□ 1722

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE TO A DATE CERTAIN.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 169) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 169

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, October 9, 1997, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 21, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, October 9, 1997, Friday, October 10, 1997, or Saturday, October 11, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, October 20, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote number 500, I was recorded as ''yes''; however, my vote should have been recorded as a ''no'' vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall number 493, the Vento amendment. If I had been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REAUTHORIZING THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON for his leadership in the effort to renew the Endangered Species Act.

The authorization of this precious piece of legislation expired 5 years ago, leaving one of our most important conservation laws vulnerable to attacks and lacking proper congressional oversight. Several years of ideological fighting and Beltway politics have kept interest groups busy while precious species of animals and plants decline and disappear. In the meantime, public and private land conflicts continue to hamper recovery efforts.

The administration has implemented needed reforms. The other body is building a consensus with the administration for improving the act. Sponsors of that effort are aware that their bill is not perfect but it is a product of good consensus and such efforts is never perfect.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and I have been engaged for several months in discussions, hoping to lead to the enactment of an improved Endangered Species Act. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], is participating, as are the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member, who has introduced a bill containing many common sense reforms. It is our hope that these talks will lead to enactment by this body of a bill which protects endangered species of wildlife for the future.

SAXTON, DINGELL URGE HOUSE TO REAUTHORIZE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

One week after a Senate Committee markup of changes to the federal Endangered Species Act, U.S. Rep. Jim Saxton (R–NJ) and U.S. Rep. John D. Dingell (D–MI) asked House colleagues for support to reauthorize the nation's most significant conservation law during the 105th Congress.

Saxton, who chairs the House Subcommittee on Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, and Dingell, who authored the 1973 law, emphasized that reauthorization is five years overdue and further delay only places endangered species and other at-risk species in further danger of extinction.

Dingell and Saxton have participated for several months in bipartisan discussions to determine how the ESA should be improved. While not endorsing the Kempthorne-Chafee-Baucus-Reid compromise, both representatives expressed hope that adoption of a Senate bill would lead to accelerated efforts by the House to pass a bill the President can sign. A copy of their floor statements follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JIM SAXTON, OCTOBER 8, 1997

Mr. Speaker, I come before this body to discuss the need to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act.

I believe the time is now to reauthorize the grand daddy of all environmental laws. It is vital that any piece of legislation that is developed is done so in a bipartisan way. I congratulate the Senate in their effort to craft such a bill. Now, it is our turn in the House to find common ground that Democrats and Republicans alike can agree upon.

This process must recognize that people who are impacted by the ESA have legitimate concerns regarding the way it works. On the other hand our lack of progress in reauthorizing the act has seen the further decline of many species and the biological extinction of others. Now is the time to act.

I want to recognize Chairman Young and the ranking member on the Resources Committee, Congressman George Miller, for their recent efforts to craft a bipartisan bill in the House. The process has been supported by the involvement of Mr. Dingell, Mr. Tauzin and Mr. Pombo. We must set politics aside and do what's right for the people of this country and for the species in which this legislation protects.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL OCTOBER 8, 1997

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from New Jersey, Mr. Saxton, for talking about the need to renew the Endangered Species Act.

The authorization for the Endangered Species Act expired five years ago, leaving our most important conservation law vulnerable to piecemeal attacks and a lack of proper Congressional oversight. For several years, ideological fighting and beltway politics have kept interest groups busy while animals and plants decline and disappear. In the meantime, private and public land conflicts continue to hamper recovery efforts.

The Clinton Administration has implemented some needed reforms. And the other body is building a consensus with the Administration for improving the Act. Sponsors of that effort readily admit their bill is not perfect, but the product of good consensus is rarely perfect.

The gentleman from New Jersey and I have been engaged for several months in discussions about improving the Endangered Species Act. Chairman Young is participating as are Mr. Tauzin and Mr. Pombo; and so is Ranking Member Miller, who introduced a bill containing many common-sense reforms. It is our hope that these talks might give this House has a chance to pass a bill which makes a good law work better for species and landowners.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). 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.

MARRIAGE TAX ELIMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend last night the special order by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], who brought attention to our body, and to the people