Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this debate about the tax bill is about who benefits. My Republican colleagues once again are trying to pass a tax bill that benefits the wealthiest of Americans and forgets about average middle-class families. And once again, only people who work and pay taxes are eligible for a tax cut. Do not let them distort the facts.

I will tell my colleagues that 61 percent of the people in this country are not buying their distortions because they believe that the Republican Congress is out of touch with the American people. Do not take my word for it. Newsweek magazine, an article by Jonathan Alter, said the following: A new CNN/USA Today poll shows 61 percent believing the GOP Congress is out of touch. And that is before middle-class voters even learn that the GOP wants to give a chunk of their tax cut to Donald Trump.

Donald Trump, one of the richest men in the world. They would provide a tax cut for the richest corporations in this country, yielding some of those folks a zero tax break.

Class warfare? Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, the Republican majority in this House has declared war on middle-class America. Let us not let them get away with it.

CLASS WARFARE

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, class warfare is exactly what it is, and they are engaging in it. It seems to me that as we listen to this vitriolic attack on the capital gains tax cut, which God forbid Donald Trump might benefit from, let us look at who really benefits from reducing that top rate on capital gains.

Over a 7-year period, the average family of four would see an increase in their take-home pay of $1,500 per year. We continue to hear talk about how $1,500 is going to be cut from the average family with this package. Baloney. We need to realize that a capital gains tax cut is what the American people need to help those who want to emerge from middle-class status and frankly become wealthier. So they are the ones who are trying to engage in this us-versus-them argument. We are the ones who recognize that we are all in this together; because the fact of the matter is, Paul Tsongas was absolutely right when he described his political party and said, you know, the Democrats unfortunately love employees but they hate employers. We are all in this together, Mr. Speaker. Let us support the Republican tax plan.

QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 180

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 858) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. That amendment shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except an amendment printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII, which may be offered only by Representative Miller of California or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Dayton, OH [Mr. HALL], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997 under a modified closed rule. While I share the sentiments of the minority that bills of this nature should be considered under an open amendment process, I believe a modified closed rule in this instance is appropriate and justified.

The Quincy Library Group is a 41-member coalition of local environmental organizations, the timber industry and local officials that met in Quincy, CA. In 1993, the group developed an innovative consensus-based pilot program to permit local management of 2.5 million acres of three national forests in California. It is a responsible plan that emphasizes local cooperation and balances environmental protection with local economic needs.

H.R. 858 is intended to end the 4-year stalemate over the implementation of environmentally sound management practices for the Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests that are aimed at preventing wildfires that are a serious threat to life and property.

The Committee on Resources has been negotiating for 8 weeks with environmental groups, the Clinton administration and even our California colleagues over in the Senate to address their substantive concerns.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute that is made in order by the rule addresses all of their concerns except the concern over local control, which is the primary purpose of this bill. In particular, the substitute amendment specifically states that the pilot project is subject to all existing environmental laws and reviews. Let me underscore that again, Mr. Speaker. The pilot project is subject to all existing Federal environmental laws and reviews.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute accurately reflects the plan that was painstakingly negotiated by this 41-member coalition. There is a legitimate concern that efforts to substantively revise that plan could cause that coalition to unravel.

The Quincy Library Group bill has bipartisan support. To strengthen that support, the rule affords the respected ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], to offer a germane amendment to further address additional concerns that, in the unlikely event, may be overlooked in the substitute amendment.

The rule, Mr. Speaker, ensures ample debate by providing 1 hour of debate on the Miller amendment in addition to the 1 hour of general debate. So Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible rule that will ensure the integrity of the Quincy Library Group while allowing for an innovative and responsible forest management plan, a pilot plan to be developed by local consensus so that we can move forward.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and of the bill itself.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, for yielding to me this time.

This resolution 180 is a modified closed rule. It will allow for the consideration of H.R. 858. This is a bill that directs the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a 5-year pilot project for the management of lands within three national forests in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the State of California.

As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. This modified closed rule makes in order one amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. No other amendments may be offered.

Reluctantly, I oppose the rule because it is an unnecessary restriction of the rights of House Members to offer amendments to this bill on the floor.

During the hearing of the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] testified that this is a controversial bill. It is opposed by State and local California environmental groups, and furthermore he testified that his concerns could be taken care of with about a half a dozen amendments.

My principal opposition to the rule is not based on the procedure up to this point. During the Committee on Rules hearing, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources, testified that numerous changes had been made in the bill to accommodate the opposition. In general, the committee process has been followed. The controversy that has resulted is part of the normal process when basic disagreements continue to exist after fair debate at the subcommittee and committee level.

The next step, which this rule will not permit, is to carry those disagreements to the House floor. Members should have the right to continue the perfecting process before the House in full view of the American public. Instead, Members are offered the right to vote on only one amendment and then to consider the bill on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

House tradition and custom encourage full and fair debate on the House floor whenever possible. That tradition is particularly strong in the Committee on Resources, which has rarely requested a restricted rule. Supporters of this restrictive, modified closed rule have failed to make the case that an exception should be made now, and as crowded as the floor schedule is for this month, surely room could have been found to take up the half dozen amendments that might be offered.

While the fire protections in the bill are needed soon by the people of California, this bill has already been in development for 4 years. The extra debate time to consider amendments will make little difference.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about the management of the national forests supported at taxpayers' expense to protect environmental resources that belong to all Americans. The representatives of the people should have the right to shape this legislation on the House floor. I oppose this rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process and chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, acting chairman today in the absence of the chairman, for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of what I think is a very fair rule for a very important subject that I think in some ways is a bellwether to be used again and again and again as a model in this controversy we have between private property rights and the preservation of our natural resources, which we generally speak of in terms of our environmental legislation.

Obviously we are never going to entirely have a winner on one side or the other of that debate. We are always going to have protection of our natural resources because our quality of life demands it, and we are always going to have private property rights because they are guaranteed, as they should be, in the Constitution of the United States.

Finding ways to work out solutions when they come in conflict is what this bill is about in one narrow specific area of the United States. I believe that the rule we have crafted works out quite well. It is a modified closed rule. It ensures that the minority opposed to some aspects of this bill, which I understand was reported out of the committee nearly unanimously; that nevertheless there was a minority and that that minority has the opportunity to improve the bill in their view through a single amendment and, of course, through the traditional motion to recommit. I am told, frankly, that this legislation is a result of 4 years of discussion by the interested party, the Quincy Library Group, which is a coalition of the environmental leaders, timber industry officials, local citizens and other interested parties in the area who would be immediately affected.

□ 1100

It would be unfortunate, I think, to allow the diligent work they have done to be compromised by misunderstanding here by those of us who were not there or, frankly, to be derailed by mischief making in Washington which, strangely enough, happens every now and then.

This rule does not shut off the amendment process but it does provide for expedited consideration of this long-awaited bill and is supported by local groups representing all ranges of the ideological spectrum. The Quincy Library Group, in my view, should be commended. They have been the conflict resolution forum for a compromise that has been tailored and shaped to resolve a longstanding specific controversy in their area.

In effect, H.R. 858 implements a locally conceived management plan for three national forests in northern California. It establishes a 5-year pilot program designed to conserve forest resources, protect wildlife habitat, and provide economic stability for the region; jobs and quality of life together. Most importantly, it represents a step away from the Washington knows best mentality that has plagued our environmental policy over the years.

This bill presents a long overdue cooperative, locally driven approach to protect our precious resources and our jobs and well-being. It is a fresh approach to land management. I applaud it. It is one that empowers local folks to make decisions and find solutions that work for them.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, which I think preserves the package, allows for the amendment if the minority wishes to make it, and allows us to get on to reflect our own views on how we will vote on the final bill, which I also urge support for.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for being so generous with his time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. The fact is that, I suppose in a sense, based on the past consideration of our timber policies in the last Congress and this Congress, that this represents a great liberalization of our opportunities to vote and debate on issues that affect our national forests. The fact is we have not had many votes on such national forest policies.

The last session, we had the discussion on the timber rider, as it became known, the infamous timber rider, the salvage timber rider which, under the auspices of timber salvage, basically opened up many of our national forests to really an unregulated adventure in terms of harvesting timber in the name of trying to suppress fires and so forth, all with good words of intent; but the consequence of it was that not just salvage operations, which are ongoing and an administrative function of the Forest Service, was in place, but in fact they ran counter to what would be sound forest health practices.

This measure that is before us and this rule, of course, does not provide for the open-ended open amendments. I

do not know of any effort to offer a significant number of amendments that would derail this particular bill, but it is an effort to overcontrol and overmanage what should be an open process on this floor. If there was a bill that could have an open amendment process, this would be it.

I do not know the outcome, but I would just suggest to the Members on the substance of this bill, because many Members have discussed the substance, this is not an argument over private property rights; this is a question of how we are going to manage three national forests all public lands, three national forests and a land mass of about 2½ million acres. So it comprises a significant portion of our national forests, the public domain not owned by private land holders.

Two-and-a-half million acres, and an area that has been of significant controversy in the Pacific Northwest with regard to the policy path for our timber harvest. The fact is that Congress has had heavy hands in this area in terms of mandating legislative timber cuts for a long time.

Finally, when the reality of an ecological crash really occurred with regard to species and diversity of wildlife and so forth in the Pacific Northwest, that resulted in lawsuits and a whole series of efforts that basically denied the problem during the Bush administration, this Clinton administration worked very hard to put in place a sound forest plan, a forest plan or planning process that has been difficult for everyone, concerned in terms of accepting the types of harvest and limits that were necessary because of new scientific information.

Now, with these key forests, a group got together, and I think all of us respect local input and respect the virtue of that, but this Quincy group has not formulated fully all of the ideas in terms of how this should be managed. The question is, should national forests be controlled strictly by local policies based upon generalized guidelines? A 22-page document that raises more questions than it answers.

If we are going to replace the NFS with such a local group, Quincy Library Group, in place of the Forest Service, which is significant national policy change, are the guidelines in place that will in fact best conserve and utilize the national forest resources, preserve the resources of these 2.5 million acres, three national forests? My answer to that is no. I think we need the Forest Service as a full partner at the table. I think we need the existing laws in place, not set aside.

The effort here to pass this law is to in fact superimpose this over the existing mosaic of Federal laws that guide the use of these national lands. Not private lands, national public lands. This effort, in my judgment, is an effort to hijack what is the Quincy Library Group, the local input, to try to superimpose it and to use it for other purposes. The end result here is to basically circumvent many of the existing environmental laws that we have, in fact, superimpose this particular policy path over such laws.

It is called a pilot project but, as I said, it involves 2½ million acres of land. It is not a pilot project. This is an effort to, in fact, circumvent the existing limits, court decisions, other factors that have provided a policy path today that in the Northwest is working, admittedly not with controversy.

Now, I think the Quincy Library effort is an admirable effort. I respect the people involved in it. I think they add significantly to the policies that are being pursued in these areas, but I think the idea is not fully developed. I think the Forest Service has not completed some of the negotiations, furthermore, trying to allocate nearly $100 million to the management of this plan for this particular group is expensive and it will take away from many of the other functions the National Forest Service is responsible for. While there is no new authorization in this bill, the expectation is that that hundred million dollars has to come out of the general budget of the forests involved and the hide of the Forest Service.

I would suggest the rule is inappropriate, not necessary, it should be opposed, as should this bill in its present form or with the amendments that are being proffered by the majority at this time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 23½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pleasantville, PA [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for the chance to speak on this rule. As a member of the Committee on Resources, I am proud to stand here today to support the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act, and to support the rule that has been designed to preserve the locally generated compromise.

For more than 4 years this group has been meeting to find common ground on the policy governing management of these forests. The title of this bill is an accurate description of the proposal's intent to recover forest health and to achieve economic stability.

Why would a Member from Pennsylvania be interested in this measure? I support this bill because it serves to move the environmental debate away from passion-driven arguments toward science-based and consensus-based approaches to forest health issues and to the management of all of our national forests.

In the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, where I serve, we have the Allegheny National Forest, 520,000 acres, a forest that in no way is similar to these forests in northern California, but the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania is 520,000 acres of the highest quality hardwoods in the world. Unfortunately, in the past, the Forest Service and this Congress has often tried to manage our national forests in one-size-fits-all.

There is a great difference between the western forests and the eastern forests. I am not as familiar with the western forests as I would like to be, but I believe there is probably a difference in the California forests and maybe the Montana and Wyoming forests, but yet in the past we have tried to manage one-size-fits-all.

H.R. 858 steers us toward sound science and conflict resolution in order to provide habitat protection for the California spotted owl, preservation of the roadless areas for the length of the pilot project, reduction of the fire risks through construction of fuel breaks, and stability of the wood products industry.

My fellow colleagues, I know there has been a long-time debate on the national forests. There are those who want to lock them up. There are those who think we should just look at them. I believe these investments were made years ago for many reasons and for many multiple uses. I believe we should always support locally generated solutions when we can have them.

I think this proposal steers us in a new direction of managing our national forests in a way that suits the region upon which they are in, in a way that protects the taxpayers of the great investment we made and preserves the high quality of these forests. When local wisdom and cooperation offer a solution to complicated emotional issues, I am doubtful a federal government is better equipped to make these decisions.

This is a good issue that has been worked out locally in northern California and I, from Pennsylvania, urge all of those from the East to look seriously at this compromise and accept it as a new way, a new direction to go in managing our national forests.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me speak to the rule. I think this rule is incredibly unfair given the complexity and the controversy surrounding this legislation that the Committee on Rules would deem that we can only have one amendment when in fact this is a multifaceted bill which now requires that we put all of the problems with this legislation in one amendment and accept it up or down, when in fact

there are parts of this bill that may very well be able to be fixed on individual votes but we are not allowed that opportunity.

I want to say that in the future, I think that when the ranking members of committees come before the Committee on Rules and ask for the opportunity to present differences in the form of amendments and those are not granted, I think we should just assume that the Committee on Rules then owes us time. If we need five amendments and they give us one, they owe us 4 hours of time. And we should take it out in terms of motions to rise or motions to adjourn or whatever it is to take up and get back that time, because this is unacceptable, an unacceptable practice of shutting down the voices of many Members of Congress that represent a different view on the reported legislation, and yet they are not entitled to offer those amendments or to seek to have the House record itself on those differences.

Now, to this legislation. This legislation is brought forth as a suggestion that somehow this embodies the Quincy Library Group, which was a group that was formed to try and see whether or not we could pull together the disparate forces and interests in our national forests, to see whether or not we could come up with a management plan for those forests. Somewhere between the Quincy Library Group and the floor of the House of Representatives today this process was hijacked. This process was hijacked by those who were interested in cutting trees, not in truly managing the forest.

That is why this legislation has very, very serious problems, problems that are highlighted by the administration in its statement of administrative positions, and that is why this legislation has terrible problems with not only many, many environmental organizations within the State of California but of the national environmental organizations.

Let us understand what we are talking about. One of the previous speakers got up and talked about private property or something. We are talking here about the public's resources. We are talking about the national forests of this Nation. These lands belong to the public. We want to encourage, and in fact the administration is already administratively doing a number of the things suggested in this legislation to work with local groups, but we must understand that as a Congress of the United States we are the stewards of those public lands and we cannot let people willy-nilly do what they want with those lands because they think, well, this would be good for me.

The fact of the matter is that this legislation exempts this pilot project of 2½ million acres of the public's lands from the environmental laws. It is not consistent with the environmental laws of this Nation that all other plans have to be governed by, and that is why the administration is opposed to this legislation at this time.

This legislation, in fact, contains the very same timber salvage rider that got this Congress into so much trouble with the American public when they saw that the cutting of trees took precedence over every other multiple use in the forest, whether it was fisheries or recreation or species protection or riparian protection, all of a sudden we found out that we could cut the trees without those considerations. This is a rerun of that language. If we read the language from the salvage rider and we read the language in this legislation, in fact, they are identical.

This legislation would exempt this pilot project if we complete the changes in the forest management plan for these particular forests, the Plumas and Lassen and Tahoe National Forests. It would exempt them from that if in fact they were done prior to the 5 years.

□ 1115

So if we find in all of the studies and all of the science that this is contrary to the best interest of these forests, they can continue to go forward; they can continue to go forward with this plan even if the new forest plans are put in place. Those are the kinds of terrible inconsistencies that shall threaten this forest.

Now, let us understand something about the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The Sierra Nevada Mountains in California are under incredible stress. There has been a huge infusion of population, of use, of very bad logging practices in the past. We have now been told in major study after major study that the entire forest system is at risk, that we have got to take care of it, that we have got to do it in a comprehensive fashion.

The President, I believe, is going out to Tahoe to look at the Tahoe National Forest which is part of this plan, to see whether or not there is a way in which we can secure the longevity of the Tahoe National Forest and the Sierras and not destroy the watersheds of Tahoe, one of the national jewels of this Nation, not destroy the watersheds of the rivers of these forests.

So my colleagues have to take it in that context when they look at this pilot project. But this pilot project, while well intentioned and hard worked on and federally financed, and it is going to probably spend about $80 million in Federal dollars to carry out the intent of this, we have got to make sure that this is, in fact, consistent with the environmental laws and with the other activities that are necessary in these forests.

A lot of those activities are driven now, in fact, by population. They are driven by people who want to use these forests for off-road vehicles, who want to use them for camping, for hiking, for biking, all of these other activities, and want to make sure that the watersheds are protected so that we, in fact, can continue to restore the fisheries and the recreational activities in the great rivers of northern California.

That is what is at stake in this legislation, and that is what this legislation does not address. I will be offering an amendment that will take the administration's objections and address them in this legislation and provide for the riparian protection. If that amendment is, in fact, adopted, I will support this legislation.

I believe, then, that this legislation is headed in the right direction and can achieve its goals. But absent that amendment, this legislation is seriously flawed with respect to the integrity of the environmental laws, to the forest plans, and to the multiple uses of these forests in the most populous State in this Nation.

These mountains and these forests are important to millions of Californians, and we will not delegate the right to destroy those forests to a handful of people who have decided that cutting trees is the only way that we can protect this forest. We can have clear-cuts under this legislation, we can decide that that is the most efficient way and, in fact, we can go ahead and just start clear-cutting some of the last of the big trees in California. That should not be allowed.

I would hope that the House would support my amendment. Then we can all go forward and support this legislation, because the process of the Quincy Library Group is, in fact, moral and right and should be encouraged. But this work product fails, fails to meet the needs of the State of California and of the people of this Nation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] by saying that this measure enjoys very strong bipartisan support in this House.

My friend from West Sacramento, CA [Mr. FAZIO] is a strong supporter of this. The gentleman from Marysville, CA [Mr. HERGER] has done a spectacular job in putting this together. And it has been, frankly, in some ways over his protest said before the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from Fort Yukon, AK [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Committee on Resources, has moved dramatically to end up supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the very, very compromising gentleman from Fort Yukon, AK [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak on the rule, but I do support this rule. There is a need for this quasi-modified rule to make sure we expedite this process. But I cannot stand by and listen to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] make the statements he has made, because we have worked on this legislation for four years.

As I told the chairman of the Committee on Rules the other day, I think they have gone too far as far as this negotiation process. But this is an attempt to listen to the local people, and we have done that. In fact, the Friends of the Plumas Wilderness Society, who have filed 15 lawsuits, 15 lawsuits to stop every logging operation in this area, now support my substitute.

I have a whole list of other people that support this legislation, and not the industry itself but the community that lives there. And, yes, this forest is endangered, not from logging but because of fire and mismanagement by the U.S. Forest Service.

It has finally dawned on people, we cannot manage this from Washington, D.C. This is a national asset, but we cannot manage it from those people who live here in Washington, D.C. or even the Congress that live outside. We ought to start listening to the people. This is what we are doing in this legislation. For the first time, we are bringing all parties together, not just this Congress but the parties that live there, the environmental community.

And may I just clear one up thing. There are no clear-cuts under my substitute at all, and no tree over 31 inches can be cut under my substitute, 31 inches in diameter. By the way, the substitute of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], keep in mind now he says he is doing what the Administration wants, and I am shocked. Because under my substitute, we protect the roadless areas. We protect those areas. And under the substitute of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], he does not protect the wilderness areas.

Then we have the environmental impact statements. This is one thing I cannot quite understand about this administration and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. My substitute gives one EIS and four smaller EIS statements. Take a look at page 8 or 10 of my substitute. Right there is a total of 5 environmental impact statements. Under the Miller substitute, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] offers one environmental impact statement. One, that is all he offers.

I never thought I would see the day the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] was out-environmentaling the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. That shocks me to death.

We keep talking about riparian restoration. The Miller substitute removes my provision of more funding for riparian rights, riparian recovery in this bill. May I suggest, we took the exact language from the administration, the exact language Jack Ward Thomas proposed. That is the language we used, the language the administration supports, so I do not know what the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is talking about.

We have communicated with the administration. We have communicated with the environmental community. We communicated with the industry itself. We communicated with the local people. We sat down with the Quincy Library Group and put together a good piece of legislation.

And may I close by saying, yes, our national forests are in terrible, deplorable shape, not because they were logged, but because this administration and, yes, other administrations decided that every area could live naturally. That may have been so many, many years ago. But look at the fires. I ask my colleagues to read the papers on fires that are occurring in California today and the fires that occur all the way around the Northwest, in Idaho, Utah, yes, even Alaska. Look at the volatility of those fires and the destruction that occurs. What happens after the fire, the soil is basically dead for our trees.

Every science that talks to us about our forests tells us we must start managing the forests, we must start looking at all alternatives, and this is what this bill does. It is a good, sound environmental bill. Remember, I remind you, the local environmentalists support this legislation.

Yes, the national environmentalists oppose it. You know why? Because they lose their control, and this is what this is all about, control. The environmental so-called community around Washington, DC, it knows nothing about the environment.

Let us start listening to the local people. Let us start listening to those that live there. Let us start saving our forests and our wildlife and the heritage we should leave to future generations.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Boise, ID [Mrs. CHENOWETH], my very, very good friend.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, just wanted to clarify the record following the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] about some of the statements that were made by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. I just want to make it perfectly clear and back up what the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] said, that this issue has far less to do with the forest health and jobs.

What the debate from the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] was about was about control by a select environmental group here in Washington, DC, who do not understand silvicultural management, who do not really understand the dynamics of good forest management.

H.R. 858 is not at all like the salvage rider. I worked on that salvage rider, and I supported it. But this is not at all like the salvage rider that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] claimed that it was. This pilot project, and let me reemphasize, it is a pilot project, is designed to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire and to prevent the need for salvage riders in the future because we will be taking care of the salvage in this particular area.

The legislation does not provide for clear-cuts. It is just the opposite. What it does call for is thinning of the forest and providing for shaded fuel breaks, in which the small trees are cut and the large trees are left to grow. That not only provides for healthy forests but healthy habitat and browse for wildlife.

In fact, the strategic fuel break system is that very system recommended in the SNEP report, the very scientific report that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] wants the Forest Service to use in the Sierra Nevadas.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I simply close by saying that this is a very fair and balanced approach because of the uniqueness of this 41-member coalition that has been assembled, the Quincy Library Group. And I would like to again congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Resources who, under his self-description, has out-environmentaled the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Marysville, CA [Mr. HERGER], who has done a superb job on this legislation over the past several years. And I would like to congratulate those Members on the other side of the aisle who have joined in this bipartisan coalition to ensure that we look at this issue in a very fair way.

I look forward to passage of this rule and passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to House Resolution 180 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 858.

□ 1129

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 858) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman

from California [Mr. MILLER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 858 is a good bill. It helps working people, it helps the environment, it saves the forest, and it helps wildlife. It certainly is not everything that I hoped for in terms of timber supply, and I will be the first one to say that again. But it is what the people in northern California want, and in northern California the people are directly affected, and I say all the people, and they deserve congressional help.

□ 1130

This is a pilot project. The bill is just as simple, just like the Quincy Library Group agreement. It directs the Forest Service to implement a science-based fire protection and forest health plan for three national forests in northern California. There are two cornerstones of the bill. Thinning, taking the volatility out of the forest, and fuelbreak work outside of roadless areas; and, second, a requirement to build fuelbreaks on 40,000 to 60,000 acres per year in roaded areas. This means thinning smaller trees, leaving larger trees, and generally improving the habitat and the condition of forests.

I want to stress again, everyone wins with this bill: Local environmental groups, timber workers, again the wildlife, school children, and communities throughout the region. That is why this bill has the support of heavy duty environmentalists like the Friends of Plumas Wilderness and the Plumas Audubon Society. These groups have sued to stop nearly every timber sale in northern California, but they support this bill.

Six labor organizations, like the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and the United Paperworkers, also support the bill. The California Farm Bureau, the Society of American Foresters, Governor Pete Wilson, State assembly members, California county education offices, county boards of supervisors all support the bill. I could go on and on with a list of those who support the legislation.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I did not think I would see the day when the staunchest people in the environmental movement, their timber company foes, the union work force, and government officials would actually agree on the timber issues in their own backyard.

That day came almost 1,500 days ago in the public library in Quincy, CA, when neighbors from all walks of life actually agreed on a forest health, land allocation, and economic stability plan. But the plan has not been implemented now for 4 years. People have tried. The Quincy Group is still trying. That is why we are here on the floor with this bill that directs the implementation of their plan.

It is a sad day, Mr. Chairman, that this Forest Service under this administration cannot do what we are directing them to do today in this plan. The management of our forests under this administration is deplorable. It is, in fact, a crime and a sin in what they have done to our forests, because there is no management.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH], the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], and I have been very, very reasonable in this bill, reasonable to the point that I am wondering whether we have made too many accommodations as I said when I spoke on the rule. It is really not what I would like. But again I want to stress it is up to the Congress to start listening to the people of America, especially those directly affected by actions of this Congress.

We have gone through 27 drafts of this bill between the 104th Congress and today. That bothers me to some extent because we are going to hear later on, ''We weren't told, we weren't notified, we weren't asked, we didn't participate.'' Twenty-seven different drafts were worked on.

No less than 50 modifications that the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] shepherded through her subcommittee and then through the full committee. My substitute has 16 changes plus 11 new subsections or paragraphs. Each address one or more of the concerns about the bill.

When national environmentalists complained that the bill might allow some timber harvesting in spotted owl habitat, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] removed two entire pages of the bill that gave rise to the concern.

When some said the Quincy bill did not protect water and riparian areas, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] offered an amendment that ensured that riparian areas would be protected with the same standards in the President's Northwest Forest Plan.

Recently, riparian restoration was raised. On page 4 of my substitute, the issue is addressed with an incentive-based, cost-effective way to restore riparian areas.

Some complained that the Quincy Library Group plan has never been the subject of an environmental impact statement. If Members would look on page 9 of my substitute, we require an environmental impact statement. The library group and I drafted it together. The same environmental leaders in northern California who have sued to block hundreds of timber sales sat with the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and myself to write language giving the Quincy plan an environmental impact statement.

A member of my committee said the Quincy plan would not even get a public hearing or other procedural safeguards. People are important. So in my substitute I included an assurance that there would be a 45-day public comment period.

Others said we were trying to exempt the bill from the National Environmental Policy Act. That was never true, but we included the environmental impact statement requirements and we included a subsection (m) which states, ''Nothing herein exempts this pilot project from any Federal environmental law.'' I do not think we could be any more clear than we want to follow the environmental laws.

Some said they were unsure whether the bill was consistent with the California Spotted Owl process. I am certain it is, but my substitute says that the California Owl Guidelines and any final owl guidelines will apply.

Frankly, this is an exercise in reasonableness on the part of the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the other members of the Committee on Resources and Members off the committee that support the bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] has been very helpful on the environmental impact statement portion.

With all these changes, it is no wonder so many groups support the Herger bill. Only the groups on the very fringe oppose the bill and they have no rational basis to do so. We tried to get them to the table, but they refused. There are groups that will never be satisfied. That is the way they make their living. Frankly I do not understand their thinking because I thought they were environmentalists.

I know from his past statements that the Secretary of Agriculture supports the Quincy plan. I asked him 6 weeks ago to assist us in crafting any changes to accommodate his concerns, but I have not heard back from him. We have been very bipartisan and bicameral in our approach. I also asked the junior Senator from California for her suggestions, and we have accommodated the concerns that she raised.

I urge Members to support my substitute and, by the way, reject the Miller substitute because as I mentioned in debate on the rule, his does not protect the riparian part of my bill. He in fact invades the roadless areas. As I said, I never thought I would see the day when I would be out-environmentaling the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], but I am doing this in my substitute. Again, I say to those who might have some questions, listen to the people of America. Listen to those that are directly affected. Yes, this is a national forest, but there are people that live in, around, and with the national forest that every day they wake up, they are faced with a problem of mismanagement under this administration. It is time that this Congress listen to those people and let us try this pilot project. What is the fear of trying a pilot project when we are failing today? Let us see if this works. If it works, it will be an example and a molding of how we can for the first time in many, many years address the

forest as a total entity, not as something far away, or from Roswell, NM. That is how they are managing it today, a bunch of aliens who have no concept about the potential of the fire damage, no concept of the homes that are lost, and the destruction not only of the forest but of the wildlife. If Members do not believe me, read the newspapers today, tomorrow, and the day after. What do they say about every Western State of the fires that are occurring? Because of the lack of management. This bill takes care of that problem and recognizes the need and necessity of cooperation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that there is no question that the gentlewoman from Idaho and the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of our committee, have worked very hard on this legislation, as have the people of the Quincy Library Group worked very hard on this legislation. But we are down to the point now where we have to vote and we have to decide whether or not this legislation meets the test of providing for the comprehensive protection of these forests or whether it does not.

The suggestion that somehow that these forests are in trouble because of this administration is just ludicrous. The fact of the matter is what has happened is this administration has had to go around and clean up after the previous administrations that decided they would not administer the forests at all, and we saw almost the entire Northwest and a good portion of California starting to be shut down economically because of the spotted owl. We now see that in fact resources are again being opened up under this administration, that cooperative agreements are being entered into with some of the largest timber companies in the country, and supplies are being returned to the market.

But where are we with respect to the Quincy Library Group? The Quincy Library Group, in their name this legislation is being put forth, and it is unfortunate to have to report to the Congress of the United States that this legislation simply does not meet the test to provide for the protection of the Sierra Nevada Forest, of the three forests that are involved in this pilot project of 2.5 million acres, that it does not comply with the environmental laws of this Nation.

I wish it did, because we have been strong supporters, many people on both sides of the aisle, of this process to try to improve and increase the voices of those people who live in the direct area. But we also have to make the bottom line decision that these forests belong to all of the people of the United States, just as Yellowstone National Park does, as Grand Canyon does, as the Appalachian forests do, of the great forests of the Midwest, of the public lands. These forests belong to the people of this Nation, and we have the stewardship obligations to make sure that these forests will be healthy, that these forests are sustainable so that future generations will have the same enjoyment, both economically, from a recreational point of view, for the use of their families, and from an environmental point of view that our generation has had.

That is the test, and that is why the Quincy Library Group exists, to see whether or not we can manage these forests on a sustained basis now, sustaining them economically and sustaining them for multiple uses. That was not the policy for the past 50 years, of both administrations, Democratic and Republican. It was that the forests were simply a crop, just cut them down and go on about your merry business. Now we find ourselves in terrible shape.

For the people of California, 33 million people, that use the Sierra Nevadas as a major recreational resource, for the millions of people who come from around the world to use the Sierra Nevada for a recreational resource, this resource is in trouble. That is why we are willing to try something like Quincy Library. But Quincy Library has got to be prepared to do it within the environmental laws of this country.

That is why the Clinton administration has sent a letter to this Congress telling us that this legislation, while they support the process, while they funded, they put $4 million into Quincy Library, that this product as it is presented to this Congress at this time is a flawed product. It is a flawed product basically because it fails and it is inconsistent with the environmental law compliance on current environmental procedures. This project is not designed so the project will be carried out consistent with the environmental laws. They state that time and again in this legislation.

My amendment is addressed to the points raised by the administration to bring this project into compliance, so that in fact when we do amend the forest plans in Plumas, the forest plans in Tahoe, this project will be brought in compliance. It will not be run if the science tells us that we are taking too many trees or we do not have the correct firebreaks or we are not protecting the streams in the right fashion. This legislation should not be able to operate outside those scientific findings, but that is what this bill allows this project to do.

I appreciate that the process is subject to environmental impact studies, but the project itself is exempted in many ways. The 2.5 million acres, the 300,000 acres of timber harvest, the riparian protections are exempted. In fact, if we go back and read Public Law 104–19, we will find language in here that saddens this Nation, that this Congress and this President at one moment said you could cut trees without consideration of the environmental laws, without the multiple use, without taking into consideration the impact of that activity on the rest of the forest.

We learned our lesson. We learned our lesson when the public told us that was unacceptable. Yet when we go to this legislation that is before us here today, we find out that the same language is present in this legislation. One of the horrible black marks on our environmental record of this Congress and this Government is now being brought back to us in this legislation.

What does that say? That language says that you can cut these trees and you never have to take into consideration the cumulative impact: Are you destroying the great rivers of northern California with siltation and debris and the fisheries? Are you having an adverse impact on Lake Tahoe? Are you having an adverse impact on the surrounding forests? Are you destroying the ability of diverse species to live in these forests? Are you causing erosion that is beyond your control and will destroy the ability of these forests to come back? Under this legislation you do not have to take that into consideration. ''The Secretary concerned shall not rely on salvage timber sales as a basis for administrative action limiting other multiple use activities.''

□ 1145

That is where we are today. It is not that we disagree with what the people of Quincy Library have tried to do and how hard they have worked. It is not that we disagree with what the chairman of this committee is trying to do and the gentlewoman from Idaho has spent so much time on this legislation. It is that this legislation needs about four or five small technical fixes which would bring it into compliance with the environmental laws and modern practices so that we do not repeat the horrendous mistakes that almost destroyed the Sierra Nevada forests of California, that have in fact destroyed the fisheries, the great fisheries, of many of the streams and rivers in northern California where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to try and recover those fisheries so that people can use them with their families.

And now this legislation puts 2½ million acres into a pilot project. Nothing wrong with that pilot project except that it does not comply with the laws of this Nation; it does not comply, it will not have to comply, with the amendments and the changes and the forest plans for these three forests. And unfortunately because of many, many years of neglect, we do not have a lot of trees to waste, we cannot be wrong for the next generation, or our grandchildren. Where we once enjoyed great, great forests of the West, our grandchildren will enjoy scrub bush, Manzanilla, and eroded soils.

Have my colleagues ever tried pitching a tent in that kind of area? Ever

try to enjoy that when it is 105 degrees in the foothills of California? That is not why people live in California.

This is about the future of these resources, and Quincy Library has all of the possibilities and the abilities to make a positive contribution to the protection of the Sierra Nevada forests. But that is not what this legislation does. It can be easily corrected with my amendment, and then we can all support this legislation.

I am sure there will be those who are unhappy with my amendment, that it does not go far enough, but I think it maintains the integrity of our national environmental laws, and it maintains the integrity of the Quincy Resource Group.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding this time to me.

Let me just say I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to commend particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] who has spent so much time and has dedicated so much of himself to bringing us here, to bringing us here today.

Let me say to my good friend from California, Mr. MILLER, with whom I have shared so many common positions on environmental issues, I am not going to go down the litanies of things that the gentleman pointed out in terms of where this bill may differ with other national policy that we have passed here, but I would say to the gentleman that we in this House have got to stop looking at environmental issues from a white and black point of view. There has got to be some middle ground, and I believe this bill finds that middle ground.

In fact, for the past 2½ years I have been advocating State and local participation as a means to rationally implement laws like the Endangered Species Act. Only those closest to home of endangered species can understand the impact of protecting them and the impact on local people and on local businesses, and that is why in my opinion the future of environmental protection is on State and local partnerships with the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this bill brings to us. H.R. 858 is a bill that puts this theory of State and local in a Federal partnership into place. H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997, implements a 5-year pilot project, a locally conceived solution to a forest health crisis in California. This program is aimed at maintaining community stability, improving forest health and preventing wildfires and making fuelbreaks in our national forests in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] which are so important.

What is so unique about this bill is its origins. In direct response to President Clinton's directive at the Forest Summit in April 1993, the Quincy Library Group was formed. It was comprised of local environmental organizations, the wood products industry, citizens and local officials. They took seriously the President's charge at that April meeting when he said, ''When you leave here today, I ask you to keep working for a balanced policy that promotes economy, preserves jobs and protects the environment.'' He said, ''I hope we can stay in the conference room and out of the courtroom.''

The Quincy Library Group plan emerged, and it is based on the Sierra Nevada ecosystem project and vastly improves the odds of saving endangered species habitat from fire damage.

My colleagues may hear from some environmental groups that my friend from California was advocating, whose position he was advocating, that they are not thrilled with the bill. Some of their criticism stems from the perception that the administration did not have enough negotiating time to draft an alternative solution. I do not agree. The bill was not even drafted until the plan remained unimplemented by the Forest Service for 1,400 days. That is 4 years. And H.R. 858 was then introduced on February 22, 1997, with bipartisan support.

In conclusion, H.R. 858 shows that locally conceived environmental solutions are possible and should be encouraged by Congress, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], the author of the bill, from the area which is directly affected.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, for more than 15 years, environmentalists and members of the forest products industry have waged war over managing western forests, and like all wars this conflict has had its share of victims. The victims of the forest management debate include schools left with dramatically reduced funding.

Twenty-five percent of all timber sales receipts are promised by mandate to fund local education and country road programs. When sales decline, so does education. Other victims are communities faced with extreme unemployment rates and an environment clogged with unhealthy forests.

In 1993 Bill Coats, Plumas County supervisor from Quincy, CA, took up the challenge of breaking the gridlock over forest management. He did so by arranging a meeting with environmental attorney Michael Jackson and Sierra Pacific Industries forester Tom Nelson. They met in the library because they knew that there they would not be yelling at each other.

The Quincy Library Group is now a coalition of 41 local environmentalists, forest product industry representatives, public officials, and concerned citizens who met each month at the Quincy Library to discuss ways to improve local forest health.

This program has been endorsed by local environmental organizations including the Plumas Audubon Society, the Friends of the Plumas Wilderness, the Sierra Nevada Alliance, and the Shasta-Tehama Bi-regional Council. At the heart of their discussions is the overriding threat that fire will destroy the forest before any action can be taken.

Nationwide last year more than 5.8 million acres burned with total fire suppression costs of close to $1 billion of taxpayer dollars. The group turned to the best science available, including the recently released Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project [SNEP] report which defines, among other things, the elements of a healthy forest.

H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Forest Group and Economic Stability Act of 1997, takes the first vital step toward conflict resolution of environmental issues across the United States. This legislation is all about compromise and consensus building on the local level. H.R. 858 is not about local control of national forests but about local input on forest management through implementation of a 5-year pilot project on portions of the Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in northern California. In short, this is all about local wisdom gaining a voice in our forests. The Federal Government still retains complete control over implementation.

The Quincy Library Group implements most of these elements through the following goals: First, reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire; second, protect environmentally sensitive areas; third, implement critical watershed stream and water quality restoration; and fourth, provide economic stability for communities dependent on the wood products industry. These goals are accomplished through implementation of a 5-year pilot project on three of California's threatened forests. My legislation implements a strategic system of defensible fuel profile zones including shaded fuelbreaks that contain fires in the more manageable forest understory.

Again, the Quincy Library Group bill is clearly science based. It improves forest health by implementing the SNEP fuelbreak program to reduce fire risk. Its riparian protection guidelines were written by scientists led by Dr. Jack Ward Thomas, former chief of the Forest Service under the Clinton administration and architect of the science work underlying the northern spotted owl debate.

Through these elements of the program, fire suppression personnel will have the ability to contain fires before they get out of hand. The proposal also implements uneven-aged forest management prescriptions utilizing individual tree selection, and thinnings and group selection to achieve optimal forest health by creating an all-age multistory, fire-resilient forest.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. BOB SMITH, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding this time to me.

This is finally a compromise that I have been looking for for at least 10 years. In my experience we have not hit balance in the practice of forestry in this country, and certainly that is evident by what has happened in the Pacific Northwest where we find in region 6, the States of Oregon and Washington, 85 percent of the public forests are shut down to any kind of management. For the first time in after 4 years, and of course it plays a very important part here, after 4 years the Quincy Library Group has finally found balance, I believe, and here again, if there are those of my colleagues who are concerned about the environmental impact here, there are four environmental impact studies in this legislation, four.

So do not let anybody fool us about how the environment is going to be taken advantage of here.

The issue here very simply is what happens when we lose the resource, and that is catastrophic fire. We rely upon science now. We rely upon science as the evidence of what will happen in the future if we do not manage forests. That is what Quincy Library Group did. Evidence here by Dr. Chad Oliver, including nine scientists across the country who have testified before our committee twice now, and one of the options they present is no management. What do we get when you have no management? I will tell my colleagues what is received. Received finally loss of specie, receive loss of water quality and quantity, and finally receive loss of the resource because finally it will burn, finally it will burn.

Mr. Dombeck, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before our committee that there are 40 million acres of land under stress of catastrophic fire or the possibility of catastrophic fire in this country.

□ 1200

Most of them are in the West. He testified that we are going to service only 1 million acres. I ask, 40 years later, what do we have? We have lost our forests. That is unacceptable. The Quincy Library Group addresses the issue because they manage the forests in a balanced fashion, which will manage the threat to ecosystem health crisis and catastrophic fires.

The bill obviously, as we have heard, is the wisdom of local stakeholders. We all know that that is better opportunity and better judgment than we can find even here in these hallowed halls, because the people in California understand the issue better than any of us do. They came forward, environmentalists, labor leaders, forest people, and they came with the idea that we ought to have this kind of management process.

Also, this bill is a clear issue of measurement. We must measure what happens. That is very important to the Congress and to those folks in California as well. There is an old saying, when performance is measured performance improves, and when performance is measured and reported back, the rate of improvement accelerates. We must measure what happens with Quincy Library.

Finally, the fundamental principle here is that we need to manage our forests to save them. We need to manage them to save them. If we are going to help 40 million acres in this country, this is just the beginning. This may be a pilot project, but this may be the beginning of an opening of pilot projects around the country to prove again that we should manage our forests, manage them scientifically, and manage them for every resource.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Health and Economic Stability Act of 1997. I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], for his work on this legislation.

This bill would implement a community-based solution to improve the ecological and economic health of three northern California communities. Catastrophic wildfire is a chief threat to the ecological integrity of the forest system. By treating the landscape through a system of strategic fuelbreaks, this plan effectively implements the principles of ecosystem management, thereby providing forest conditions for wildlife, fish, and human beings. In addition, this bill provides interim protection of all roadless areas in the three forests.

I would like to applaud the Quincy Library Group for their efforts in developing this plan. Representatives of local environmental groups, labor unions, wood product organizations, and local government officials sat down and hammered out a plan to address the challenges facing their community. I would like to encourage more local communities to work together to find practical solutions to address their problems.

I am greatly encouraged to know that folks with such different interests can sit down and reasonably work out a solution based on sound science, bipartisan cooperation, and local expertise even on a sometimes controversial issue like forest management.

Finally, H.R. 858 is not exempt from environmental laws. It simply provides for a 5-year pilot project in which the Forest Service retains complete control of its implementation. Let us give this type of community-based bipartisan scientific approach a chance to work.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Health and Economic Stability Act of 1997.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act.

In April 1993 at the Northwest Forest Summit, President Clinton put forth a challenge to a community in northern California in the midst of timber wars and litigation brought about by the listing of the northern spotted owl and a reduction of logging levels in the forests of northern California.

President Clinton said to the people in the local area of Quincy, CA: ''When you leave here today, I ask you to keep working for a balanced policy that promotes the economy, preserves jobs, and protects the environment. I hope we can stay in the conference room and out of the courtroom.''

So a group of local citizens around Quincy, CA, including the local county supervisor, timber employees, and members of the local environmental community, and they are strong environmentalists, I might say, seized the President's challenge. The group had their first meeting at the public library in Quincy because it was the only location which assured quiet, civil discussion about many difficult and contentious issues and concerns that divided the regional community.

The manager's amendment before us today is the result of 4 years of consensus building on issues that do not easily lend themselves to a consensus. We can see that here on the floor today, because we could resolve this here. I hope we will.

The bill provides a framework for managing the forests of the Sierra Nevada through fire suppression, watershed protection and riparian restoration and seeks to direct these activities toward meeting the local needs of communities dependent on these forests for economic livelihood.

Since my colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. WALLY HERGER, introduced this bill early in this Congress, H.R. 858 has come a long way. I testified before the committee in March as a cosponsor of this bill in support of the process of local people getting together to work out problems in their community. But I also acknowledged that the bill still had a long way to go. In any attempt to put an agreement into legislative language the devil remained in the details. What followed in northern California after the committee hearing was perhaps one of the most remarkable steps forward we have seen in this country since the two sides embattled in a debate over our Nation's forests first butted their heads together.

Members of the QLG, the Forest Service, Congress and the national environmental community came together in an attempt to work out further differences. Much progress was made in the several meetings which were held during the past few months. But as is always true with consensus, not all the glitches were ironed out.

Provisions have been added which ensure compliance with environmental laws as well as interim and final California spotted owl guidelines, and there is an authorization for additional appropriations for the Forest Service to implement the Quincy Library Group proposal. But I know the administration still had a some concerns.

I am sympathetic with the amendment being offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER which addresses some of the issues raised and ensures a straightforward interpretation of the bill's environmental protection provisions. But here we are arguing about interpretation of language and not legislative intent, which I believe is the same, if not very similar. We can reach closure, and I hope we will, before the amendment is offered and hopefully broadly supported.

Senator FEINSTEIN has also been working with the QLG, the administration, and members of the environmental community on Senate legislation which I believe will move us closer to a bill which has something in it for just about everyone.

As I have said all along, this bill is a work in progress. But I feel certain if we continue to work together, not only on the floor today but as the bill proceeds to the Senate, we will be able to send a bill to the White House that the President will not only sign, but do so gladly.

So I urge my colleagues to enable this work in progress to move forward today by voting ''yes'' on this bill, hopefully on an amendment that has been agreed to by both sides to further clarify intent, but even without, if no agreement is reachable today. This bill deserves to be sent forward so the process of refinement can continue.

Let me simply say, I think we have to put more faith in communities that are at odds with each other but are willing to work together to come to solutions. We cannot solve every problem in Washington. We cannot solve every problem in the Forest Service without input from local people. I think what the gentleman from California, Mr. WALLY HERGER, has attempted to do and which I have joined him in the effort to accomplish is to validate that process that these local community activists have so long and thoroughly engaged in.

This is not a bill that is perfect, but it is getting close, and it deserves to be supported by a broad bipartisan coalition on this floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Alaska, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of comment here today about, what about cumulative impacts as a result of the Quincy Library Group proposal succeeding; what about cumulative impacts on rivers and streams and on wildlife; what about sedimentation and soil erosion?

Mr. Chairman, it just does not take a rocket scientist to realize that when you have uncontrollable fires in the forests, it destroys the wildlife, the little critters and the big critters. That is a horrible way to die, let us face it. It does not take a rocket scientist to understand that when we have uncontrolled forest fires that it destroys the sedimentation and we have massive erosion. That is what is causing the pollutant load in our streams and our rivers.

I am so impressed with the work of the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and the work of the Quincy Library Group. I have been impressed by the way in which this unlikely coalition of individuals, each with strongly held beliefs, have worked together to achieve a common goal. That is to preserve the ecology of the forests where they work, where they live, and where they play, and to protect the jobs, economy, and the social fabric of their community. They have that right in America, and we should back them up.

For the economy, the Quincy Library Group bill means jobs. The fuelbreaks and selection harvests will generate 2,250 family-wage jobs each year, and 12,250 jobs over the life of this pilot project. This counts only the direct jobs that are produced, but the indirect jobs that are generated will more than double those figures. Mr. Chairman, that amounts to 25,000 jobs. These family-wage jobs are sorely needed in a community where we have seen at least 32 mills that have closed in just the recent years.

If now we can break the gridlock over environmental issues by implementing a locally developed solution that also puts people back to work, then we are doing the right thing. I believe if jobs are the only issue, the Quincy Library Group would not have reached the agreement on a legislative proposal, but they also agreed that something must be done to ensure a clean, safe, and healthy environment for the short- and the long-term future.

Their plan will improve the environment in the following important ways: It improves the health of the forests by thinning smaller trees and allowing better forest habitat to develop; it quickly begins to reduce the extreme fire risk in the Sierras, using a strategy described and recommended in the recent scientific report known as the SNEP report, or the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project report; it protects streamside areas and fisheries with the provision I added to the bill in my committee, which applies the same riparian measures that are included in the President's forest plan; and it preserves roadless areas, while focusing on thinning and forest health activities in areas that are already roaded.

It ensures that spotted owl habitat will not be entered for timber harvesting, since in committee we removed a provision that would have allowed limited harvesting after catastrophic events, and it ensures, through the manager's amendment, that the project will receive an EIS, so environmental laws apply.

While I do not necessarily believe there should be more wilderness, and I question the need for the riparian guidelines used in the President's forest plan, I recognize that the QLG plan is part of a balanced compromise based on commonsense solutions. The Quincy Library Group has convinced me that their plan will address ecological concerns, sustain a viable community, and allow people to make a living. We must now support their goal and ''just say no'' to those in the national conflict industry who oppose this bill.

As the Quincy Library Group told my subcommittee, they heeded the President's call to leave the courtroom and meet at the conference table. The result, H.R. 858, will break the timber gridlock, at least in one part of northern California. Environmental leaders, timber companies and the many others who make up the Quincy Library Group have agreed that it is not a sin to cut a tree, and it is important to move forward with a plan to protect the forests that they love.

Now it is important that we support their effort and provide the means to implement that plan by passing H.R. 858.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished minority member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG for working with me and others who had concerns about this bill. I think we now have a bill which allows an important experiment to move forward, while ensuring that it proceeds within the framework of existing environmental law. That is very important to me and many of my colleagues in this House.

I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy to clarify a few points.

First, under the Young substitute, I would ask the gentleman from Alaska, would an environmental impact statement have to be completed before the pilot project got underway?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, it would.

Mr. BOEHLERT. In the event that an environmental review found that the project was in some way at odds with environmental law or the spotted owl

guidelines, then the project would have to be altered accordingly?

□ 1215

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct. The bill does not exempt the project from any environmental law and it explicitly references the spotted owl guidelines.

Mr. BOEHLERT. One final question, Mr. Chairman. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent the Forest Service from undertaking site-specific analysis as part of an environmental impact statement?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. No, there is not.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those assurances. I think that my colleagues can now see how this bill provides adequate environmental protection. This valuable locally developed experiment will be able to go forward to the extent that it passes muster under existing environmental law. We have provided no special dispensations but we have ensured that the initial stages of environmental review cannot be dragged on indefinitely.

I think this Congress needs to do everything possible to advance locally developed solutions to environmental issues, but those solutions must be in compliance with environmental, Federal environmental law. This bill satisfies both of those goals. This bill would advance a locally negotiated, created, worthy 5-year experiment while ensuring that the experiment moves forward only to the extent that it complies with Federal environmental law. It is exactly the right approach to the stewardship of Federal lands that belong to us all. Creative management, full-fledged protection.

In forest management in particular, this strategy has been lacking. On one side we have those who want to ban all logging in Federal forests; on the other, those who want to limit the role of environmental concerns in managing those forests. But those extremes must be rejected. This bill rejects them.

I am pleased this bill has been revised to represent a true middle ground. I want to thank all of those on both sides of the aisle who have worked so cooperatively with the Quincy Library Group. This is how the system should work. I want to commend both the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] in particular with whom I have had the privilege of working closely. I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working cooperatively with us.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, as vice chairman of the Western Caucus, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 858 and my opposition to the substitute offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. In November of 1992, representatives from local environmental organizations, local foresters, local elected officials, and interested citizens began meeting at the library in Quincy, CA. The result of this effort is the legislation we have before us today, H.R. 858, a proposal that is good for forests, good for people, and good for the environment.

Using the best and most current science available, the Quincy Library Group has brought before us a 5-year forest management pilot program that strengthens the health of the forest in the Quincy region by reducing the catastrophic wildfires, restoring streams and watersheds, prohibiting timber harvesting in all designated roadless areas, and saving endangered species.

H.R. 858 represents a bold new approach to solving today's environmental problems, an approach that is long overdue. The legislation put forward by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] marks the new beginning of an era of environmentalism in America, one that emphasizes local wisdom, local cooperation, and incentives not in conflict and controversy.

For too long we have placed our trust into the hands of nameless, faceless Washington bureaucrats to decide what is best for our environment and our well-being in local communities like Quincy. In order to better protect the environment, we must move beyond the outdated approaches of the past. We must replace the old Federal command and control approach to environmental protection with one that rewards local stewardship and private property incentives. H.R. 858 achieves these important objectives.

Mr. Chairman, do not let the eco-thugs destroy the environment of northern California. Vote no on the Miller amendment and yes on H.R. 858, the Quincy Library bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me as I rise in opposition to H.R. 858, the Quincy Library legislation and in support of the Miller amendment to H.R. 858.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because this committee bill, despite the valiant efforts of the distinguished chairman of the committee, whom I hold in the highest esteem, this bill is not what it appears to be. It does not provide forestry stream protection. It does not promote adequate public input. It does not provide environmental controls on logging. Indeed, in spite of the efforts of our distinguished chairman, H.R. 858 is a facade. The legislation is not even necessary.

The goals stated in this bill could easily be accomplished at less cost and with less controversy by administrative action. What may have started out as a laudable plan by a small group of concerned citizens has not resulted in fulfilling the original concept of forest protection. If Congress intends to go forward with this legislation, it should at a minimum, at a minimum, Mr. Chairman, include the Miller amendment to bring H.R. 858 into compliance with Federal environmental laws governing forest protection and particularly the protection of the spotted owl and its habitat in the region.

The Miller amendment stipulates that environmental impact statements under the legislation must be prepared in accordance with existing Federal law. The management of these vast tracts of California forest should be based on sound science and environmental policy. We should not proceed with anything less than the Miller amendment.

While the original goal of the Quincy Library Group, and indeed the distinguished chairman, was to reduce catastrophic wildfires, that is an important goal for the Quincy communities and surrounding forest, it has been lost in this debate. H.R. 858 is a drastic departure from the intended goal. Instead H.R. 858 sets a poor example for citizen involvement by allowing Federal laws to be circumvented and sends the message that the activities of local communities can be made immune from Federal laws governing Federal forests.

The echo from this message will reverberate in future forest management decisions, signalling that environmental laws can be disregarded. Let us not set a bad precedent today. I urge my colleagues to support the Miller amendment when it is offered later and to oppose final passage of this bill, if the Miller amendment is not adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think what is becoming clear in this debate is there is clearly an agreement in terms of purpose and intent, I believe, essentially among all parties to this legislation; that is, that we ought to try and see as to whether or not local communities can be involved to a greater extent, can help the Federal Government design forest practices and forest management that is consistent with the interest of those communities. When I say those communities, I mean it in the broadest regard, as is reflected in the Quincy Library where we have included the environmental community, the business communities, the forest industries community, those interested in recreation, small businesses and all of the rest, that those communities get a great deal of consideration and participation in the design of the management and the practices on our forests.

Where I think this debate departs is that in designing this pilot project, we have run into some glitches that I think are minor in terms of intent but important in terms of the law and important in terms of trying to reduce

the potential for litigation on this pilot project. My amendment seeks to address those concerns that have been raised by this administration. It has been funded, it has been championed, it has been motivating, the Quincy Library Group. I am sure that we are disappointed that we are at this stage, but they have come forth and I admit they only came forth this morning or late yesterday afternoon with the statement of administrative position clearly outlining these important changes that they sought. But we should not argue about whether or not the administration came forward on a timely basis. What we ought to do is to see whether or not, in fact, we can clear up those concerns so that we can have, in fact, here a unified position on this legislation. We will have the ability to expedite it through the Senate and have it in fact become the law so that we can get on with this process.

A number of speakers have alluded to the fact that the Quincy Library Group has been meeting for a very, very long time, that this work product, their desire, has been around a considerable period of time. It would be a shame that if after we get consideration of this in the House, then, in fact, we find out that we cannot get consideration because of these remaining controversies, we cannot get consideration of it in the Senate where it languishes and I think it is fair to say that that would be a very real problem.

I think with the acceptance of these amendments, we basically have legislation where we have the kind of agreement that allows for the expediting of this within the other body. I would hope that as I get prepared to offer my amendment, that all parties who have worked so very, very hard on this legislation would understand that I think in some cases we are talking about a difference in language, maybe not a difference of intent. It is clear that the gentlewoman from Idaho, the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and others have gone a long distance in trying to address those concerns. But now we have a clearly stated list of concerns from the administration that in fact are going to have to be addressed, whether they are addressed here or addressed later. We ought to address them here and dramatically improve the chances of this legislation becoming law so that people in Quincy Library can get on with this pilot project.

Ordinarily you would not think that this would be terribly important, when we are talking about a pilot project, but as I tried to say in my opening remarks, we are talking about a forest system in our State of California that is under a great deal of stress, a forest system that a lot of changes have to be made in, and there is not a lot of room for error, whether you are from the forest industries side of the equation or whether you are from the environmental side of the equation or whether you are a small business trying to sell gasoline and food and recreational supplies to people who come there to use it. If we do not from this date forward manage these forests correctly, we run the risk of losing these forests for many, many generations. We cannot afford to do that.

I think that is the purpose of the administration's amendments, which, again, comes from an administration that created the Quincy Library Group, has funded the Quincy Library Group, and now finds itself in a position where it has, I believe, four or five recommendations to make this bill consistent with the environmental laws of their concern. I would hope that we would be able to address those when I offer my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I have followed this process as a person who comes from a district where the forest wars have raged during my entire tenure in Congress. I have followed the Quincy Library project with great hope as a way to move away from embittered and polarized interests to some solutions that make sense. I am very concerned that we have ended up with a bill on the floor that the administration has raised strong objections to a few points of language and concerns within the bill. I am hoping that we work that out, because I would like to see this project go forward to implementation.

□ 1230

Because it is finally moving away from the forestry we have been practicing in this country since NFMA and before that, which is the approach of save and sacrifice. That is, over here we will have huge clearcuts, and over here we will put some land aside. The President's plan was an improvement, but what it did was saved more and sacrificed less. It did not look at alternative management.

This project would, over a wide and large land base, first, reserve roadless areas, reserve wilderness areas, enhance riparian protections, follow all the recommendations for the spotted owl recovery program in terms of canopy closure, but it would engage in what is called light touch, uneven aged stand management, light touch forestry, over about a quarter of this land base. Now, that, to me, is a step forward in recovering the health of this ecosystem and in beginning to turn down the temperature on these conflicts.

There are some who have vested interests in continuing the conflict, and they are going to object even if we come to a reasonable conclusion here, those at the poles of this debate. But I believe the vast majority of the people want to see us work out an agreement here that can be signed into law by the President, that will allow us to look at a different type of forest management to recover forest health and leave those areas that are already healthy alone.

That is what the Quincy Library project is about. Those were the conclusions that were reached by this local group, rather amazingly. I was very skeptical when we put forward funding for the Quincy Library project. I said we will never get strong environmentalist and strong industry advocates to sit down in a room together and agree on much of anything. Well, there has been substantial agreement, but now the disagreement has gone beyond the walls of the Quincy Library to here on the floor, where we still have a few fine points to work out so that we can ensure that we have a bill that is acceptable to the administration and that we can go forward.

Again, reserve the roadless areas, reserve the wilderness areas, enhance the protections, follow the spotted owl guidelines, but go to light touch uneven aged stand management on those lands outside of those critical areas that are not in a very healthy condition. It would definitely be a step forward in our understanding of how we might recover some of the damage that has been caused by mismanagement of Federal forestlands over the last half century here in this country.

So I am hopeful that it will be possible to come to that sort of an agreement here on the floor today. I will support the gentleman's amendment when it is offered later and am hopeful that we can work out any other differences.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act.

In April 1993, at the Northwest Forest Summit, President Clinton put forth a challenge to a community in northern California in the midst of timber wars and litigation brought about by the listing of the northern spotted owl and a reduction in logging levels in the forests of northern California.

President Clinton said to the people local to the area of Quincy, CA, "When you leave here today, I ask you to keep working for a balanced policy that promotes the economy, preserves jobs and protects the environment, I hope we can stay in the conference room and out of the courtroom."

A group of local citizens around Quincy, CA—including public officials, timber employees, and members of the environmental community—seized the President's challenge.

The group had their first meeting at the public library in Quincy—the only location which assured quiet, civil discussion about many difficult and contentious issues and concerns.

The manager's amendment before us today is the result of 4 years of consensus building on issues that do not easily lend themselves to a consensus.

The bill provides a framework for managing the forests of the Sierra Nevada through fire suppression, watershed protection and riparian restoration, and seeks to direct these activities toward meeting the local needs of communities dependent on these forests for economic livelihood.

Since my colleague, WALLY HERGER, introduced this bill early in the 105th Congress, H.R. 858 has come a long way.

I testified before the committee in March as a cosponsor of this bill, in support of the process of local people getting together to work out problems in the community. But I also acknowledged that the bill still had a long way to go.

In any attempt to put an agreement into legislative language, the devil remained in the details.

What followed in northern California after the committee hearing was perhaps one of the most remarkable steps forward we have seen in this country since the two sides embattled in the debate over our Nation's forests first butted their heads together—members of the QLG, the Forest Service, Congress, and the national environmental community came together in an attempt to work out further differences.

Much progress was made in the several meetings which were held during the past few months, but as is always true with consensus, not all the glitches were ironed out.

Provisions have been added which ensure compliance with environmental laws as well as interim and final California spotted owl guidelines, and there is an authorization for additional appropriations for the Forest Service to implement the Qunicy Library Group proposal.

But I know that the administration still has some concerns, and I am supportive of the amendment being offered by my colleague GEORGE MILLER, which addresses some of the issues raised and ensures a straightforward interpretation of the bill's environmental protection provisions.

Senator FEINSTEIN has also been working with the QLG, the administration, and members of the environmental community on Senate legislation, which I believe will move us closer to a bill which has something in it for just about everyone.

As I have said all along, this bill is a work in progress.

But I feel certain that if we continue to work together, the House and the Senate will be able to send a bill to the White House that the President will sign.

I urge my colleagues to enable this work in progress to move forward today by voting yes on H.R. 858.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 858 offered by Representative MILLER which would ensure the environmental integrity of an otherwise bad bill. Based on its own merit, H.R. 858 is a bill that would have serious environmental and fiscal impacts.

Proponents of H.R. 858 have sold the bill as a consensus between environmentalists and the timber industry. In reality, no such consensus exists. Environmental organizations from the affected forests oppose this bill. To date, not a single environmental organization has endorsed the bill. Further, when the Clinton administration hosted meetings between the Quincy Library Group and environmental organizations, the Quincy Library Group ended those negotiations. So much for collaboration.

There are a number of serious concerns with the legislation. If enacted, this bill would double the amount of logging that is currently being practiced on the Lassen and Plumas National Forests and the Sierraville Ranger District of the Tahoe National Forest. Further, there are no assurances that the logging will not violate environmental law. The massive experiment consisting of up to 350,000 acres of logging over a 5-year period, would be done prior to environmental review. This is fundamentally contrary to the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and National Forest Management Act. The experiment could cause tremendous harm on the ground.

Finally, the bill is bad for the taxpayers. The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the implementation of the increased logging levels that would be allowed by H.R. 858 would cost taxpayers $83 million over the next 5 years. This money will come from other programs on the Lassen and Plumas National Forests. It is fiscally irresponsible to continue to spend taxpayer dollars to subsidize an increased logging program that already costs taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

Representative MILLER allows the pilot project to go forward, but simply makes sure that no environmental laws are waived or superseded. What could possibly be wrong with that?

Let's do the right thing for the environment. The environmental analysis should determine the levels of logging, not a handful of local residents who would ask the rest of the taxpayers to pay the $83 million price tag for a project that makes an end run around our country's environmental laws.

I urge my colleagues to support the Miller amendment, and if accepted, to support H.R. 858.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment numbered 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute numbered 1 is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. PILOT PROJECT FOR PLUMAS, LASSEN, AND TAHOE NATIONAL FORESTS TO IMPLEMENT QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP PROPOSAL.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal'' means the agreement by a coalition of representatives of fisheries, timber, environmental, county government, citizen groups, and local communities that formed in northern California to develop a resource management program that promotes ecologic and economic health for certain Federal lands and communities in the Sierra Nevada area. Such proposal includes the map entitled ''QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP Community Stability Proposal'', dated June 1993, and prepared by VESTRA Resources of Redding, California.

(b) PILOT PROJECT REQUIRED.—

(1) PILOT PROJECT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Agriculture (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary''), acting through the Forest Service, shall conduct a pilot project on the Federal lands described in paragraph (2) to implement and demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities described in subsection (d) and the other requirements of this section, as recommended in the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal.

(2) PILOT PROJECT AREA.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot project on the Federal lands within Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest in the State of California designated as ''Available for Group Selection'' on the map entitled ''QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP Community Stability Proposal'', dated June 1993 (in this section referred to as the ''pilot project area''). Such map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS AND RIPARIAN PROTECTION.—

(1) EXCLUSION.—All spotted owl habitat areas and protected activity centers located within the pilot project area designated under subsection (b)(2) will be deferred from resource management activities required under subsection (d) and timber harvesting during the term of the pilot project.

(2) RIPARIAN PROTECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Scientific Analysis Team guidelines for riparian system protection described in subparagraph (B) shall apply to all resource management activities conducted under subsection (d) and all timber harvesting activities that occur in the pilot project area during the term of the pilot project.

(B) GUIDELINES DESCRIBED.—The guidelines referred to in subparagraph (A) are those in the document entitled ''Viability Assessments and Management Considerations for Species Associated with Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forests of the Pacific Northwest'', a Forest Service research document dated March 1993 and co-authored by the Scientific Analysis Team, including Dr. Jack Ward Thomas.

(3) RIPARIAN RESTORATION.—During any fiscal year in which the resource management activities required by subsection (d) result in net revenues, the Secretary shall recommend to the authorization and appropriation committees that up to 25 percent of such net revenues be made available in the subsequent fiscal year for riparian restoration projects that are consistent with the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal within the Plumas National Forest, the Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of the Tahoe National Forest. For purposes of this paragraph, net revenues are the revenues derived from activities required by subsection (d), less expenses incurred to undertake such activities (including 25 percent payment to the State of California under the Act of May 23, 1908 (Chapter 192; 35 Stat. 259; 16 U.S.C. 500, 553, 556d).

(d) RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—During the term of the pilot project, the Secretary shall implement and carry out the following resource management activities on an acreage basis on the Federal lands included within the pilot project area designated under subsection (b)(2):

(1) FUELBREAK CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of a strategic system of defensible fuel profile zones, including shaded fuelbreaks, utilizing thinning, individual tree selection, and other methods of vegetation management consistent with the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal, on not less than 40,000, but not more than 60,000, acres per year.

(2) GROUP SELECTION AND INDIVIDUAL TREE SELECTION.—Utilization of group selection and individual tree selection uneven-aged forest management prescriptions described in the Quincy Library Group-Community

Stability Proposal to achieve a desired future condition of all-age, multistory, fire resilient forests as follows:

(A) GROUP SELECTION.—Group selection on an average acreage of .57 percent of the pilot project area land each year of the pilot project.

(B) INDIVIDUAL TREE SELECTION.—Individual tree selection may also be utilized within the pilot project area.

(3) TOTAL ACREAGE.—The total acreage on which resource management activities are implemented under this subsection shall not exceed 70,000 acres each year.

(e) COST-EFFECTIVENESS.—In conducting the pilot project, Secretary shall use the most cost-effective means available, as determined by the Secretary, to implement resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(f) EFFECT ON MULTIPLE USE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall not rely on the resource management activities described in subsection (d) as a basis for administrative action limiting other multiple use activities in the Plumas National Forest, the Lassen National Forest, and the Tahoe National Forest.

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—In conducting the pilot project, the Secretary shall use—

(A) those funds specifically provided to the Forest Service by the Secretary to implement resource management activities according to the Quincy Library Group-Community Stability Proposal; and

(B) excess funds that are allocated for the administration and management of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest.

(2) PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.—The Secretary may not conduct the pilot project using funds appropriated for any other unit of the National Forest System.

(3) FLEXIBILITY.—During the term of the pilot project, the forest supervisors of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest may allocate and use all accounts that contain excess funds and all available excess funds for the administration and management of Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and the Sierraville Ranger District of Tahoe National Forest to perform the resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(4) RESTRICTION.—The Secretary or the forest supervisors, as the case may be, shall not utilize authority provided under paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) if, in their judgment, doing so will limit other nontimber related multiple use activities for which such funds were available.

(5) OVERHEAD.—Of amounts available to carry out this section—

(A) not more than 12 percent may be used or allocated for general administration or other overhead; and

(B) at least 88 percent shall be used to implement and carry out activities required by this section.

(6) AUTHORIZED SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to implement and carry out the pilot project such sums as are necessary.

(h) TERM OF PILOT PROJECT.—The Secretary shall conduct the pilot project during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the later of the following:

(1) The date on which the Secretary completes amendment or revision of the land and resource management plans for Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest pursuant to subsection (j).

(2) The date that is five years after the date of the commencement of the pilot project.

(i) EXPEDITIOUS IMPLEMENTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAW COMPLIANCE.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REQUIREMENT.—All environmental impact statements for which a final record of decision is required to be prepared in accordance with this subsection, and all records of decision adopted under this subsection, shall comply with applicable environmental laws and the standards and guidelines for the conservation of the California spotted owl as set forth in the California Spotted Owl Province Interim Guidelines issued by the Forest Service, and subsequently issued final standards and guidelines that modify such interim guidelines when such final standards and guidelines become effective.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR PILOT PROJECT AND FIRST INCREMENT.—Not later than the expiration of the 150-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Regional Forester for Region 5 shall, after a 45-day period for public comment on the draft environmental impact statement under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) for all of the pilot project area specified in subsection (b)(2) that covers the resource management activities required by subsection (d) for the 5-year duration of the pilot project—

(A) adopt a final record of decision for that statement; and

(B) include as part of that statement a project level analysis of the specific resource management activities required by subsection (d) that will be carried out in an area within the pilot project area during the increment of the pilot project that begins on the day that is 150 days after enactment of this Act and ends December 31, 1998.

(3) SUBSEQUENT YEARLY ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—Not later than January 1 of 1999 and of each year thereafter throughout the term of the pilot project, the Regional Forester for Region 5 shall, after a 45-day public comment period, adopt a final record of decision for the environmental impact statement under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 consisting of a project level analysis of the specific resource management activities required by subsection (d) that will be carried out during that year. A statement prepared under this paragraph shall be tiered where appropriate to the environmental impact statement referred to in paragraph (2), in accordance with regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality.

(4) CONSULTATION.—Each statement and analysis required by paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be prepared in consultation with the Quincy Library Group.

(5) FOREST SERVICE FOCUS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Regional Forester for Region 5 shall direct that, during the period described in subparagraph (B)—

(i) any resource management activity required by subsection (d), all road building, and all timber harvesting activities shall not be conducted on the Federal lands within the Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Sierraville Ranger District of the Tahoe National Forest in the State of California that are designated as either ''Off Base'' or ''Deferred'' on the map referred to in subsection (a); and

(ii) excess financial and human resources available to National Forests and Ranger Districts that are participating in the pilot project shall be applied to achieve the resource management activities required by subsection (d) and the other requirements of this section within the pilot project area specified in subsection (b)(2).

(B) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The period referred to in subparagraph (A) is when the resource management activities required by subsection (d) are being carried out, or are eligible to be carried out, on the ground on a schedule that will meet the yearly acreage requirements of subsection (d) and under environmental documentation that is timely prepared under the schedule established by paragraphs (2) and (3).

(6) PROTECTION OF EXISTING WILDERNESS.—This section shall not be construed to authorize any resource management activity in any area required to be managed as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(7) CONTRACTING.—The Forest Service, subject to the availability of appropriations, may carry out any (or all) of the requirements of this section using private contracts.

(j) CORRESPONDING FOREST PLAN AMENDMENTS.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Regional Forester for Region 5 shall initiate the process to amend or revise the land and resource management plans for Plumas National Forest, Lassen National Forest, and Tahoe National Forest. The process shall include preparation of at least one alternative that—

(1) incorporates the pilot project and area designations made by subsection (b), the resource management activities described in subsection (d), and other aspects of the Quincy Library Group Community Stability Proposal; and

(2) makes other changes warranted by the analyses conducted in compliance with section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)), section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604), and other applicable laws.

(k) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 28 of each year during the term of the pilot project, the Secretary after consultation with the Quincy Library Group, shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the pilot project. The report shall include at least the following:

(A) A complete accounting of the use of funds made available under subsection (g)(1)(A) until such funds are fully expended.

(B) A complete accounting of the use of funds and accounts made available under subsection (g)(1) for the previous fiscal year, including a schedule of the amounts drawn from each account used to perform resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(C) A description of total acres treated for each of the resource management activities required under subsection (d), forest health improvements, fire risk reductions, water yield increases, and other natural resources-related benefits achieved by the implementation of the resource management activities described in subsection (d).

(D) A description of the economic benefits to local communities achieved by the implementation of the pilot project.

(E) A comparison of the revenues generated by, and costs incurred in, the implementation of the resource management activities described in subsection (d) on the Federal lands included in the pilot project area with the revenues and costs during each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1997 for timber management of such lands before their inclusion in the pilot project.

(F) A schedule for the resource management activities to be undertaken in the pilot project area during the calendar year.

(2) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—The amount of Federal funds expended on each annual report under this subsection shall not exceed $50,000.

(l) FINAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning after completion of 6 months of the second year of the pilot project, the Secretary shall compile a science-based assessment of, and report on, the effectiveness of the pilot project in meeting the stated goals of this pilot project. Such assessment and report—

(A) shall include watershed monitoring of lands treated under this section, that should address the following issues on a priority basis: timing of water releases, water quality changes, and water yield changes over the short and long term in the pilot project area;

(B) shall be compiled in consultation with the Quincy Library Group; and

(C) shall be submitted to the Congress by July 1, 2002.

(2) LIMITATIONS ON EXPENDITURES.—The amount of Federal funds expended for the assessment and report under this subsection, other than for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A), shall not exceed $150,000. The amount of Federal funds expended for watershed monitoring under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed $75,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002.

(m) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section exempts the pilot project from any Federal environmental law.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendment numbered 2 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which may be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, 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. 858), to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR OFFERING OF AMENDMENT IN LIEU OF MILLER OF CALIFORNIA AMENDMENT TO H.R. 858, QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of business in House Resolution 180 be modified so that it shall be in order for Mr. YOUNG of Alaska to offer the amendment now at the desk in lieu of the amendment numbered 2 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Mr. MILLER of California, and that the amendment be considered under the same terms as would otherwise be applied to amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 180 and rule XXIII, 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. 858.

□ 1241

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. 858) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, all time for debate had expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to Members that there is a little confusion going on right now, but there has been some discussion in trying to reach an agreement with the administration. I have letters from the administration saying that they basically support the implication of this legislation, from Mr. Glickman, the Department of Environmental Quality. What we have been trying to do for the last hour is to work out some mutual agreement where I personally believe that we can, in fact, send this bill to the Senate and have the Senate take it up without any amendments and send it to the President.

Now, there may be some that may not agree with what has been done on both sides, but it is my belief it is the best way to try to solve these problems. Because I am a realist, and I recognize there are those that oppose this bill, especially the national environmental community, I understand that and I understand that there are those in the Senate who have the power, because their rules put holds on bills and nothing occurs, I think it is very important to get this pilot project on its way to become a law.

I have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for the last hour, and we have been saying things to one another and discussing this, what we can accomplish. I am resentful of the administration, because I just got their letters about 10 minutes, 15 minutes ago. I think this is inappropriate on the part of the administration when this is their brainchild, when they thought this would be the way to go.

We have done everything possible to make this work. It is my belief, the way that this has been made up, that we have an opportunity now to really solve what was in my substitute but was a definition that appeases not only the administration but the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and others that are involved.

Now, I will not say that we did not have the votes. I believe we had the votes to pass it in the House big time, and I understand that, but there is also a chance in the way this works, if we want to get this program in place, on time, working for the people, the Quincy Library Group and the people in that arena, we must try to solve the problems here on the floor of the House to give them that opportunity.

If these amendments destroy the intent of the bill and if it does not work, then we can always review it. We can come back and find out what is happening. But it is an attempt to make sure that we have a fledgling duckling turn into a beautiful swan. It is an opportunity to make this work.

I know there is some question about what we are doing here, and I apologize to those people, but this is the way this program works. This is a democracy. This is a legislative process, putting a package together that becomes a reality.

So with that, I would like to thank the gentleman from California and those involved. I would like to suggest respectfully, for those that are unaware of what we are doing, that this is really, I think, our opportunity to fulfill not only an obligation, although we can win on this floor, but we can go forward and have an opportunity on the Senate side and get this to the President of the United States and make sure that these local people are heard and done correctly.

If it does not work, we can come back and revisit it again. I do believe it will work.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for offering this amendment. I think, in fact, as I said, there is very little disagreement about the intent and the purpose of this legislation and what all of us would like to see carried out. The gentlewoman from Idaho, the subcommittee chair, has worked long and