Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

Page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

Page 3, line 24, strike ''(B)'' and insert ''(A)''.

Page 4, line 1, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(B)''.

Page 4, line 3, strike ''(D)'' and insert ''(C)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, almost 9 years ago, the Department of the Interior proposed designating Steens Mountain in Harney County, Oregon, as a national monument. This designation would have harmed the cooperative management and preservation successes on the mountain and would have choked the local ranching way of life while allowing little public input into the management process.

So I met with the people of Harney County out at Frenchglen, and we challenged then-Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt to let us attempt to write a plan, rather than suffer the consequences of a top-down Federal designation. That would have been a way that would not only preserve the ecological treasure of Steens Mountain but also the way of life out in that part of Oregon.

To his credit, Secretary Babbitt allowed for our request. He gave us a shot at coming up with something better, and the residents of Harney County rolled up their sleeves and we all went to work.

This effort produced an historic bipartisan, legislative success. Working with State and Federal officials, representatives from the environmental community, my colleagues in the Oregon congressional delegation, the governor and others, we crafted a unique piece of legislation that not only satisfied the environmental concerns, or ''lands legacy'' initiative, of the Clinton administration but also allowed for a way of life to continue on the mountain that has existed for more than 100 years since the first settlers started arriving in this rugged part of the West in the 1800s.

Moreover, the bipartisan legislation established an historic agreement between conservation groups and the local ranching community, implemented a unique cooperative management system with oversight by a citizens' advisory council, and among many other things, designated the first grazing-free, cow-free wilderness.

The bill was crafted with so much local and bipartisan support that it was approved by the House on voice vote and unanimously by the United States Senate. In the years since, management principles in that legislation have proven that they can work; although it has not always been easy.

Unfortunately, many in Harney County who have dedicated much to the successful implementation of the Steens Act worry that Washington, D.C., again may derail the very specific purposes and objectives laid out in that Act. Without consulting the formally recognized stakeholder groups in the region, I'm concerned the underlying legislation would include the Steens in the National Landscape Conservation System.

Given my experience in creating the historic Steens Act, I understand the delicate balance between providing additional protection for deserving areas, while also ensuring the opportunities for other, historic uses. That is why I drafted the amendment today to strike the reference of the Steens Act from H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act.

The problem is simple. The Steens already has a set of strongly supported, congressionally mandated management purposes and objectives from the 106th Congress. I'm concerned that the Steens Act, specifically noted in this legislation, would give the Steens a duplicative set of management principles that would prove to be bait for unproductive lawsuits.

I certainly don't want clauses in H.R. 2016 to be used to upend the delicate balance all parties, including conservation and ranching groups, achieved with the writing and passage of the Steens Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I might engage in a colloquy, can you assure me and the good people in Harney County that your bill, H.R. 2016, if it becomes law, will not in any way supersede, undermine, or be used as a reason to change any of the purposes established in section 1(b) or the objectives established in section 102(b) of the Steens Act, Public Law 106–399.

I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much.

I am very well aware of the efforts made by you and the rest of the Oregon delegation to create one of the most unique pieces of Federal land management legislation in the Steens Act. You sought a balance of land protection, multiple historic uses, citizen involvement, and the creation of the first grazing-free wilderness in the country.

I can clearly state to you that H.R. 2016 will not in any way supersede, undermine or be used as a reason to change any of the purposes established in section 1(b) or the objectives established in section 102(b) of the Steens Act, Public Law 106–399.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Chairman GRIJALVA, I appreciate your commitment to the Steens Act and recognition of all that went into its development and approval by Congress.

I thank you for your assurances here today on the floor of the House of Representatives to me and to the people of Harney County and this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. CUMMINGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Acting 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. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1625

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5724, UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–574) on the resolution (H. Res. 1092) relating to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5724) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084 and rule XVIII, 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. 2016.

□ 1627

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. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for