

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 105-354.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. 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. BLUNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCINNIS, 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. 1270), to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON NATION'S ACHIEVEMENTS IN AERONAUTICS AND SPACE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1996—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year (FY) 1996, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities in FY 1996 involved 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

A wide variety of aeronautics and space developments took place during FY 1996. The Administration issued an integrated National Space Policy, consolidating a number of previous policy directives into a singular, coherent vision of the future for the civil, commercial, and national security space sectors. The Administration also issued a formal policy on the future management and use of the U.S. Global Positioning System.

During FY 1996, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) successfully completed eight Space Shuttle flights. NASA also launched 7 expendable launch vehicles, while the Department of Defense launched 9 and the commercial sector launched 13. In the reusable launch vehicle program, Vice President Gore announced NASA's selection of a private sector partner to design, fabricate, and flight test the X-33 vehicle.

Scientists made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields such as space science, Earth science and remote sensing, and life and microgravity science. Most notably, NASA researchers cooperating with the National Science Foundation found possible evidence of ancient microbial life in a meteorite believed to be from Mars.

In aeronautics, activities included the development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise, and assist U.S. industry to be more competitive in the world market. Air traffic control activities focused on various automation systems to increase flight safety and enhance the efficient use of air space.

Close international cooperation with Russia occurred in the Shuttle-Mir docking missions and with Canada, Europe, Japan, and Russia in the International Space Station program. The United States also entered into new cooperative agreements with Japan and new partners in South America and Asia.

In conclusion, FY 1996 was a very active and successful year for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, environmental health, and economic competitiveness.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 29, 1997.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2746, THE HELPING EMPOWER LOW-INCOME PARENTS (HELP) SCHOLARSHIPS AMENDMENTS OF 1997 AND H.R. 2616, CHARTER SCHOOLS AMENDMENTS OF 1997.

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-357) on the resolutions (H. Res. 288) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2746) to amend title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to give parents with low-incomes the opportunity to choose the appropriate school for their children and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2616) to amend titles VI and X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and expand charter schools, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FORAGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 284

*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. 2493) to establish a mechanism by which the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior can provide for uniform management of livestock grazing on Federal lands. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour, with thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by

the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources and thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed three hours. 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 Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Smith of Oregon or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. If that amendment is adopted, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose of clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum, time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution. The proposed rule is a modified open rule providing for one hour of general debate, with 30 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources, and 30 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate, the

bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 3 hours.

The proposed rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Furthermore, this rule provides that prior to consideration of any other amendment, a manager's amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] or his designee shall be made in order and debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 also provides that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Furthermore, the rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

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 have been adopted.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, the Forage Improvement Act of 1997, is a balanced, bipartisan bill, that assures some predictability to western ranchers' ability to plan for forage use.

This legislation will require the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to coordinate their administration in the Grazing Management Program. Additionally, the legislation creates new discretionary authority for the government and ranchers to enter into cooperative management plans, where the rancher is meeting rangeland management goals.

These are important and significant reforms. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would include for the record a letter from the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. The National Cattlemen's Beef Association is an organization that is urging all Members to vote aye on House Resolution 2493, the Forage Improvement Act of 1997. NCBA commends the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the Chairman of the Committee on Resources, for their work on House Resolution 2493, and fully supports the balanced bipartisan bill they have reported out of the respective committees.

It makes several major changes, but assures some predictability to western ranchers' ability to plan for forage use, such as requiring the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to coordinate their administration of grazing management programs.

Two, requires scientific monitoring of grazing conditions and allowing the agencies to coordinate monitoring with ranches and/or qualified ranchland consultants. Three, prohibiting subleasing of grazing allotments by absentee ranchers. Next, creating new discretionary authority for the government and ranchers to enter into cooperative management plans, where the rancher is meeting rangeland management goals. Next, codifying a new grazing fee formulated to ensure a fair return to the government and resulting in a 36 percent increase over the current fee.

Codifying the resource advisory councils, they are called RACS, with enhancements that will improve coordination and communication between the Federal agencies and regional, State and local levels on Federal land and management issues.

House Resolution 2493 does not affect existing multiple use activities like hunting and fishing, nor authorizations nor agreements set under other Federal or State laws. It does not amend the National Environmental Policy Act, it does not amend the Clean Water Act, it does not amend the Endangered Species Act or the Clean Air Act.

And though it does clarify that Federal employees cannot demand access across private property as a condition for obtaining a grazing permit, it does not prevent Federal personnel engaged in grazing administration activities access to do their work, nor does it limit public access to Federal lands in any manner.

When this resolution is brought before the House, I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect a statement of the chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], and I would, first of all, like to commend the chairman. I think he has done a tremendous job. He has had a lot of different interests that he has had to balance, and I think this is appropriate to reflect his thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] does rise in strong support of House Resolution 2493, the Forage Improvement Act, introduced by his good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who should be applauded for laboring tirelessly and putting together a bill that keeps controversy out and common sense in regarding grazing practices on our public lands.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] has worked extensively hard to bring together the many sides of the grazing issue and has assembled a bill that helps a rancher whose livelihood depends on public land grazing without doing any harm to the range land resources. In fact, implementing this bill will ultimately improve the rangelands across the West.

Controversy and confrontation on grazing on public lands has been raging for years. It is clear that changes in

the current grazing laws and regulations are not only long overdue, but are absolutely necessary in order to resolve many of the grazing issues.

□ 2115

H.R. 2493 makes these necessary changes. For example, this bill will bring economic stability to those ranchers who use Federal land for grazing, while at the same time generate additional revenue for the Federal Treasury. This will be accomplished by implementing a new grazing formula which is easy to understand, simple to track, and which charges a fair price to the rancher who buys access to forage from the Federal Government.

Furthermore, the changes found in H.R. 2493 will improve ranchland conditions by increasing the focus on science-based monitoring. For far too long and for a variety of excuses, the Federal Government simply has not done its job in assessing ranchland conditions to monitor.

The bill of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] puts the emphasis back to what actually exists on the ground, through a monitoring program that is scientifically based and which follows established protocols. This program will greatly enhance the decision-making process and help establish ranchland goals that are good for land and achievable.

Moreover, H.R. 2493 will establish a program of management flexibility to those ranchers who have demonstrated good land stewardship. This will help to keep the grazing in good and excellent condition.

This is a good bill whose time has come. It does nothing to harm the environment. In fact, it will improve ranchlands across the West. It treats the Western land grazer honestly and fairly, and in return the U.S. Treasury makes more money and gets improved ranchland resources. I urge my colleagues to support and vote for House Resolution 2493.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to take a look at the impact of multiple use on Federal lands, and where that concept came from. We have to look back in the history of this country. If we look back at the history of this country, there was a point in time where this country urged its citizens to settle the West: Go west, young man, go west.

In doing that, they tried to encourage their citizens to go out to the West and set down their stakes, grubstakes, so to speak. In order to do that, they felt, in order to entice their citizens to go to the West and settle this unknown land, they felt that they needed to give land grants.

A land grant of 160 acres, which was pretty typical in the State of Kansas, was enough for a family in those times to support themselves. But once you got into the mountains, into the rough terrain of the Rockies, 150 acres is what was necessary to feed one cow.

In other words, to sustain a family in the Rocky Mountains, as compared to

what is necessary to sustain a family in Kansas or the rich farmlands of Nebraska or Missouri, it took several thousand acres, compared to the few acres it took in those very agricultural land-rich States. So the government felt it did not have the political support, obviously the public support, to go ahead and give land grants of several thousand acres to people who settled in the Rocky Mountains, and thereupon the concept of multiple use was created.

Multiple use is very important. If we take a map of the United States and we take a look at the government ownership, we will find that by far, no comparison, by far the majority of land ownership by the government in this country is in the western half of the United States, not in the eastern half.

So as a result, for the people in the western half of the United States to live, the concept of multiple use, which includes not just grazing, and by the way, multiple use means a lot of different things to a lot of different people. It means the ability to hike on Federal lands. It means the ability to have minimum stream flows in our streams to help us protect our environment.

It means that every power line in my district, and by the way, my district, the Third District of Colorado, the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, is geographically larger than the State of Florida. Every power line, every TV tower, every highway, every drop of water, the water either originates, runs across, or is stored, all of this comes across Federal land. All of it is very dependent on multiple use.

I grew up in the Rocky Mountains. My family came to the Rocky Mountains in 1871. My wife's family came to the Rocky Mountains in 1872. I have a very close friend of mine, Al Stroobants, his family came many, many years, very similarly, generations of families out there in those mountains.

What is very, very important is that the concept of the government was it would be a land of many uses. What we see happening is people who do not understand the concept of multiple use, people who do not understand the concept of private property and the importance of it as a foundation for the freedoms in our country. They try and take away the multiple use on Federal lands and take away that sign that says, "You are now entering the Rocky Mountain National Park, a land of many uses," or those types of signs, and replace them with a sign that says "No Trespassing."

There are fearmongers out there who would make us think that there are cattle grazing every inch of the Rocky Mountains, that there are condominiums going up everywhere, that the water is being wasted and abused. Do not take these people on their word. Look at the proof of the pudding.

The proof of the pudding is in the hearts and souls of the people who are

descendants of the generations of the people who were persuaded by this very government in Washington, D.C. to go west. These people deserve the courtesy of having their bill heard.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and to the legislation that the rule would make in order, the so-called Forage Improvement Act. This rule is open in name only. Last night the Committee on Rules voted to limit the amendment process to 3 hours; not 3 hours of debate time but 3 hours in total. That includes voting time on any amendments and any other parliamentary motion or question which may arise during that time.

Three hours would be totally inadequate, given that the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] alone has filed nine amendments, and other Members have filed an additional half-dozen. The ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] offered three amendments to the rule last night in an attempt to allow sufficient time for all amendments to the bill to be fully debated on the floor. However, the majority refused to accept the ranking member's amendments to the rule.

Even if this were a carefully crafted bill, and it is not, that had moved through the committee process, and it did not, with ample legislative hearings, and there were not, in time for Members to consider it, the brief time for floor consideration that the Committee on Rules made in order last night would still be problematic. But the fact of the matter is that the bill was just introduced a month ago, was rushed through the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Resources with no legislative hearings whatsoever, and it shows.

I am left with the impression that the majority did not want the members of those committees to look too closely at what they were passing for fear that they might see it for what it is, special interest legislation that is a bad deal for the American taxpayer and a very bad deal for our environment. Rather than seizing this opportunity to enact genuine and positive reform of our grazing laws, this legislation undermines the management of Federal land resources by continuing the subsidized use of public lands for wealthy corporate interests.

The Interior Department Inspector General reports that grazing benefits go to a vast array of large foreign-owned companies and domestic corporate conglomerates, including a brewery, a Japanese land and livestock company, an oil corporation, and a life insurance company. These are not struggling family businesses or mom and pop ranchers, but multinational

corporations reaping huge profits, most of whom are engaged primarily in businesses that are wholly unrelated to ranching. Why should they not pay the market rates for the grazing rights on our Federal lands?

Every western State charges a grazing fee that is higher than the Federal Government. Several States charge six times as much. Yet, this bill continues that disparity with a new fee formula that does not even come close to reflecting the fair market value of the use of our public resources.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that little additional Federal land revenues will be generated from this bill, and in fact, when the legislation's new administrative requirements on land management agencies are taken into account, the grazing program will lose even more money than it currently does.

This bill makes other modifications to the Federal land grazing program above and beyond its changes to the grazing fee formula. For example, it would allow ranchers with grazing permits to sublease their lands to private interests at a significant profit over what they have paid the Federal Government for the use. Yet, incredibly, the Committee on Resources failed to hold a legislative hearing on this bill, denying Members any opportunity to hear testimony on the far-reaching implications of this legislation.

Members should be aware that Secretary Babbitt has given notice that he will recommend a veto should this bill reach the President's desk. But this ill-advised legislation does not deserve to make it that far. Indeed, it should not even reach this floor, given the cursory exposure and debate it received in committee. Because of the truncated amendment process made in order by the Committee on Rules last night, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Further proceedings on the resolution will be postponed until tomorrow.

□ 2130

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLUNT]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.