot project from any Federal environmental law.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Again may I stress the importance of this legislation and the amendment which I offer to the original amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

This is an interpretation which was disputed between the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and myself and from the administration and what they requested. We still believe we did what we should have done in the original bill, or the substitute which I offered, but there is a disputing of definitions. We now believe that we have an opportunity with my amendment to take and resolve that dispute between the gentleman from California, myself, and the administration.

I have had the commitment of the gentleman from California that he is going to support this legislation if my amendment is adopted. Now, the total package will be voted on. And I have also had indications that the Senate would work appropriately with this legislation and the administration would sign this legislation if it gets out of this House in this form.

If this does not occur, that means that we would have to go back to con-

ference; but I am confident that if we went to conference, I have the support of the ranking member and other members involved whereby we can in fact solve this problem and get the community input as necessary.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, there has been much said about the preservation of this forest. One of the biggest fears I have and have always had is the burning of our forests today and the lack of management.

□ 1245

Fires are natural, yes. We have not been involved with Smokey the Bear, but we have put out fires for many, many years. The volatility of these acres now is about 100 barrels of gasoline per acre in some of our forests. Some of the most magnificent trees today are threatened because of the lack of fire control or fire suppression or, in fact, the continued growth and undergrowth that makes it impossible to put a fire out, and it kills the soil when it burns.

So we talk about the future generations walking through the forests. There will be no forests to walk through if we do not have the proper management. Yes, we can leave some trees aside. We can leave the old growth where it is in some places. We can also take and have the management thinning in the appropriate classification. But we must have what I call the appropriate management, and who better can do that than those in the area in which it lives? I think it is so crucially important that we continue to try this pilot project.

I want to stress again and again, pilot project, five-year project, all environmental laws, all registrations now. But it allows the taking of timber. It allows the proper fire suppression. So I urge the adoption of my amendment. I think it is crucially important that we have the opportunity to continue this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], on the legislation itself and not necessarily directed to the amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Quincy Library Group and the manager's amendment. The Quincy Library Group was not created in a vacuum. The national urban environmental organizations have been involved and aware of the Quincy Library Group since its inception in 1993.

National urban organizations have also been involved and endorsed at one time or another each element of the Quincy Library proposal. For example, the 5-year pilot program which is established by this legislation calls for an annual range of between 40,000 and 60,000 acres to be treated with strategic fuel breaks. This acreage was proposed directly by the national urban organizations.

The Quincy Library proposal is a positive bill that is good for the forest, good for the people, good for the environment, and receives a wide range of

support. Therefore, I ask Members for their support in passage of H.R. 858 and the manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may control the time otherwise reserved for an opponent of the amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for yielding. I want to thank both the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member, for coming together here on the floor to reach common ground on a very significant piece of legislation.

I think our bipartisan effort, and I am confident this bill will be agreed to after this amendment is agreed to by an overwhelming margin, has really set the tone for what I hope can be a new era in the way in which we resolve our differences on forest practices.

We have been at war with each other. We have not been able to resolve our differences. We have stopped progress. We have not created any new initiatives or new incentives to move on. I think this Quincy Library Group language, the original premise for it and the amended version that will pass today, is evidence that we can lay down our swords and actually work together to accomplish something.

We do not know that this is the solution. But the 5 years that we have given ourselves to try to put this local agreement into effect without violating national laws, I think is a window of opportunity. Should we succeed in these three national forests, dealing with the riparian restoration issues and the thinning issues and fire suppression, all the other issues that I think are part of contemporary management of our national forests, we will have perhaps set for the future a standard by which other forests can be managed with all the players coming together, environmentalists and local officials and local business people, people who work in the forests and people who employ them, coming together to find a common approach to getting off dead center. For that I am very thankful, as I am sure many of my colleagues and many of my constituents are.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who has been very busy here the last hour and a half on the floor trying to help us hammer out this agreement, and for taking part in these discussions and serving as a go-between. I want to thank him for that effort.

Both the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from

California [Mr. HERGER] are the closest representatives to this area and clearly, as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] tries to remind us all the time, have the concern with the greatest impact. I think that this is a balanced approach that the gentleman has worked on, and I appreciate and thank him for your efforts.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for his comments, and I simply want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for his initiative and his successful steering of this measure through, I hope, to the Senate and to the President.

It is a breakthrough. I think this would not have been accomplished without the willingness of the staff of the Committee on Resources and its leadership to resolve their differences here today on the floor so that we can offer an united front and, hopefully, see implementation of this concept.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding me the time. I also want to thank all those people on both sides of the aisle that have been involved in working through this legislation to reach a compromise that will benefit not only the people in the community that are directly involved in this issue, but it will have a positive impact on the rest of the country and on logging in general.

Are we smart enough, Mr. Chairman, to sustain logging, mimic nature, and protect biological diversity? I think we are, and I think this legislation will begin the process for us to understand how to do that.

Does this Nation need wood? The answer is yes. Must we sustain logging, or should we sustain logging? The answer is we must sustain logging. Does this Nation need the kind of health that biological diversity offers species, including human beings? Biological diversity ensures that we are going to sustain the kind of things we need in order to survive on this planet. Not only can we protect and sustain biological diversity, we must sustain biological diversity.

So are we smart enough, in this society that we call the United States of America, with a democracy, with a free market economy out there, with people with varying interests, can we get together and resolve these issues? The answer is yes.

And if we look at the legislation, does it protect the habitat for species? This legislation protects habitat for species. Does it protect and do further research on riparian areas? The answer is yes.

On page 8, line 18: "All environmental laws apply to this pilot project." On page 10: "An annual review of the project is ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture," an annual review.

If my colleagues look on page 15, line 6, this has something else to do with ensuring that we are going to do the right thing: "The Secretary shall compile a science-based assessment of the effectiveness of this pilot project."

The legislation is sound. Are we smart enough, as people in this democracy, to sustain logging, mimic nature, and protect biological diversity? Can we do that? The answer is yes. I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, our forests are really in deplorable condition. My colleagues can see and anyone who flies over the Sierra Nevadas can see just what a terrible state they are in, how years of drought and insect infestation have killed in some cases more than one-third of all the standing trees, a number of brown trees they can see flying over the Sierra Nevadas. We have had some devastating forest fires. And the prognosis is, unless we manage these forests, we are going to have fires on an even greater scale than we have seen so far, that will absolutely wreak havoc for years upon the environment and destroy the livelihood of all the people that live in timber-based communities.

Mr. Chairman, the Quincy Library Group represents remarkable consensus amongst local residents, local timber experts, local businessmen, local environmentalists, all local people who have produced this consensus to properly manage the forests. The only group opposed to this legislation is the arrogant, left wing, taxpayer subsidized environmental lobby, because if we have consensus to manage our forests at the local level, they might not be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. We should approve this bill and finally send a message to the world that local people can govern themselves, so I urge the approval of this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this bill with the amendment, except that because it is essentially a bottom-up process and we all got here from local government, and this is where people who live on the land take care of it, both sides of the issue, environmentalists and non-environmentalists, have come to consensus. I think it is a good bill and we ought to support it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I came over here to oppose this bill initially, and I am now met with the fact that the chairman and ranking member have come to an agreement that has been difficult to achieve concerning this issue. I commend them, and I intend to support that agreement because of the confidence I have in both of my colleagues and the staff who are engaged in this issue with me.

I must say I am somewhat uneasy with it. I am uneasy, Mr. Chairman, because it is implied that somehow the National Forest Service or some of our other land management planning agencies, the Park Service, BLM and the Fish and Wildlife Service, really did not have the information they need or did not have the know-how; and the fact is that these land management agencies are revered around the world for their knowledge with regards to the cutting edge understanding land management and the ability to manage the national forests, our temperate rain forests, our arboreal forests, the NFS is at the cutting edge of this particular study and application on the ground.

We ought to look at what has happened to the ability of the Forest Service and other land management agencies to develop the type of rapport that we need with local communities. I believe what has happened, as we examine the record, is that there have been significant reductions in professional staff throughout the 1980's and into the 1990's.

If we look at our budget for the next 5 years, I think we are going to find more problems along those lines. As budget are curtailed fewer personnel will be available for on the ground communication. And most of the plans we have actually go through extensive work, far above the Administrative Procedures Act, for example, such land management plans go through extensive work to try and share with local communities what the plans are for a forest, what the plans are for a park or for other public domain lands.

This modified substitute is a good idea in the sense that if we can develop consensus at the local level and it is consistent with scientific principles and sound national land management practices, that these national lands, which in this case happen to be in California and Oregon, would in fact be effectively managed and we will with a better rapport have less misunderstandings and less acrimony.

As new scientific information is developed and new knowledge is acquired, we have to bring this to bear in terms of land management plans in our forests, parks and other public lands. That is what Congress has asked the Forest Service to do in the many laws and policies that exist. That is what Congress is requiring the Park Service or BLM or other land management agencies to do, and that is a tough job,

a very tough job, because that new information portends changes regards the use of our forests, park and public domain lands.

□ 1300

However, I think engaging people locally in this formal way may prove to be quite expensive. I think we need to look at the total bill in dollars. This is more than just a pilot plan. I think it is a significant commitment by this Congress in terms of local engagement which must be matched with a fiscal commitment. I would just suggest that if my colleagues want this, if it is to work, then hopefully the same will stand up and start putting the money into the Forest Service to do the job in terms of forest health, to do the job in terms of developing this type of local input, and the ability to fully carry out the process of not just decisionmaking but implementation.

This is a very difficult task. It is an expensive task. I think it is one that is worth the effort if in fact the process accomplishes the promised objectives and goals. As I said earlier in my statement when we were talking on the rule for this measure's consideration, I do not disagree with the Quincy Library Group concept, but I do not think that I wanted to see this idea hijacked for other purposes, to get around the environmental and other laws that today present a challenge to some, the cost of local input should not be dispensing with the body of land use environmental laws.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997. As reported to the House the bill is unacceptable. Often in Congress we are faced with legislation in its best wrappings that attempts to appeal to our most common and good instincts, but unwrapped it reveals just another effort to benefit a special interest group. What could make more sense than a local group getting together to settle its differences in the confines of a library? What could be better than an agreement that satisfies everyone involved, preserves a community's economic stability, and protects the environment? You would think, upon reading the information provided by the supporters of this bill, that this was a slice of American pie, the most perfect proposal that Congress should rubber stamp.

Well I say to my colleagues that this bill from the Resources Committee is far from perfect. This isn't the Quincy Proposal. This is an attempt by these interests to force feed the American taxpayer and the U.S. Forest Service a policy path which side steps most major environmental laws and scientific principles. This bill could be yet just another attempt to cut more trees by sidestepping environmental law and existing rules and policy governing our national forests. This initial bill, H.R. 858, is a consensus proposal without a consensus on this floor. Is it a stalking horse for special exploitive interests? This bill takes a positive development and tries to cash it in before it becomes fully defined, much less developed. Cash it in for whom?

This measure which affects over 2.5 million acres of 3 national forests and could become

a 1997 version of the infamous 1995 salvage rider, the risks in the initial measure are just too great.

I opposed this initial bill because it disregards important environmental safeguards. It does not require real compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] or the National Forest Management Act. Instead, it substitutes a questionable and sloppy review process for true environmental stewardship without the safeguards. We've had enough trouble with the timber industry already—and this measure must not be just another special exception from some of the most important protected industries in America.

I want to make it clear that I am not critical of the Quincy Library Process. I am objecting to writing into law a half-baked concept and excepting it from the professional management practices that have helped guide the timber policy. This bill as law would superimpose a policy which is in glowing generalities a 22-page document that will lend itself to risk.

I question this bill further because it will cost \$83 million over the next 5 years. That's \$83 million the U.S. Forest Service will not be able to spend on creating more recreational opportunities for our kids, restoring old roads, or protecting the environment. In a time when we are finally tightening our belts, I ask my colleagues: can we really afford \$83 million to fund an uncertain and incomplete policy?

I oppose this original bill because it calls itself a pilot program, while it in fact deals with 2.5 million acres and 3 national forests. This is not characteristic of a pilot program. This could well result in a semantic exercise that is being sold with a goal to jettison important environmental protections.

I oppose this bill because it continues the majority's strategy of attempting to quietly ram through anti-environmental time bombs. Members of the Quincy Library Group themselves have expressed optimism that they are nearing an administrative solution with the Department of Agriculture. My friend from California, Mr. FAZIO, who originally supported this bill, contacted the Subcommittee on Forests asking us to give the administrative route more time. He was ignored, of course, because this bill is no longer about the Quincy Library Agreement—when unwrapped in living color this bill is about more logging and fewer environmental restrictions.

Finally, and most importantly, I oppose this bill because it sets a dangerous precedent. Clearly, communities have a vital role in determining our national forest policies. This bill, however, goes too far down that road. Simply because citizens live next to Federal land does not entitle them to manage that land. Those who live close to such land are important partners, often stewards, who offer real strength and accountability. Our national forests and public lands, however, are the property of all Americans. Every single American—not just the residents and interests of Quincy, CA—has a stake in ensuring that they are adequately protected from irresponsible management practices now and for future generations.

Finally, the majority and minority Members are offering the long-sought changes that have been agreed to. I urge my colleagues to support this Young/Miller substitute. It's an improvement over the very imperfect measure reported; it limits some of the risks, but is a bill really necessary? Couldn't this be done without a new law? It is a major concern. This

measure should be carefully watched in the legislative process and close oversight if it is enacted into law the next 5 years to ensure that the commitments to sound science and environmental sensitive land use planning are effective and achieved.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raised a very serious concern earlier about one particular section of the bill which resembled language from the infamous timber salvage rider which I opposed. The language in concern was that the Secretary concerned shall not rely on salvage timber sales as a basis for administrative action limiting other multiple use activities, et cetera.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. As part of the amendment, that language has been stricken from the legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman now feels that this bill fully complies with all existing environmental laws, and reserves rights of appeal, litigation, and other things to the public and other concerned individuals?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I appreciate the willingness of the proponents on the other side of the aisle to work with the minority to address the significant concerns raised by the administration. It is my hope now that we will be able to move this process forward with some dispatch and, as I said earlier, to begin to look at a different way of managing our forests; reserving the roadless areas, the few that are left, reserving and preserving the wilderness areas that are statutorily defined by Congress, meeting the needs of the spotted owl and other endangered species in the area, clean water concerns, but also engaging in some forestry activities in what would be called a lighter touch, uneven age stand management regime, one that came after hours and hours and hours of discussion between traditional antagonists in this part of the country. I only hope that a similar process can be modeled on the Quincy Library project for my own district and other areas where for so long we have been engaged in pitched battles.

Early on in the forest debates I got the carpenters union to go with some environmental activists up to look at management similar to what is being proposed here today, uneven age stand management, principally thinning, along with a forester who works on alternative management. There was substantial agreement that that would be something that had promise. I got the

carpenters to then go to an ancient forest conference and say they would look at an alternative that preserved all the remaining old growth if we could look at alternative management on the remaining lands. Yet the administration out of hand rejected that as did Lord Thomas reject that in going through the plan, to develop the President's forest plan. I think this is a crack in the armor of the old save and sacrifice forestry. This threatens people that are polarized at either ends of the debate. I applaud this process to move away from save and sacrifice to uneven age stand management, selective management and forestry that is sensitive to all environmental laws and truly perhaps for the first time to multiple uses.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for his remarks in support.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], the author of this legislation, to speak not only on the amendment but to the bill itself.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very appropriate that this bill just moments before it comes before a vote here on the House floor in the U.S. House of Representatives ends, or concludes the way that it started. The way that it started was some 4 years ago in a small community of a couple of hundred citizens in Quincy, CA, within the Plumas National Forest in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, a community which for 15 years had been racked with wars of the environmental community, warring with those that were trying to support the wood products industry. The fact that their economy had come to a standstill, the environmental health of the community and of these forests had come not just to a standstill but was actually to a state that we were seeing these forests burning up through fires. Just last year alone some 870,000 acres of forest burned in the State of California alone. Other environmental issues were not being addressed. And so at that time we saw the environmental community, the wood products community, the schools, the locally elected officials come together at a place that they felt they would not yell at each other, and that was the library. They started a long process of meeting together night after night, more than some 46 representatives, leaders in all the different areas of the community, working together to finally come up with a plan that was using the most recent environmental science, science that had been developed in this very area itself of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, to come up with a plan which was a win-win for everyone: A win for the environment, a win for the California spotted owl, a win for riparian problems that we have there, a win also for the economy of this community as well, a community

which throughout that area some 32 mills had closed in just the last couple of years.

And to see at this time all the working together there, working with the administration, working with our two U.S. Senators, literally thousands of meetings, and then to see it culminate here before our very eyes in which we see very much the same type of scenario taking place, I really did not think, I have been here six terms, I was not sure if I would see the time when my very good friend and distinguished leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and myself and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and others, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and others could come together in agreement. I think it is certainly, I feel is either the highlight, or certainly one of the highlights of my political career.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, yesterday was luncheon, today it is legislation, tomorrow it is frightening to think of what it could mean. I appreciate the gentleman's cooperation, and I want to thank him for how hard he has worked on this legislation. As he has pointed out, more times than I care to count, this is not a new idea with respect to Quincy Library. These people have worked very, very hard on this, and this is not an idea that somehow does not have a lot of support. It has a lot of support, and I think with changes of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], we now have what I would assume is almost going to be unanimous support in the House. I thank the gentleman for all of his perseverance and his hard work on this.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman.

Then just to conclude, to see it come together is encouraging, is something that I feel can be a beginning, hopefully, of a number of other very controversial issues that we have, that we have shown, are showing, are in the process of showing here this afternoon that both sides can come together, Conservatives, Liberals, Democrats, Republicans, and make the system work.

Again, I want to thank everyone involved. I certainly want to thank all those from our communities in northern California who never gave up, who hung in there. I want to again say that I am very supportive of this amendment, our legislation, and I want to emphasize this for those people who are watching, that this legislation remains basically, the intent is basically exactly the same as it was before. We think that this helps improve the bill and it helps for, I believe, the support we are going to need in the Senate and I believe the support that we will have from the President.

Again I want to thank everyone. I support this, I urge Members' support

on this amendment, and I urge their overwhelming support on the bill itself.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be modified by the form I have at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

On page 6, line 11, after "use", insert ", subject to the relevant reprogramming guidelines of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations".

On page 11, line 15, insert before "excess", the following: "subject to the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations reprogramming process,".

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can only urge a "yes" on my amendment and a "yes" on final passage of the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], as modified.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 858) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, pursuant to House Resolution 180, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]
YEAS—429

Abercrombie	Christensen	Foglietta
Ackerman	Clay	Foley
Aderholt	Clayton	Forbes
Allen	Clement	Ford
Andrews	Clyburn	Fowler
Archer	Coble	Fox
Armye	Coburn	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Baesler	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Condit	Frost
Baldacci	Conyers	Furse
Ballenger	Cook	Galleghy
Barcia	Cooksey	Ganske
Barr	Costello	Gejdenson
Barrett (NE)	Coyne	Gekas
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Gephardt
Bartlett	Crane	Gibbons
Barton	Crapo	Gilchrest
Bass	Cubin	Gillmor
Bateman	Cummings	Gilman
Becerra	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bentsen	Danner	Goode
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Berman	Davis (IL)	Goodling
Berry	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Billbray	Deal	Goss
Billrakis	DeFazio	Graham
Bishop	DeGette	Granger
Blagojevich	Delahunt	Green
Bliley	DeLauro	Greenwood
Blumenauer	DeLay	Gutierrez
Blunt	Dellums	Gutknecht
Boehlert	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bonilla	Dickey	Hamilton
Bonior	Dicks	Hansen
Bono	Dingell	Harman
Borski	Dixon	Hastert
Boswell	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Boyd	Dooley	Hastings (WA)
Brady	Doolittle	Hayworth
Brown (CA)	Doyle	Hefley
Brown (FL)	Dreier	Hefner
Brown (OH)	Duncan	Herger
Bryant	Dunn	Hill
Bunning	Ehlers	Hilleary
Burr	Ehrlich	Hilliard
Burton	Emerson	Hinchey
Buyer	Engel	Hinojosa
Callahan	English	Hobson
Calvert	Ensign	Hoekstra
Camp	Eshoo	Holden
Campbell	Etheridge	Hooley
Canady	Evans	Horn
Cannon	Everett	Hostettler
Capps	Ewing	Houghton
Cardin	Farr	Hoyer
Carson	Fattah	Hulshof
Castle	Fawell	Hunter
Chabot	Fazio	Hutchinson
Chambliss	Filner	Hyde
Chenoweth	Flake	Inglis

Istook	Miller (CA)	Schaffer, Bob
Jackson (IL)	Miller (FL)	Schumer
Jackson-Lee	Minge	Scott
(TX)	Mink	Sensenbrenner
Jefferson	Moakley	Serrano
Jenkins	Molinari	Sessions
John	Mollohan	Shadegg
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Johnson (WI)	Moran (VA)	Shays
Johnson, E. B.	Morella	Sherman
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Shimkus
Jones	Myrick	Shuster
Kanjorski	Nadler	Sisisky
Kaptur	Neal	Skaggs
Kasich	Nethercutt	Skeen
Kelly	Neumann	Skelton
Kennedy (MA)	Ney	Slaughter
Kennedy (RI)	Northup	Smith (MI)
Kennelly	Norwood	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Nussle	Smith (OR)
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
Kim	Obey	Smith, Adam
Kind (WI)	Olver	Smith, Linda
King (NY)	Ortiz	Snowbarger
Kingston	Owens	Snyder
Klecza	Oxley	Solomon
Klink	Packard	Souder
Klug	Pallone	Spence
Knollenberg	Pappas	Spratt
Kolbe	Parker	Stabenow
Kucinich	Pascrell	Stark
LaFalce	Pastor	Stearns
LaHood	Paxon	Stenholm
Lampson	Payne	Stokes
Lantos	Pease	Strickland
Largent	Pelosi	Stump
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
Lazio	Petri	Talent
Leach	Pickering	Tanner
Levin	Pickett	Tauscher
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tauzin
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Porter	Thomas
Lipinski	Portman	Thompson
Livingston	Poshard	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Thune
Lofgren	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
Lowe	Quinn	Tiahrt
Lucas	Radanovich	Tierney
Luther	Rahall	Torres
Maloney (CT)	Ramstad	Towns
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Trafficant
Manton	Redmond	Turner
Manzullo	Regula	Upton
Markey	Reyes	Velazquez
Martinez	Riggs	Vento
Mascara	Riley	Vislosky
Matsui	Rivers	Walsh
McCarthy (MO)	Rodriguez	Wamp
McCarthy (NY)	Roemer	Waters
McCollum	Rogan	Watkins
McCrery	Rogers	Watt (NC)
McDade	Rohrabacher	Watts (OK)
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McGovern	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
McHale	Roukema	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McInnis	Royce	Wexler
McIntosh	Rush	Weygand
McIntyre	Ryun	White
McKeon	Sabo	Whitfield
McKinney	Salmon	Wicker
McNulty	Sanchez	Wise
Meehan	Sanders	Wolf
Meek	Sandlin	Woolsey
Menendez	Sanford	Wynn
Metcalf	Sawyer	Yates
Mica	Saxton	Young (AK)
Millender-	Scarborough	Young (FL)
McDonald	Schaefer, Dan	

NAY—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—4

□ 1334

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 858, QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 858, the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action the House has just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SATELLITE INDUSTRY TECHNOLOGY DISPLAY IN CANNON CAUCUS ROOM

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, today in the Cannon Caucus Room, the third floor of the Cannon Building, all of the various technologies of the satellite industry are on display. These demonstrations will give Members a great look at the world of communications, of satellite technologies in the developing world and in the developed world, and will give a great insight as to what is coming in terms of technology for our own country in communications.

I urge Members to stop by before 3 o'clock and just take a look at the future in the Cannon Caucus Room on the third floor.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1775, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1775) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the

Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 5(a) or clause 5(b) of rule XXI are waived. No amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order unless printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only on this issue.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be in the somewhat unique position of serving the House and my constituents as a member of the Committee on Rules and as chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I certainly feel in very good company, following the footsteps of our former colleague, Tony Beilenson, who in the 101st Congress served in both capacities, and did so in great distinction from the other side of the aisle.

I am proud to be able to fulfill obligations to both committees in bringing forward to the House Resolution 179, making in order H.R. 1775, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998. I believe this rule is without controversy.

With the approval of this rule by the House later today during a debate on the bill itself I will be describing in more detail the specific provisions of the unclassified portions of H.R. 1775. All Members have been advised that

the bill's classified provisions are and have been available for review in the Committee on Intelligence spaces.

For the purpose of this rules debate, I would simply like to point out to the House that this measure reflects several months of very hard work and bipartisan cooperation by the Members of the Committee on Intelligence and its staff. It is a bill which I think is solid, professional, and necessary, and a bill which I believe faithfully fulfills our obligation to the American people to conduct vigorous oversight of our Nation's intelligence programs and activities. We are the line of defense in that area for the people of this country. We take our job seriously.

Mr. Speaker, as to this rule, House Resolution 179 is a fairly traditional rule for this type of legislation. As in past years, the rule is a modified open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Intelligence. My friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], will take care of that part for the minority.

The rule makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill which shall be considered by title and as read.

In addition, based on consultation with the parliamentarian, the rule waives points of order against the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, which is the germaneness section, and clauses 5(a) and 5(b) of rule XXI prohibiting appropriations on an authorization bill and prohibiting the consideration of tax or tariff measures which have not been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

These waivers are quite technical, but I would like to briefly explain them so Members understand what we are doing. The germaneness waiver is necessary because the committee mark which comes in the form of an amendment in the nature of a substitute is broader in scope than the bill as originally introduced.

This will come as no surprise to most Members. The rule XXI clause 5(a) waivers pertain to three specific sections of H.R. 1775: sections 401, 402, and 603. On those specific sections, as on many of the issues in this legislation, the Committee on Intelligence staff has been in close contact with the staff of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations which has not, to my knowledge, objected to these waivers. In fact, we have worked closely with the appropriations staff on this point.

□ 1345

Regarding the 5(b) waiver that pertains to the Committee on Ways and Means, I submit for the RECORD correspondence between the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Rules.