amend the Gallatin National Forest Plan and the Deerlodge National Forest Plan to integrate the acquired land into the plans.

(2) PROCESS TIME.—The amendment process under paragraph (1) shall be completed as soon as practicable, and in no event later than 540 days after the date on which the amendment process is initiated.

(3) LIMITATION.—An amended management plan shall not permit surface occupancy on the acquired land for access to reserved or outstanding oil and gas rights or for exploration or development of oil and gas.

(4) INTERIM MANAGEMENT.—Pending completion of the forest plan amendment process under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) manage the acquired land under the standards and guidelines in the applicable land and resource management plans for adjacent land managed by the Forest Service; and

(B) maintain all existing public access to the acquired land.

(f) RESTORATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall implement a restoration program including reforestation and watershed enhancements to bring the acquired land and surrounding national forest land into compliance with Forest Service standards and guidelines.

(2) STATE AND LOCAL CONSERVATION CORPS.—In implementing the restoration program, the Secretary shall, when practicable, use partnerships with State and local conservation corps, including the Montana Conservation Corps, under the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that sufficient funds are made available to the Gallatin National Forest to carry out this Act.

(i) REVOCATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any public orders withdrawing lands identified in the Option Agreement from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws are revoked upon conveyance of the lands by the Secretary.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The title was amended so as to read: ''To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to exchange land and other assets with Big Sky Lumber Co. and other entities.''.

GALLATIN LAND CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate has taken up and passed S. 1719 and H.R. 3381, the Gallatin Land Consolidation Act of 1998. S. 1719, a bill that I have sponsored and that my good colleague Senator BURNS has cosponsored, is identical to H.R. 3381, a bill sponsored by Montana Congressman RICK HILL that has already passed the House. These bills complete the Gallatin Land Exchange process—an effort that began almost ten years ago.

In 1993, I had the pleasure of sponsoring the Gallatin Land Consolidation and Protection Act that completed phase 1 of this exchange. Like S. 1719, that bill was co-sponsored by Senator BURNS. The House companion in that case was carried by my good friend and colleague, former Representative Pat Williams from Montana.

Together, these bills represent a bipartisan effort where members from both sides of the aisle have worked in a cooperative spirit for the good of Montana. And these bills represent a broad community consensus in Montana about the needs of the Gallatin area for today and for tomorrow.

Mr. President, let me tell you why these bills are good for Montana and good for America. In the early 1990s when we first began this process, the federal government owned every other section of land in the Gallatin Range. As people in the area were fond of saying, you could play checkers from Bozeman, Montana to the Yellowstone border.

And while this pattern might be good for checkers, it was bad for just about every other purpose. The Forest Service could not manage this unwieldy land ownership pattern. Imagine the frustration of trying to manage every other section of land for elk habitat as houses and subdivisions spring up in the middle of your forest. And this pattern kept the public from even being able to access their public lands.

Mr. President, this pattern may have made sense when it was created as part of the railroad land grants over a hundred years ago, but it does not make sense today.

And that is why I am pleased that we have put our backs into this effort and, after ten years, are finally poised to complete this project. The pending legislation is supported by Montanans from all walks of life. Hunters and fishermen support the exchange because it will protect important habitat for elk and moose and will protect important fisheries. Conservationists support the exchange because it protects important grizzly bear habitat in the Taylor Fork. Loggers support the exchange because it will help deliver trees to the local mill in Livingston, Montana. And local homeowners, from the Taylor Fork to Bridger Canyon, all have endorsed this exchange.

This consensus did not just happen. It was the result of a lot of hard work. I met personally with representatives from each of these groups and walked the lands involved in this exchange. I heard the concerns of Mike Liebleson from the Bridger Canyon Property Owners Association and I heard the concerns from George and Patricia Leffingwell. And we addressed their concerns. And we addressed the concerns of Montana small mills represented by the Independent Forest Products Association. And we met the concerns of the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, The Wilderness Society and other local conservation organizations. And last, but certainly not least, we worked closely with the Forest Service and the Administration to try to make sure that this bill reflected their needs.

Throughout this process, the private party to this exchange, Big Sky Lumber Company, has acted in good faith. They have made numerous unilateral concessions to increase the environmental benefits of this exchange and to address public concerns. Their attorney, Joe Sabol, has been instrumental in pulling this package together. Without his efforts and those of Bob Dennee, Lands Specialist for the Gallatin National Forest, and Kurt Alt, Wildlife Biologist for the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, none of this would have been possible.

Mr. President, this has been a community effort. And, as a result, it reflects a community consensus. This is the way that we should resolve issues in the West.

STAR PRINT—REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 1719

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report to accompany S. 1719 be star printed with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GREAT LAKES FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 599, H.R. 1481.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1481) to amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleagues for taking the time today to consider this legislation which is so important to my region.

I introduced The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act GLFWRA of 1997 as S. 659 in the Senate in April of 1997, in coordination with the introduction of the companion bill, H.R. 1481, in the House by Congressman STEVE LATOURETTE. It's been a long process, but one in which bipartisan and bicameral cooperation at every step of the process served to create a better and stronger bill to serve the needs of the Great Lakes region.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act has eight Senate sponsors, including myself, and twenty-eight of our colleagues on the House are also cosponsors. This bill represents the consensus of a diverse collaboration of tribal, state, federal and international agencies with jurisdiction over the management of fish and wildlife resources of the Great Lakes. The bill also has received favorable review and broad support of organizations throughout the Great Lakes region for the approach it takes toward

restoration of the ecological integrity of the Great Lakes ecosystem.

The primary purpose of the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act is to implement proposals that address recommendations put forth by the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study. To this end, the Act reauthorizes the existing Great Lakes Coordination and Great Lakes Fishery Resources Offices. The bill also sets up a proposal review committee under the guidance of the existing Council of Lake Committees to review grant proposals and identify projects of the highest priority for the restoration of the fish and wildlife resources of the Great Lakes Basin. The Act encourages, supports, and coordinates Federal and non-federal cooperative habitat restoration and natural resource management programs in the Great Lakes Basin.

The Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act represents a new generation of environmental legislation, one that recognizes the complexity and inter-relatedness of ecosystems. This act seeks to address natural resource management in a comprehensive and conscientious manner by building partnerships among the Great Lakes states, U.S. and Canadian governments, and native American Tribes. Through regional cooperation, I believe we can address the environmental and economic concerns of the Great Lakes Basin and continue on the road towards the recovery of this precious natural and national resource. By passing this legislation, we in the Congress will be taking the right next step toward responsible stewardship of the Great Lakes as we venture into the new millennium.

This fall, as I look back on the earth from space, I will be sure to look down on the Great Lakes. I know that they will be a cleaner, safer place for both humans and wildlife to live than they were at the time of my last flight because of the efforts we have made over the past decades. With the passage of this legislation, I will also be sure that they will continue to become even cleaner, safer places where fish and wildlife communities, and the human communities who enjoy them can continue to prosper.

Mr. LEVIN. I would like to ask the distinguished sponsor of the Senate bill if he could comment on whether or not the bill, H.R. 1481, is intended to provide Indian Tribes in the Great Lakes region with any fish and wildlife management authority beyond that contained in existing treaty provisions and as recognized by Federal courts.

Mr. GLENN. The bill's provision appointing tribal representatives to the committee created by the bill is not intended to expand their existing authorities.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Would the Senator from Ohio provide a further clarification that the Senate intends that the committee created in the bill will provide its recommendations under the guidance and direction of the Council of Lake Committees of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission?

Mr. GLENN. The Senator from Michigan is correct. That is the intent.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his assistance and, as an original cosponsor of S. 659, I applaud his efforts to move this important legislation expeditiously.●

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1481) was considered read the third time, and passed.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP CORRECTION

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 660, S. 2469.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

A bill (S. 2469) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 2469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

[SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

[(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—**]**

[(1) Coastal Barrier Resources System unit FL–35P was designated under the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–591) to include Florida State conservation land within the Coastal Barrier Resources System;

[(2) unit FL–35P is an ''otherwise protected area'', a designation that was intended to include land held for conservation purposes;

[(3) the boundary of unit FL–35P runs through a portion of the Ocean Reef Harbor Course South development, which was in existence on the date of enactment of the 1990 Act;

[(4) at the time unit FL–35P was designated, 9 residences were located in the portion of the development that was included within the boundaries of the unit;

[(5) the 11.7 acres comprising that portion are not held for conservation purposes, and are not an inholding within conservation land;

[(6) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has received certificates of occupancy and corresponding plat maps from Monroe County, Florida, verifying that a portion of unit FL–35P was developed, and accordingly that the portion referred to in paragraph (5) was mistakenly included in the Coastal Barrier Resources System; and

[(7) modification of the boundary of unit FL–35P to exclude the 11.7-acre parcel referred to in paragraph (5) would constitute a valid technical correction.

[(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to make a technical correction to unit FL–35P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System to exclude from the unit the 11.7-acre parcel of developed property that was mistakenly included in the unit.

[SEC. 2. CORRECTIONS TO MAP.]

SECTION 1. CORRECTIONS TO MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such corrections to the map described in sub**[**section (b) as are necessary to ensure that depictions of areas on the map are consistent with the depictions of areas appearing on the map entitled ''Amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System'', dated August 31, 1998, and on file with the Secretary.**]** *section (b) as are necessary to exclude—*

(1) the lots that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are located on Harbor Island Drive and Baker Road; and

(2) the adjacent body of water;

within the Ocean Reef Harbor Course South development.

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that—

(1) is included in a set of maps entitled ''Coastal Barrier Resources System'', dated October 24, 1990; and

(2) relates to unit FL–35P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriated place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 2469), as amended, was considered read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORRECTIONS TO MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such corrections to the map described in subsection (b) as are necessary to exclude—

(1) the lots that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are located on Harbor Island Drive and Baker Road; and

(2) the adjacent body of water;

within the Ocean Reef Harbor Course South development.

(b) MAP DESCRIBED.—The map described in this subsection is the map that—

(1) is included in a set of maps entitled ''Coastal Barrier Resources System'', dated October 24, 1990; and

(2) relates to unit FL–35P of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.