

Congressional Record -- House

Friday, October 26, 1990

101st Cong. 2nd Sess.

136 Cong Rec H 12832

REFERENCE: Vol. 136 No. 149 -- Part 3

TITLE: CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 987, TONGASS TIMBER REFORM ACT

SPEAKER: Mr. DANNEMEYER ; Mr. GEJDENSON ; Mr. HANSEN ; Mr. MILLER of California ; Mr. MRAZEK ; Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore ; MR. UDALL ; Mr. VENTO ; Mr. YOUNG of Alaska

TEXT: Text that appears in UPPER CASE identifies statements insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the House on the floor.

[*H12832] Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill (H.R. 987) to amend the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, to designate certain lands in the Tongass National Forest as wilderness, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 23, 1990.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include

therein extraneous material, on the conference report on H.R. 987, now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 987, the Tongass Timber Reform Act.

Few matters have received more attention from the Interior Committee over the years than the debate over management of the vast public lands in the State of Alaska. Due largely to efforts of Chairman Udall and the Interior Committee, the landmark Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 set aside over 100 million acres in new or expanded national parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas.

The conference report on H.R. 987 takes care of unfinished business from ANILCA. Since 1980, it has become increasingly clear that the Alaska Lands Act failed to establish a reasonable balance between timber harvest and other uses of the resources of the Tongass National Forest.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a true compromise. Not everyone will be satisfied. The House bill provided for tougher restraints on the timber industry and more lands protection. The Senate bill had provided for fewer reforms and set aside less lands. In merging the two approaches, the conference committee has produced strong, comprehensive reform legislation aimed at curbing the abuses which have long plagued our Nation's largest national forest.

Key features of H.R. 987 as reported from conference are elimination of the \$40 million permanent fund and 4.5 billion board feet per decade timber supply mandate, increased buffer protection for salmon streams, mandated [*H12833] changes in the long-term timber contracts, and permanent protection for over 1 million acres of critical fish and wildlife habitat.

Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to acknowledge our colleague Bob Mrazek who is the original sponsor of this legislation and who deserves the credit for its success. I also want to thank the other conferees, especially Mr. Gejdenson and Mr. Vento, who are special recognition for their chairing hearings and laying the groundwork for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to recognize the input of the members of the Agriculture Committee who have been terribly helpful to getting this bill to the floor, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Jontz], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman], and the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown], all of whom debated this issue in the Agriculture

Committee and helped with it during the floor debate on this important matter when it was before the Congress earlier this year.

I want to express my gratitude for the tireless work of Bart Koehler and the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council on Tongass reform. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, we would not be here on the House floor today without SEACC. Fighting a seemingly unwinnable battle against powerful timber interests and the entrenched bureaucracy of the Forest Service, this remarkable coalition of small communities, fishermen, and other concerned Alaskans has prevailed.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we would not be here without the work of staff members, Dan Kish and Rick Agnew from the minority side representing the office of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young]; the minority members of our committee, Dan Kish and Rick Agnew and my own staff person from the subcommittee, Jeff Petrich, who worked tirelessly on this effort.

Finally I guess I would like to recognize the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young].

I would say to my colleagues that one of the more difficult tasks in this Congress is representing a State the size of Alaska with its diverse interests, being a single-Member delegation from that State. While it represents an area in size almost equal to some 25 percent of the land mass of the lower 48 States, it has only one Representative in this body. Yet we find that so many of our national policies crisscross that State, whether it is defense policy, environmental policy. Alaska very often becomes the focus of those debates and those discussions.

I want to say that Mr. Young has adequately and properly represented his constituency in Alaska on this matter. The manner in which he conducted himself throughout the deliberations in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on the floor of this Congress and in the conference committee helped us provide a compromise that I think recognizes the diverse constituency around the Tongass and the multiple uses necessary in the Tongass so that all Alaskans may benefit from this legislation, from those who enjoy it to those who must make their living within the Tongass.

It has been a long and tortuous trip to get us here, many, many years of deliberation and discussion. Mr. Young has been at the center of those debates throughout the discussions within this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional comments on specific provisions of the conference report which I will insert in the Record.

TITLE I -- FOREST MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. TO REQUIRE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR TIMBER MANAGEMENT ON THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

The Conference Report amends section 705(a) of ANILCA to repeal the \$40 million permanent appropriation and to eliminate the unrealistically high and uneconomic mandate that the Forest Service make available 4.5 billion board feet of timber per decade. As amended, section 705(a) makes absolutely clear that the Tongass timber program is subject to the appropriations process and every law applicable to national forest management. The phrase "other applicable law" also includes provisions, such as the subsistence requirements of Title VIII of ANILCA, which are unique to Alaska.

Pursuant to section 705(a) as amended by the Conference Committee, the Forest Service is directed to seek to meet market demand for timber "to the extent consistent with providing for multiple use and sustained yield of all renewable forest resources". Included within the scope of "renewable forest resources" is fish and wildlife habitat. This language requires the Forest Service to meet the needs of resource based industries other than timber -- including commercial fishing, sport hunting sport fishing, and tourism -- and provide for non-commodity uses of forest resources for subsistence and recreation.

The revised section 705(a) puts a halt to the Forest Service's "timber first" approach to managing the Tongass. The Forest Service originally interpreted ANILCA section 705(a) as a mandate to offer 450 million board feet of timber annually, no matter what the market demand, impact on other multiple uses, or cost to the taxpayers. As amended, section 705(a) requires that timber sale offerings, even if consistent with other resource needs and sustained yield principles, must not be in excess of actual market demand.

The net effect of section 705(a), as amended, is to assure Tongass planning and management does not give timber harvest priority over other uses of the national forest. Given the overwhelming sense of Congress that the Forest Service has mismanaged the Tongass, the burden is now on the agency to prove that it can be responsive to the changing public views of how -- and for what purposes -- this forest should be managed. The era of preferential treatment for a single commodity, timber, is over.

SECTION 102. IDENTIFICATION OF LANDS UNSUITABLE FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION

The Conference Report amends section 705(d) of ANILCA to clarify that lands should not be excluded from harvesting for economic reasons alone in the suitability analysis required under section 6(k) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 ("NFMA"). This limited exemption gives the Forest Service some flexibility to allow for the harvesting of marginal timber stands. Section 102 is consistent with Congress' intent to redirect the Forest Service away from its past course of promoting the excessive harvesting of the highest volume old-growth timber from the Tongass.

The section 6(k) provision is clearly not a mandate that "below cost" timber sales be required in perpetuity. The costs and benefits associated with inclusion of economically unsuitable timber in the harvest schedule should be fully evaluated in relevant planning documents and budget submissions to Congress.

SECTION 103. FISHERIES PROTECTION

Section 103 of the Conference Report provides for a minimum 100-foot buffer strip on each side of anadromous stream systems (Class I) and tributaries with resident fish (Class II). The House bill protected other significant tributaries (Class III) with mandatory 100-foot buffers, but the Conference Committee agreed to allow such buffers to be established according to the "best management practices" of the Forest Service.

The buffer language was modeled after the National Marine Fisheries Service's recommendations. While the Conference Committee has allowed for some flexibility on Class III streams, it is with the clear expectation that the Forest Service will assure protection of riparian habitat and water quality. To condemn Class III waters to improper harvesting techniques, such as cutting to streamside, would be absolutely contrary to the intent of Congress.

Over 90 percent of the salmon commercially harvested in Southeast Alaska are spawned and reared in the streams and lakes of the Tongass National Forest. The forest's riparian habitat supports a renewable resource of great significance to the Southeast Alaskan economy. While the Forest Service is on record as opposing mandated buffer zones, it is the Congress' expectation that the agency will now faithfully execute the law and devote its energies in the future to protecting lakes and streams of the Tongass beyond the statutory minimum requirements.

SECTION 104. FUTURE REPORTS ON THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST AND CONSULTATION

The Conference Report amends section 706(b) of ANILCA to require the Forest Service to report to Congress on the impacts of timber harvest on subsistence, wildlife and fisheries habitats. The Forest Service must also consult with the Southeast Alaska commercial fishing organizations in preparing management status reports for Congress.

To date, the Forest Service has a serious credibility problem with the public, the courts, and the Congress when it dismisses the negative impacts of the timber industry's operations in the Tongass. It is simply outrageous that the multi-million dollar draft Tongass Land Management Plan Revision perpetuates the agency's fantasy that -- no matter how much of the Tongass is harvested -- no adverse impacts whatsoever occur for fisheries, recreation or subsistence. Section 104 is included in the Conference Report in an effort to encourage the Forest Service to provide more comprehensive, and candid, information about the status of the Tongass.

SECTION 105. SMALL BUSINESS SET ASIDE PROGRAM

Section 105 of the Conference Report contains two provisions which are intended to [*H12834] assist the development of small businesses in the Tongass. In *Reid Brothers Logging Company v. Ketchikan Pulp Company and Alaska Lumber and Pulp Company*, the Federal courts held in 1981 that the two long-term contract holders systematically

violated the anti-trust laws over a 16-year period and drove many small timber companies out of business.

The Conference Report's small business provisions, in addition to the long-term contract modifications, are intended to encourage fair competition in the Southeast Alaska timber industry. Section 105(c) was added to the Conference Report in order to make clear that the small business programs shall not benefit the holders of the long-term contracts or their affiliates.

SECTION 106. TENAKEE SPRINGS ROAD

The Conference Report prohibits the Forest Service from connecting Tenakee Springs with the logging road system on Chichagof Island. The need for Congress to intervene in this matter illustrates the Forest Service's insensitivity to the desires of small communities in Southeast Alaska.

TITLE II -- TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST LANDS PROTECTION

The Conference Report provides for the permanent protection from commercial timber harvest of 18 areas comprising over 1 million acres. Six areas totaling approximately 300,000 acres are protected as wilderness and 12 areas totaling approximately 718,000 acres are protected according to the Tongass Forest Plan management criteria of Land Use Designation II ("LUD II").

The House conferees felt strongly that more acres should have been protected and more Wilderness designated than in the Conference Report. In particular, key portions of Upper Hoonah Sound, Nutkwa, West Duncan Canal, and tributaries to Salmon Bay Lake were not included in the lands protected by the Conference Committee. The House conferees also argued that areas such as Kadashan should have been designated Wilderness.

However, the Conference Committee has produced a reasonable compromise by permanently protecting many of the most important areas from the House bill. The values of the areas in the House bill are described in the Interior Committee report on H.R. 987 (Rept. 101-84, Part 1). It is important to note that the areas which have not been protected by the Conference Committee remain subject to the Tongass Land Management Plan revision and may be placed off limits to commercial timber harvest in that process.

The specially designated LUD II areas will require careful and prudent management by the Forest Service. As adopted by the Conference Committee, the primary management directive is that LUD II areas "are to be managed in a roadless state to retain their wildland character". While LUD II designation permits certain specified activities not allowed in Wilderness, it is clear that the overriding priority is to protect these areas of critical fish and wildlife habitat by discouraging unnecessary development (such as road corridors) and requiring that permitted development (such as mining on patented claims) be limited in scope to be compatible with the area's wildland character. Other allowed

activities (such as personal use of wood), should not be abused so as to undercut the protected status of the LUD II areas and degrade their natural integrity.

TITLE III -- MODIFICATION OF LONG-TERM TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS IN ALASKA

Instead of canceling the long-term timber contracts with the Ketchikan Pulp Company and the Alaska Pulp Corporation as provided for in the House bill, the Conference Report modifies the contracts as set forth in nine specific reform directives.

As identified by the Forest Service's Reid Brothers Review Team and explained in detail in the Interior Committee's report on H.R. 987 (Rept. 101-84, Part 1) the long-term contracts vary substantially from standard short-term, competitively bid independent national forest sales. Despite a specific Congressional directive in section 15(b) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the Forest Service has failed to eliminate the inequities between short-term sales and long-term contracts in Alaska. In particular, the long-term contract holders have paid substantially lower stumpage rates for Tongass timber.

In order to assure that valuable public resources in the Tongass are protected and wisely managed and in order to promote fair competition, the Conference Report finds that it is in the national interest to modify the long-term contracts. The basic source for the Conference Report's modifications is the recommendations of the Forest Service's Reid Brothers Review Team.

Section 301(c)(1) is intended to standardize timber sale administration on the Tongass. For example, unlike short-term sale procedures, clearcut units under the long-term contracts are not completely surveyed, marked, cruised and appraised before completion of environmental assessment procedures or even before formal release to the contract holder. This provision would require the Forest Service to change its management practices.

Paragraph (2) prohibits "high-grading" or harvesting a disproportionate amount of the highest volume, best quality Tongass timber. This provision mandates that the highest volume timber stands be harvested only in proportion to the extent that they currently exist in each contiguous management area (141 management areas were designated by the 1979 TLMP). This assures that there will be a non-declining even flow of the highest-volume old-growth timber over the 100-year rotation. Only the highest-volume old-growth stands that are currently in the timber base of a management area shall be used in determining the proportionate rate of harvest.

The high-grading prohibition is extremely important. It constitutes one of the most critical reforms in both the long-term contracts and Forest Service management practices. The intent is to spread the harvest of the highest volume timber over the rotation, thus providing for sustained yield of the Tongass resources. The TLMP schedule, which

provides for a disproportionate harvest of the best timber in the earliest decades of the timber rotation, must now comply with this paragraph.

Paragraph (3) prohibits the Forest Service from offering additional timber to the long-term contract holders unless they have substantially harvested all the timber released within three years, unless and only to the extent that specific harvests are blocked by third-party lawsuits. This provision will stop the contract holders from amassing backlogs of timber while cutting only the best stands.

Paragraph (4) requires the Forest Service to determine the location, size and timing of harvests. This provision stops the practice of allowing the contract holders to dictate precise locations of harvests in the field. The differences between the planned timber harvests set forth in environmental assessments and what is actually harvested has been substantial. It is intended that the Forest Service strictly control any changes in harvest unit location, size and timings and that such changes be in compliance with NEPA and fully disclosed to the public.

Paragraph (5) requires that timber rejected by a contract holder be subtracted from the volume remaining under the appropriate contract. It is the intent of this provision that the Forest Service make every practicable effort to sell rejected timber, especially to independent small businesses in Southeast Alaska.

Paragraph (6) provides that all utility logs offered under the long-term contracts shall be fully counted against the respective contract volume requirements. This will require an accounting of all utility logs delivered in the past to the contract holders.

Paragraph (7) directs that the Forest Service allocate purchaser road credits -- which are discounts in timber prices in return for logging road construction -- in the same manner that is used in the standard, short-term sales program. Unlike short-term sale purchasers, the contract holders have been allowed to "bank" road costs which exceeded the value of the timber purchased. This provision would prohibit that practice.

Paragraph (8) constitutes the most important reform of the long-term contracts. Under this provision, the unfair pricing advantage which the contract holders have enjoyed for decades is eliminated. The Forest Service is required to increase the price of timber released to the long-term contract holders to reflect the prices that would be received in competitively bid timber sales. The provision is also intended to incorporate the findings of the Reid Brothers Review Team pricing validation report which determined that the prices used to appraise timber under the long-term contracts were not based on arms length transactions.

Paragraph (9) prohibits the Forest Service from supplying the contract holders with timber of higher value or quality than timber offered to all other purchasers under the standard, short-term sales program. This provision is intended to specifically eliminate any long-term contract provision which provides for "mid market" timber or any other guarantee of timber which exceeds the standard offering to short-term purchasers. This

provision is intended to make absolutely certain that high-grading will be not be perpetuated on the Tongass.

Section 301(d) of the Conference Report requires the Forest Service to implement the mandates of this section by making the necessary revisions to the text of the long-term contracts. This duty is purely ministerial. The Forest Service's sorry record of failure to achieve fundamental reforms in the long-term contracts necessitates this approach. To assure that the Forest Service does not hinder in any way implementation of the reforms, section 301(g) of the Conference Report provides for an audit by the General Accounting Office and compliance report to Congress.

No later than ninety-days after date of enactment, the Forest Service is required to submit the text of the revised contracts to Congress along with a certification that the revisions are in compliance with this section. After 90 days, the Forest Service has absolutely no authority to release timber to the long-term contract holders under terms other than those set forth in this section. It is important to note that, should the contract holders sue to enjoin implementation of the section, the Forest Service can not release timber under the "old" contract terms.

Section 301(e) requires the Forest Service to conduct a comprehensive assessment of whether multiple use and sustained yield needs can be met consistent with providing the volume of timber allowed under the [*H12835] modified contracts. The Forest Service is also required to study the potential impacts of eliminating the two monopoly contract areas. The study, along with the Forest Service's recommendations, shall be submitted to Congress no later than one year after date of enactment.

These provisions are of particular significance to the House conferees who remain skeptical that true contract reform can be achieved without addressing the issues of contract volume and monopoly areas.

Section 301(f) is an important directive to the Forest Service to take any other actions necessary, beyond revising the text of the long-term contracts, to change management practices to be consistent with this section. For example, high-grading should be stopped, whether by the long-term contract holders, or by independent operators. The Forest Service is also encouraged to carry out the intent of this reform legislation by going beyond the bare minimum requirements. As just one example, the Forest Service could address the Congressional concern about the conflicts between contract volume requirements and multiple use, be engaging in a cooperative effort with the State of Alaska to fully utilize private timber and the vast amount of beach logs as alternative sources of wood fiber for the pulp mills.

TITLE IV. -- HAIDA LANDS SELECTIONS

Section 401 of the Conference Report allows the Haida Corporation to accelerate selection of 5,800 acres of land in the area of Sultzter Portage. While section 401(d) expressly prohibits the Haida Corporation from exercising additional selection rights in the

Nutkwa LUD II area, it is not anticipated that the Haida Corporation will select additional acreage in any of the areas protected by this legislation.

TITLE V. -- MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 602(a) of the Senate bill directed the Forest Service to engage in negotiations with the Sealaska Corporation involving an exchange of certain lands in the the Greens Creek area of Admiralty Island National Monument. According to Secretary Yeutter's letter to the Conferees dated October 11, 1990, an exchange is necessary to allow expansion of the existing Greens Creek mine operation. According to Secretary Yeutter, the Forest Service is engaged in ongoing negotiations with the Sealaska Corporation concerning a Greens Creek land exchange.

Section 602(a) was dropped by the Conference Committee. However, this change was made without prejudice to ongoing negotiations between Sealaska and the Forest Service. A fair value exchange of the Greens Creek assets, especially if the United States acquires significant surface estate in the trade, could well be in the national interest. The Greens Creek exchange, including the mine operator's claims to extralateral rights to develop minerals on federally owned lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, should receive serious attention in the next Congress.

Section 502(b) of the Conference Report directs the Forest Service to negotiate with three Alaska Native Corporations in order to acquire privately owned inholdings with the Cube Cove area of Admiralty Island National Monument. The first priority of the negotiations, which reflects a longstanding interest of the Interior Committee, is to protect the unharvested Lake Florence drainage. It is intended that the Forest Service take this directive seriously and to submit to Congress an acquisition proposal which is a fair deal for the taxpayers.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlemen from California [Mr. Miller], for those kind words. It, however, makes it difficult for me to follow my script. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what has been said here is partially true in the sense that this is an amendment to the Alaska National Lands Act of 1980.

Mr. Speaker, most of those people in this room were not here in 1980, when the Alaska National Lands Act literally set aside 100 million acres for what we call exclusive use in parks and refuge. In that it also added 5 1/2 million acres of the 17 1/2 million acres in

the Tongass Forest. At that time we were told these were the pristine acres that must be set aside, the old-growth timber, the rainforest will be preserved.

We thought at that time we had accomplished a working solution to a problem, recognizing the need of the working Alaskan, the logger, the store owner, the school teacher, and the student himself.

We thought we had reached that solution by setting aside 5 1/2 million acres that never was ever written about or talked about how much land was set aside in 1980. Well, we did that, thinking we had reached a compromise at that time.

I am not going to lay the blame for this on the chairman's back because, very frankly, he came after that fact. He did not live through that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, there are those groups who, at that time, said, "Well, that is not enough, we are going to give some more." They came down with a bill, and I will say this, a bill that was so onerous that it makes it hard for me to talk when I think about it.

It is a bad bill, was a bad bill, it passed this House overwhelmingly because of the pressure. But it was not the large timber companies, it was the environmental groups across this Nation not understanding what they were doing to the Alaskan people. And it passed. And it went over to the Senate side.

I thought the Senate itself, and I may mention the Senate because I have two colleagues over there, I think they did a very good and admirable job.

I will say that what came out of this is not a compromise. Let us make it perfectly clear; it was a compromise between the Senate bill, it was a compromise between the House bill, but it was not a compromise with the 1980 act.

I will tell you what this bill really does; it does break the 1980 deal, it takes an additional 1 million acres of land out of forest management and multiple use, it closes 300,000 acres to mining in southeast Alaska, one of southeast Alaska's most promising economic diversifications; it unilaterally changes some aspects of the contracts in the only year-round private industry in southeast Alaska and threatens Alaska's third largest industry. It throws out the forest laws passed by the Congress which applied to every forest in the country and replaces that with the forest management preferred, quite frankly, by some of those on the Hill.

It once again proves that Alaska is being treated like a colony or a territory rather than as a State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, again may I say if we did not even act on this bill, 90 percent of the Tongass would be off limits to timber, 90 percent. What this does is add 1 million acres, and very frankly then just 92 percent will be off limits.

What has bothered me, and I hope we have the assurance of my chairman, is that the working person of America has to be considered when we pass these environmental pieces of legislation. And I truthfully will suggest I do not think they have been really considered.

What concerns me the most, Mr. Chairman, I hope I can indulge in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee: As I mentioned a little earlier, we set aside 5 1/2 million acres of wilderness in the Tongass. And now we set aside another million acres.

As the chairman of the committee which handles Alaskan issues, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], I hope that I can ask the gentleman a direct question that we will not be revisiting this issue next year or the year after that or the year after that or the year after that, so that there is some reliability of where my people are going to be in the working field.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please address that issue at this time and see where we are?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, as manager of this legislation, it is our belief that this is in fact a true compromise, that while there were parties and organizations on one side that wanted more wilderness, there were clearly parties, organizations, and entities on the other side that wanted a reduction in those areas.

We believe we have put together a compromise that brings some finality to this issue, and that is based upon the fact that this is a good-faith compromise between members of this committee, the minority members of this [*H12836] committee, the Members of the Senate and all of the entities which have been involved in this debate over the last 5, 6, 7 years.

It is not our intention to revisit this issue, provided that the spirit and the intent of this legislation is carried out, and I believe that it will be.

I think that speaks for itself. This is not a conclusion that was arrived at lightly by any party to these deliberations. Everybody had to give up something.

But the purpose of arriving at this compromise was to settle this issue, and I would say that that is the intent of myself, and I believe I speak for others who have struggled with this from this side so terribly long.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, what concerns me is immediately upon the conference, and I want to compliment the chairman and his work with the conference, immediately upon filing the conference report we had comment on how mention from the Wilderness Society and from much of those other groups said it is a good beginning, and that so much bothers me that, if that is a good beginning, then, very frankly, we ought not have the legislation because they want more, and more, and more on settling factors for people of my State because it is more apparent each day. So, he is the chairman of the committee, and I am going to take his word as a fellow colleague that this will be not revisited next year because the Wilderness Society wishes to do it, or Friends of the Earth, or whatever much of those bunch of people that live in this Hill, around this Hill, trying to, very frankly, put the American people out of work.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest one thing we have got to start doing around here is start thinking about workers. We hear people down in the well talking about workers and how we got to protect American jobs when we got people taking jobs away from Americans every day. True environmental action.

I want to ask my colleagues, "Who are these environmental groups? What are they made of?" They are white, they are well-educated, and they have got theirs, and they don't let anybody else have any of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any of the homeless or impoverished. I do not see any migrants. I do not see any of those people come to this country because it is a great country. I do not see those people. I see those that have it, and I get very upset, Mr. Speaker, when I start talking about hearing people on that side of the aisle, very frankly, saying we have to protect the environment, and yet we have got to protect American jobs. We cannot do it by locking up resources. We cannot do it by locking up land.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest this still is not a good bill. It is bad legislation. It is better than what passed the House, and I will admit that, but it still affects American workers in Alaska and workers in Alaska, and this is just a stepping stone. Every time I hear any body in this floor talk about we have to set this amount of land aside without consideration of the individuals. I think it is wrong, as I said before, and it is, very frankly, un-American.

Mr. Speaker, I said that in the Niobrara River argument and I said it before. When we take away the rights of individuals in this country to make a living, it is not correct for this body to do so.

I RISE IN THE STRONGEST OPPOSITION TO THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 987, THE TONGASS TIMBER REFORM ACT. THIS IS NOT, AS SOME MAINTAIN, A COMPROMISE. THERE IS NO COMPROMISE TO IT. THE ANTIJOBS ENVIRONMENTAL ELITISTS GET THE GOLD MINE, AND THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF ALASKA GET UNEMPLOYED.

THE NAME OF THIS BILL SHOULD BE "IT'S NEVER ENOUGH." BACK IN 1980, ENVIRONMENTALISTS WOULDN'T STOP UNTIL THEY GOT 5.4 MILLION ACRES OF WILDERNESS IN HUGE CHUNKS. THEY EVEN AGREED TO AUTOMATIC FUNDING TO BUILD ROADS IN THE TONGASS TO ACCESS TIMBER FOR INDUSTRY ON THE REMAINING LAND IN RETURN FOR WILDERNESS. BUT THAT WASN'T ENOUGH. THE INK WASN'T EVEN DRY ON THE ALASKA LANDS ACT BEFORE THEY WERE COMPLAINING ABOUT TIMBER HARVESTING ON THE REST OF THE TONGASS. THEN THEY COMPLAINED ABOUT THE AUTOMATIC FUNDING THEY AGREED TO -- IT JUST WASN'T ENOUGH. SO THEY GOT SOMEONE FROM LONG ISLAND TO INTRODUCE A BILL TO CUT OFF THE AUTOMATIC FUNDING. BUT THAT WASN'T ENOUGH. THEY WANTED MORE LAND. THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA GOT TOGETHER AND CAME UP WITH A SETTLEMENT THAT WOULD HAVE BANNED TIMBER HARVEST ON 673,000 ACRES IMPORTANT TO COMMUNITIES. ENVIRONMENTALISTS PRAISED THE COMPROMISE, AND THE SENATE MADE IT THEIR BILL AFTER IT WAS ENDORSED BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE LEGISLATURE. BUT IT WASN'T ENOUGH. THIS BILL ALMOST DOUBLES THAT LOCAL SOLUTION, AND IS A SLAP IN THE FACE TO THE LOCAL PEOPLE OF SOUTHEAST ALASKA. BUT HOW MUCH OF THE TONGASS IS ALREADY PROTECTED FROM TIMBER HARVEST? A QUARTER? A THIRD? A HALF? HOW ABOUT 90 PERCENT. THAT'S RIGHT; 90 PERCENT OF THE TONGASS IS OFF LIMITS WITHOUT THIS BILL. THIS BILL SAYS TO THE WORKERS IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA THAT 90 PERCENT FOR RECREATION AND TOURISTS ISN'T ENOUGH; 10 PERCENT FOR YOUR JOB IS TOO MUCH.

THIS BILL WILL BE A GOOD TEST OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S PLANT-CLOSING BILL. THEY SAY THEY'RE FOR THE WORKING MAN AND WOMAN, AND THEY ARE -- UNLESS THE WORKING MAN OR WOMAN IS DOING SOMETHING THEIR MOST PAMPERED SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP -- THE ENVIRONMENTALISTS -- DON'T LIKE.

I'D LIKE TO TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO ADDRESS MYSELF TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF SOUTHEAST ALASKA WHO WILL BEAR THE BRUNT OF THIS LEGISLATION. BUT THE MESSAGE IS THE SAME FOR FARMERS AND WORKING MEN AND WOMEN THROUGHOUT THIS COUNTRY.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS IN WHOLESALE RETREAT FROM THE WORKING MAN IN THIS COUNTRY. THEY WANT YOUR VOTES, AND THEY SOUND LIKE THEY'RE OUT TO HELP YOU, BUT THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT YOU, AND BILLS LIKE THIS SHOW IT.

THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS DON'T CARE ABOUT LOGGERS AND MILLWORKERS IN SITKA, KETCHIKAN, WRANGELL, KLAWOOCK, OR HAINES -- JUST LIKE THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT THEM OR THEIR FAMILIES IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST OR ANYWHERE ELSE.

THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS DON'T CARE ABOUT STEVEDORES OR LONGSHOREMEN IF THEY'RE LOADING LOGS OR PULP OR LUMBER YEAR-AROUND.

THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS DON'T CARE ABOUT -- THEY DON'T EVEN LIKE -
- MINERS IN JUNEAU -- THE STATE POLITICAL BUREAUCRATS JUST PROVED THAT BY DRIVING 7800 POTENTIAL JOBS AT THE QUARTZ HILL MINE IN KETCHIKAN OUT OF THE STATE.

THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS DON'T CARE ABOUT THE PEOPLE IN THE OIL INDUSTRY IN ALASKA. THEY LIKE THE POLITICAL JOBS THEY HAVE AT THE DEPARTMENTS OF FISH AND GAME AND DEC BECAUSE OF THE OIL MONEY, BUT THEY DON'T LIKE WHERE IT COMES FROM.

AND THEY USE THOSE POLITICAL JOBS AS PULPITS FROM WHICH THEY ATTACK THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN SO THEY CAN PROTECT THEIR WEEKEND RETREATS ON FOREST LAND OWNED BY ALL AMERICANS.

THEY SAY THAT THIS WON'T HURT WORKERS IN ALASKA. THAT'S BULL. YOU NEED TREES IF YOU'RE A LOGGER, MILLWORKER OR STEVEDORE OR LONGSHOREMAN, AND THIS BILL TAKES OVER A MILLION ACRES OF TREES AWAY FROM YOU ON THE TONGASS.

THAT'S ON TOP OF THE 5 1/2 MILLION ACRES THEY TOOK IN 1980.

LET'S FACE IT, FOLKS, THEY DON'T CARE ABOUT YOU. YOU'RE JUST A SOURCE TO TAX -- TO GET MORE MONEY. YOU'RE JUST AN INDIVIDUAL, THOUGH, AN IF YOU LOSE YOUR JOB, THEY DON'T CARE -- THEY'LL JUST RAISE TAXES ON EVERYBODY ELSE.

IF YOU'RE TIRED OF GIVING THEM YOUR VOTE AND HAVING THEM MAKE FUN OF YOU AND THEN DO AWAY WITH YOUR JOBS, STOP.

THEY WILL DO THIS AS LONG AS THEY CAN GET AWAY WITH IT, AND WHEN THEY GET CAUGHT, THEY WILL STOP. IT'S UP TO YOU.

SO WHAT DOES THE BILL DO?

IT BREAKS THE 1980 DEAL THE ENVIRONMENTALISTS AGREED TO ON AUTOMATIC FUNDING IN RETURN FOR WILDERNESS.

IT TAKES OVER 1 MILLION ACRES OF LAND OUT OF FOREST MANAGEMENT AND MULTIPLE USES.

IT CLOSES 300,000 ACRES TO MINING, ONE OF SOUTHEAST ALASKA'S MOST PROMISING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATIONS.

IT UNILATERALLY CHANGES SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONTACTS IN THE ONLY YEAR-ROUND PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA, AND THREATENS ALASKA'S THIRD-LARGEST INDUSTRY.

IT THROWS OUT THE FOREST LAWS PASSED BY CONGRESS WHICH APPLY TO EVERY FOREST IN THE COUNTRY, AND REPLACES THAT WITH THE FOREST MANAGEMENT PREFERRED BY A COUPLE OF HILL STAFFERS.

IT ONCE AGAIN PROVES THAT ALASKA IS BEING TREATED LIKE A COLONY OR A TERRITORY, RATHER THAN AS A STATE OF THE UNION.

THAT'S ALL IT DOES.

IT DOES SOMETHING ELSE, TOO.

WITHOUT THIS ACT, ONLY 10 PERCENT OF THE TONGASS IS AVAILABLE FOR THE WORKERS; 90 PERCENT IS OFF LIMITS FOREVER.

THAT SHOULD BE PROOF TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF THE TONGASS. THE SPONSORS OF THIS BILL DON'T EVEN WANT YOU TO HAVE 10 PERCENT TO FEED YOUR FAMILIES ON.

MR. SPEAKER, I RESTATE MY STRONGEST OPPOSITION TO THIS BILL.

I AM PLEASED TO BE ABLE TO INCLUDE A PROVISION WHICH WILL PERMIT THE HAIDA NATIVE CORP. TO RECEIVE ITS LAND SELECTIONS UNDER THE 1986 LEGISLATION WE PASSED ON ITS BEHALF. THE LANDS IT WILL RECEIVE ARE TRADITIONAL HAIDA LANDS. THE LANDS WILL BE SUBJECT TO AN EASEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR THROUGH THE AREA, WITH OWNERSHIP [*H12837] OF THE TIMBER TO REMAIN IN HAIDA CORP. IT IS OUR INTENT THAT HAIDA CORP. RETAIN FULL CONTROL OVER THE TIMBER AND SURFACE ESTATE COVERED BY THE EASEMENT, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO EXERCISE CONTROL FOR ROAD-BUILDING ACTIVITIES.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Vento]. He has been very instrumental in hammering out this agreement, and I want to thank him for all of his time and effort on behalf of this legislation.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

The Tongass temperate rain forest in southeast Alaska and the House have waited a long time for this day. It was almost 10 years ago, on November 12, 1980, that the House of Representatives reluctantly agreed to the Udall-Anderson bill, and cleared the way for President Carter to sign into law the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

The Alaska Lands Act contained much good. I supported Chairman Udall's decision to acquiesce in the Senate version, despite the refusal of the Senate to go into conference with the House to try to reconcile the different versions of the bill. But I shared his profound regret about the Senate's provisions for future management of those parts of the Tongass National Forest that were not included in conservation system units.

Those Senate provisions laid the groundwork for a decade of disgrace in the Tongass that will end when this conference report is enacted into law.

When I say a decade of problems a decade of disgrace in the Tongass, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the way the Forest Service has interpreted and implemented the provisions of the Alaska Lands Act mandating a timber-supply quota of 4.5 billion board feet per decade and providing for an automatic, unappropriated flow of at least \$40 million every year for the Forest Service to meet that quota.

The conference report now before us, like the bills the House passed in 1988 and again last year, would remove these pernicious provisions from the Alaska Lands Act.

I well recall that when this part of the Alaska lands bill was being debated in the Senate, Agriculture Secretary Bob Bergland, a fellow Minnesotan, called it a mandate to overcut the Tongass. He was right. Through the past decade it distorted the planning process and management of the Tongass, to unduly emphasize timber cutting at the expense of noncommodity uses of that precious temperate zone rain forest -- one of the few such forests -- and the many species that depend on it.

The House-passed version of the Tongass bill and reconciliation package would have simply repealed that part of the Alaska Lands Act. That would have unequivocally put the management of the Tongass on the exact same footing as the other national forests. This conference report is a little less clear-cut, since it rewrites that part of the Alaska Lands Act instead of repealing it. I would have preferred outright repeal, but I agreed to the conference language because I believe that it has the same effect. That is, it eliminates the bias in favor of timber production, and reasserts the requirements that the Forest Service is to manage these national forest lands for the full spectrum of uses and with appropriate balance among all the renewable resources -- timber, fish and wildlife, recreation, and others -- and uses. All the laws and policies that apply generally to the national forest system will apply in full to the Tongass under this language, and therefore I believe that that it is acceptable and meets the House's goal of a basic reform of section 705(A) of the Alaska Lands Act.

But just reforming this part of the Alaska Lands Act, by itself would not be enough to put management of the Tongass on a sound footing, because of a second basic problem -- one that goes back even further. I refer to the two 50-year timber contracts based on legislation of the 1940's. As the 1988 House-passed Tongass bill stated, these contracts, relics of another era, have undermined fair competition and have failed to provide a fair financial return to the people of the United States, the owners of the Tongass National Forest. More than that, they have undermined sound management of the Tongass because they have in effect allowed fundamental land-use decisions to be controlled by the holders of the contracts and not by the National Government.

To remedy this, the House-passed bill provided for outright cancellation of the contracts. The Senate's version did not go that far, providing only for modifications to the contract terms. Out of the conference has emerged a compromise. Frankly, it is not as strong as I would have wished. But that is the nature of compromise, and I support this one, which directs mandatory modifications in the contracts and calls for further review of additional steps concerning them that may be necessary to bring management of the Tongass into line with other national forests and the national interest.

In connection with the requirement for further reviews and reports, Mr. Speaker, I should report that during the conference on the Tongass Timber Reform Act, the conferees from Alaska made it clear that they hoped that this legislation would end Congressional decisionmaking about the Tongass. I understand the importance of providing some certainty for everyone involved, and I hope that it will not be necessary for Congress to revisit the issues dealt with in the Tongass parts of this conference report. However, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the willingness of supporters of the House-passed Tongass bill to agree to the compromise language about the contracts contained in this conference report is based on our intention of closely monitoring its implementation to make sure that it is achieving the intended goals. If the further reviews and reports required by this part of the conference report show that the contracts are continuing to distort the management of the Tongass to an unacceptable degree, further actions will have to be given serious consideration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Tongass parts of this conference report, like the House bill, would provide permanent protection of some very important parts of the Tongass, by designating them as wilderness. Other areas that the House would have so designated are given a somewhat less complete protection, putting them off-limits to timber harvest but allowing other activities that wilderness would preclude. Again, this is a compromise, but one that I believe is acceptable and deserving of approval.

In particular, I am glad that the conference report will provide for wilderness designation for the Young Lake Area, and for its addition to the Admiralty Island National Monument.

With respect to Admiralty Island, Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes the Senate provisions calling for further negotiations aimed at acquisition of the Lake Florence Area. That area is the last uncut portion of the major inholding within the Admiralty Island

Monument owned by the Shee Atika Corp., the Native corporation whose shareholders are the Native people of Sitka, and Sealaska, the regional corporation for southeast Alaska.

The establishment of that inholding, and the subsequent cutting of the timber on most of these lands, is another source of regret for many of us. This is another legacy of the Senate version of the Alaska Lands Act.

It is also something that the House worked hard to avoid. In the 99th Congress, the House passed a bill, cosponsored by our former colleague, John Seiberling, along with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young] and Chairman Udall, that provided for a generous offer to Shee Atika and Sealaska, for acquisition of these Admiralty Island lands in exchange for money and other lands, including interests in the Greens Creek Area where active mineral development is underway. I strongly supported that bill, which passed the House in August 1986.

Unfortunately, the Senate never acted on that bill, and most of the timber on Shee Atika's Admiralty Island lands has now been cut.

[*H12838] If there had been time to do so, Mr. Speaker, it would have been desirable to work out for inclusion in this conference report detailed provisions for keeping the last of that timber from being harvested, and for addition of the Lake Florence Area to the Admiralty Island National Monument. However, those provisions have not been worked out, and it would be absolutely wrong to hold up this legislation, this long-overdue reform of management of the entire Tongass National Forest, in an effort to resolve remaining questions. Therefore, I join in support of the conference report's provisions calling for serious, expedited negotiations between the Forest Service and the parties involved, to try to achieve this goal of saving the Lake Florence area, and I urge the administration to make this a high priority matter.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation and admiration for the leadership on this important matter that has been demonstrated by my colleague on the Interior Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] working closely with Chairman Udall and other members of our committee, including the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Gejdenson] and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Mrazek] -- who has played an outstanding role in bringing us to this conference report -- Mr. Miller has demonstrated the tenacity and resourcefulness that have made possible a successful resolution on this protracted struggle. I congratulate him for what has been achieved, and I urge all Members to join with us in overwhelming support for this conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Dannemeyer].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young], my colleague, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get involved in this discussion, but since we have talked about the environmental party in American politics, I think the American people would like to know just what the environmental party is in this country and the political clout that they have achieved. It is interesting to compare their size; that is to say, they have a contributing base in this Nation of a little less than 13 million people, and that contributing base contributes roughly \$335 million a year to influence public policy in America. If my colleagues contrast that quantity of people and money with the contributing base of the two national, Democrat and Republican, Parties, it is interesting by way of contrast because the Democrat and Republican Parties combined nationally have a contributing base of about 2.4 million people, and this base of contributors contributes roughly \$93 million a year; \$93 million for the two national parties in American politics to influence public policy; \$335 million for the environmental party, a little less than 13 million in a contributing base versus 2.4 million with the two major parties.

Is it any wonder that this Nation is now experiencing energy dependence? This environmental party has stopped nuclear power development in America. They have stopped development of an oil field of huge dimensions in ANWR in northeastern Alaska. They have stopped developing the resources off of the Nation's coastlines around America and because of this energy dependence, have now contributed to the reality that we have 200,000 men of this Nation in the sands in the Middle East, prepared to put their lives on the line because some people in this country are unwilling to develop the resources of this country. Not only are they unwilling to develop the resources in this country, but they want to lock up even more in the State of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time to identify this environmental party. They have every right to exist; do not misunderstand me. I am not suggesting that they do not have the right to exist.

Mr. Speaker, these are the organizations that comprise this environmental party: The Center for Marine Conservation, the Clean Water Action Project, the Environmental Defense Fund, Greenpeace, U.S.A., National Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, National Resources Defense Council, the Nature Conservancy, Public Interest Research Groups, Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and World Wildlife Fund.

The people who comprise this environmental party are to be congratulated. They have a ring through the nose of the U.S. Congress, and the reality of their ability to get things done politically in the House and in the Senate is very simple: The fear on the part of Members from the bite of crossing the environmental party is far greater than the political clout or bite that might be forthcoming from the combined manufacturers, the energy producers, and the utilities in this country.

It is a sad day for all of us, but it is a reality of what we are facing, that this environmental party is the tail wagging the dog in American politics.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I would just say two things: The Tongass bill does not deal with an energy issue directly. Secondly, it was the party of the gentleman from California [Mr. Dannemeyer], in a rush to deregulate government, that ended up leaving us without an energy policy. We had an energy policy in 1980, and it was the gentleman and his party that took it apart in the last decade.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I guess if you drink the water in the home State of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Gejdenson] all the time, my good friend, you may come to that conclusion. But I look at the water glass a little differently. I say that this environmental party has established an energy dependence for Americans, sadly for all of us, and the wisest thing we can do here today, not only do we have this bill, but the next bill we are going to take up I am told is the amendments to the Clean Air Act, which is another story all of its own.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Gejdenson].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for the work he has done here today.

You know, as we look back to the Grand Canyon and other national treasures, there is not a great debate about the balance. But I am sure at the time there were those who wanted to develop the Grand Canyon, who wanted to develop some of those splendid areas in this country.

When we sit here so often and sanctimoniously tell poorer nations in Central America and South America to protect their rain forests, and you look at the little amount we have done here, this bill is a small step in the right direction.

It is the great effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], and his tenacity, that has brought use to this point. We held hearings on this bill which I chaired 3 or 4 years ago as a result of the legislation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Mrazek]. We have gone past the House two or three times at this point. It is only because of the tremendous effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] that has brought us to this point that we have a bill that starts to protect some of the most beautiful places in this country, like the Lisianski River.

I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], for his great work on this issue. Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Mrazek], clearly the moving force behind this legislation, and who has worked long and hard on seeing it to a successful conclusion.

Mr. MRAZEK. Madam Speaker, I can well remember 5 years ago when a member of my staff, who is an outdoorsman and environmentalist, came back from the Tongass National Forest and said what a remarkable treasure it truly is for the heritage of the United States of America. But he suggested that we were losing that [*H12839] heritage; that that 17 million-acre forest was being clearcut. In other words, 500- and 600-year-old trees, trees here when Christopher Columbus discovered the New World, were being cut down by a Japanese holding company that controlled a company called Alaska Pulp, and trees that were worth hundreds of dollars were being sold to the Japanese for the cost of Big Mac hamburgers.

The Tongass National Forest is actually the last great habitat for the grizzly bear and the last unspoiled habitat for the bald eagle. It is some of the most pristine wilderness that you will ever want to see. Some day hopefully your grandchildren will see it.

I am very proud of the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] and others held in the House and Senate worked together to do some things that are going to allow the timber industry in Alaska to coexist with the fishing industry and tourism, so that that priceless resources of this Nation, the largest national forest in the United States of America, will be protected and preserved for the future, where we are not going to cut down timber when there is no demand for it, and we are going to reform the contracts of that that Japanese holding company will be paying a fair price for the timber it cuts down, and we are going to see certain areas, specially sensitive areas, set aside to be kept forever wild.

Madam Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Gejdenson], because although I am proud to be the person who first introduced the Tongass Timber Reform Act 5 years ago, truly the legacy of protecting this great forest primarily rests with the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], who has carried this fight forward, and who I was very proud to visit Alaska with and see firsthand just how extraordinary a place the Tongass National Forest truly is. If you and your family cannot get up there, know at least that your grandchildren will be able to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Unsoeld). The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Hansen].

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

Mr. HANSEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to make some remarks on the land exchange discussions on Admiralty Island in Alaska. As the members of the Tongass conference committee know, there is an operating mine on Admiralty Island -- the Greens Creek Mine -- which is operated by the Kennecott Corp. of Salt Lake City. The Senate version of the Tongass bill contained a provision to encourage land exchange discussions

between the U.S. Forest Service and the Sealaska Corp., an Alaska Native Corporation. The purpose of these discussions was to place the lands surrounding the Greens Creek Mine into private ownership to allow for mineral exploration and possible development. Senator Garn of Utah was the sponsor of the so-called Greens Creek Land Exchange Amendment at the time of Senate floor consideration of the Tongass bill. The land exchange would have involved the Forest Service, Sealaska, and the Kennecott Corp. on behalf of the Greens Creek joint venture, which owns the mine. It was anticipated that a land exchange agreement that all parties could support could be reached.

Unfortunately, no such agreement was reached. In fact, since Senate adoption of the amendment, negotiations between the parties have ceased and I am informed that there is no hope of consensus among the parties. For this reason the conference committee wisely dropped the Garn amendment from the final Tongass bill.

I wholeheartedly support the decision of the conference committee on this matter. It is unrealistic and a mistake for the Forest Service to continue one-sided negotiations that cannot be successful. As my esteemed colleague, Senator Garn, stated on the Senate floor:

There is no Congressional mandate for the current negotiations to continue ... the deletion of the amendment should clearly send the signal that no negotiations are requested or required by the Congress.

Additionally, I would state that no land exchange agreement can hope to succeed unless it ensures that the concerns and interests of the single most affected party, the Greens Creek joint venture, are dealt with. This ultimately means that the Greens Creek joint venture must be involved in any negotiations of interested parties in a Greens Creek land exchange. Since the current process has not succeeded, as evidenced by the failure of the negotiations and the deletion of the Garn amendment by the conference committee, I would advise the Forest Service to begin to look at other options.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I promised myself I would not get emotionally involved about this and get worked up about it today, but it is very difficult when I hear the two previous speakers get down in the well and flat not tell what I believe is the truth.

I hear about the last rain forests. It is a rain forest, but people forget in 1980 we set aside 5 1/2 million acres of the finest timberland in the world that was rain forest and protected it forever, the 500-year-old trees. That was done. We thought we had a deal.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] said, along came this group and said:

That ain't enough. We want to take so much that we will stop all logging in southeast Alaska.

Seventeen million acres of trees, and we cut less than 10,000 acres a year. That is less than 1 percent of the total land mass cut in New York State, let alone California, Oregon,

and Washington. California, Oregon, and Washington cut as much timber in 1 year as we plan on cutting in 10 years. But somewhere along the line people lost sight of what happened in 1980, why we passed that legislation, what we thought we had done, and how we thought we had created a table of stability.

Then when I hear the gentleman from Minnesota saying it is maybe not enough, or we are going to look at it next year, and he said, I think we set it aside, but I am not sure, and the gentleman from Connecticut saying maybe we ought to come back and do it again.

No wonder my people are saying, where are we, America? What is Congress doing to us, because of 13 million people, of the elitist, waffle-stomping people that are trying to ruin this country? If we did not have any land set aside, none at all, Madam Speaker, none at all, I would be on the side of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], and I would be the first one to say that, because I think some of these areas should have been set aside, and they were in 1980.

But when I hear the gentleman from Long Island [Mr. Mrazek] talk about the last rain forest, and we must protect it, and it is being clearcut, nonsense. Nonsense, I say to you.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we are not back in this well fighting this battle 2 years or 3 years or 4 years from now because some little group over here walking around with packs on their backs with their little plastic oil derivative backpack saying they ought to set more land aside because I saw it and it was clearcut.

Madam Speaker, let me say something about timber. Timber is not a nonrenewable resource. Sweden today out-produces us in timber, and they have been cutting trees for 1,000 years. Timber is what we must leave as a legacy to our future generations, by managing it, by growing it as they do in the State of Washington, the State of the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. Unsoeld]. They have more trees now than they had in 1930.

Management can achieve it if we are allowed to do it. But for some along the line who are saying save the 500-year-old tree, and the more timber set aside, the more we are going to have in the future, that is not the way it works.

Madam Speaker, I am going to suggest another thing. The people of my State voted for statehood, thinking they would be given a fair shake, and be considered as Americans equally treated. This legislation does not treat [*H12940] them equally. They set up a different managed forest than any other forest in the United States. That is incorrect.

Madam Speaker, I am not one that cannot count. I would suggest also that this Congress is going to pass this conference report. I do not plan on asking for a rollcall vote, for those Members who are listening to this, and I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] does not call for a rollcall vote. But I can assure those on the other side of the aisle that have taken jobs away from Alaskans, and those that promote this type of legislation on the outside, that 13 million people, they had better not come back at me

again. I may be only one, but they had better not come back at me again. They had better leave my people alone and leave my State alone.

I will suggest respectfully that this battle is to cease. It is to stop. Enough is enough.

If I have to call on the chairman, the gentleman from California, and the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from New York next year, I hope it is on amicable terms. I can assure Members that it will not be if my jobs are taken away from my Alaskans.

MADAM SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A STATEMENT REGARDING LAND EXCHANGE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN SEALASKA CORP., AND THE FOREST SERVICE INVOLVING LANDS ON ADMIRALTY ISLAND. DURING THE COURSE OF DEBATE ON THE TONGASS BILL, H.R. 987, SENATOR GARN OFFERED AN AMENDMENT DIRECTING THE FOREST SERVICE TO CONSIDER AN EXCHANGE BETWEEN THE FOREST SERVICE AND SEALASKA INVOLVING THE SUBSURFACE IN THE GREENS CREEK AREA OF ADMIRALTY ISLAND. AT MR. GARN'S INSISTENCE, THE AMENDMENT WAS DROPPED.

I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE'S AGREEMENT TO DROP THE GARN AMENDMENT SHOULD IN NO WAY BE TAKEN AS AN INDICATION THAT THE CONGRESS DOES NOT FAVOR AN EXCHANGE. IT IS IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE FULL MINERAL POTENTIAL OF THE GREENS CREEK AREA CANNOT BE ACCOMPLISHED WITHOUT AN EXCHANGE OR AN EXTENSION BY LAW OF THE ABILITY TO PROVE UP THEIR CLAIMS. THIS WAS TRIED ADMINISTRATIVELY AND LEGISLATIVELY, TO NO AVAIL. SECRETARY YEUTTER SENT A LETTER TO SEVERAL OF THE CONFEREES STATING THAT HE HOPES AN EXCHANGE CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED TO PERMIT SUCH DEVELOPMENT, AND THAT WITHOUT AN EXCHANGE SUCH DEVELOPMENT MAY WELL NOT BE POSSIBLE. I AGREE.

I SINCERELY HOPE THE FOREST SERVICE WILL BE ABLE TO NEGOTIATE AN EQUITABLE EXCHANGE AGREEMENT. I ENCOURAGE THE FOREST SERVICE TO CARRY OUT NEGOTIATIONS WITH APPROPRIATE PARTIES AND TO COME TO CONGRESS WITH ANY AGREEMENT THAT IS COMPLETE FOR RATIFICATION.

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

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

Madam Speaker, quickly, let me just thank everybody who has been involved in this compromise for all of their hard work.

Also let me quickly just say that I think the attacks made on the environmental community by the gentleman from California are irresponsible and reckless. To attack the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Audubon Society, and the National Wildlife Federation is outrageous.

America ought to be thankful for the environmental movement. As we watched the Berlin Wall come down and we walked behind that wall, we saw polluted rivers, children dying from pollution, people choking on their own water, people who could not breathe their air, unsafe atomic power plants, and the destruction, the absolute destruction of the natural resources of that country.

We are not in that position in this country, and we are not in that position because of the environmental movement, and the gentleman ought to understand that.

The gentleman's reckless and outrageous comments do not do justice, and certainly do not do the environmental movement of this country justice.

MR. UDALL. MADAM SPEAKER, IT WAS ALMOST 10 YEARS AGO TO THE DAY THAT I STOOD ON THE FLOOR OF THIS HOUSE AND ASKED MY COLLEAGUES TO PASS THE ALASKA NATIONAL INTEREST LANDS CONSERVATION ACT. AFTER MANY YEARS OF PAINSTAKING WORK BY THE HOUSE, THE SENATE HAD FINALLY BESTIRRED ITSELF TO PASS A BILL. AFTER IT HAD ACTED, THE SENATE REFUSED TO CONFERENCE WITH THE HOUSE, INSISTING THAT WE TAKE THEIR BILL OR LEAVE IT.

WE TOOK THE SENATE BILL, DESPITE MY GRAVE MISGIVINGS ABOUT MANY OF ITS PROVISIONS. AT THE TIME I SAID THAT THE GREATEST FAILING OF THE SENATE ALASKA LANDS BILL WAS, WITHOUT QUESTION, ITS TREATMENT OF THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA. THE WILDERNESS DESIGNATIONS WERE EASY ONES FOR THE MOST PART, LIMITED TO TREELESS, ROCKS AND ICE AREAS. THE MANDATE THAT THE FOREST SERVICE PROVIDE 4.5 BILLION BOARD FEET OF TIMBER PER DECADE TO TWO PULP MILLS WAS, I SAID, A MANDATE TO OVERCUT THE NATION'S LAST TEMPERATURE RAIN FOREST. AND THE PROVISION OF AN ANNUAL, OFF-BUDGET FLOW OF AT LEAST \$40 MILLION, OSTENSIBLY FOR INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT OF MARGINAL FOREST LANDS, WAS AN OPEN INVITATION TO MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

THAT DAY, I SAID THAT I "SHED A TEAR" FOR SOUTHEAST ALASKA AND ITS MAGNIFICENT FOREST, AND THAT THE HOUSE WOULD NEVER REST UNTIL WE HAD GOTTEN IT RIGHT, ONCE AND FOR ALL.

TODAY, MADAM SPEAKER, I CAN WIPE AWAY THAT TEAR AND REJOICE IN THE FULFILLMENT OF THE PROMISE MADE THAT DAY.

AFTER YEARS OF SO MUCH WORK, AND SO MUCH BARGAINING, A CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TONGASS TIMBER REFORM ACT, IS BEFORE US. IT TERMINATES THE ANNUAL, OFF-BUDGET \$40 MILLION APPROPRIATION. IT TERMINATES THE 4.5 BILLION BOARD FEET PER DECADE MANDATE. IT FORCES BROAD AND SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN TWO 50-YEAR TIMBER CONTRACTS THAT ARE AT THE HEART OF SO MANY OF THE TONGASS' WOES. AND IT PROTECTS MORE THAN A MILLION ACRES OF SOME OF THE MOST MAGNIFICENT TIMBER LANDS LEFT ON THIS PLANET. I TRULY BELIEVE THAT THIS AGREEMENT ADVANCES THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN FISHERIES, WILDLIFE, RECREATION, AND WISE USE OF TAX DOLLARS, YET PROTECTS THE PRIVATE INTERESTS OF THE TIMBER INDUSTRY.

MANY PEOPLE DESERVE CREDIT FOR THIS RARE ACHIEVEMENT. BUT I WANT TO EXPRESS MY SPECIAL THANKS TO BOB MRAZEK, FOR HIS DEDICATION, TO SAM GEJDENSON, FOR HIS TENACITY, TO SENATOR BENNETT JOHNSTON, FOR HIS STATESMANSHIP AND MOST ESPECIALLY TO GEORGE MILLER, FOR HIS INCREDIBLE PATIENCE, SKILL, AND STRENGTH. AND FINALLY, I WANT TO APPLAUD BART KOEHLER OF THE SOUTHEAST ALASKA CONSERVATION COALITION AND ALL THE RESIDENCES OF SOUTHEAST ALASKA WHO DEVOTED SO MUCH OF THEIR LIVES AND ENERGY TO THIS GREAT CAUSE.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Unsoeld). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 987.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Madam Speaker, is there any additional time available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having vetoed in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.