

the fact of extreme adversity. His commitment to all individuals, young and old, is a testament to his impeccable character.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Congressman JOHN LEWIS. His accomplishments speak for themselves, yet his humility surpasses all he has done for his district, his country, and the rights of all Americans. It is with a great sense of pride that I refer to Congressman JOHN LEWIS as a colleague and friend.

#### TAJIKISTAN'S PEACE ACCORD

#### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 15, 1997*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, after 5 long years, Tajikistan's civil war—the costliest conflict in the former Soviet Union, in terms of casualties—may be over. Negotiations underway since 1994 under U.N. auspices have finally produced a peace accord and the opposing sides have crafted a power-sharing arrangement. Provisions are in place for over 20,000 refugees to return and elections are planned within 12 to 18 months.

Tajik President Imomali Rakhmonov and Saidabdullo Nuri, leader of the United Tajik Opposition [UTO], signed the General Agreement on Peace and National Accord on June 27. Among the accord's key features is the 26-member National Reconciliation Commission, composed of 13 government and 13 opposition representatives, and chaired by Nuri. Until elections are held, the opposition will control at least 30 percent of government portfolios. The opposition's fighters will be integrated into the government's force ministries, and 460 fighters will protect opposition leaders in Dushanbe. On July 10, the Reconciliation Commission came to terms on a general amnesty that will allow members of the UTO to return to Tajikistan.

The general agreement was signed in the Kremlin, testifying to Russia's key mediating role. Moscow had backed Tajikistan's Government against the opposition—a melange of democratic, Islamic, and regional forces—since the war broke out in 1992, but has obviously rethought its priorities and acknowledged that the opposition cannot be defeated militarily, at acceptable cost. Moreover, the advance of the Taliban forces in Afghanistan, which Tajik opposition fighters had used as a staging ground for assaults against Russian and Tajik Government forces, has also convinced Moscow and, apparently, anti-Taliban, Shiite Iran, that Tajikistan must be stabilized in the face of the new threat from Sunni Islamic fundamentalism.

As many analysts have pointed out, however, it is too soon for rejoicing. Though Moscow seems determined to end the conflict, there are several potential spoilers. Foremost among them is Abdumalik Abdullojanov, Tajikistan's former prime minister and chairman of the Party of National Revival. Abdullojanov represents the interests of Leninabad, the country's most populous and wealthy oblast, which had produced Tajikistan's rulers since the 1930's. By contrast, President Rakhmonov and his followers are from Kulyab oblast, whereas Nuri and most of the opposition are affiliated with the

mountainous region of Karotegin. Yet Abdullojanov was not invited to participate in the peace talks or the Reconciliation Commission, and his followers have been given no positions in the coalition government. With no stake in the agreement and no incentive to promote its success, Abdullojanov has every reason to undermine its implementation, and can count on the backing of the population in northern Tajikistan.

Abdullojanov also has the presumed support of Islam Karimov, President of Uzbekistan, which borders Leninabad oblast and is Abdullojanov's base of operations. Karimov did not authorize Uzbekistan's signature as guarantor of the Tajik peace agreement, indicating that Russia and Uzbekistan—though they share deep concerns over Taliban victories in Afghanistan—continue to compete for influence in Tajikistan, and that Tashkent will not play along unless its interests and those of its allies in northern Tajikistan are taken into account.

If the government in Dushanbe does not see these dangers, the opposition does. On June 28, UTO first deputy leader Akbar Turajonzade told Interfax that Dushanbe's unwillingness to include representatives of other parties and movements, specifically mentioning Abdullojanov, was a mistake and could jeopardize prospects for peace.

Apart from Abdullojanov, any number of well-armed military commanders, with strong local bases, could resume hostilities or simply block the establishment of a unified country with a recognized government exercising authority over its entire territory. And even if they could be brought over, the process of sharing government portfolios and dividing the economic pie among all the various movements and factions will require masterful diplomacy.

Still, the peace accord and all its attendant problems are far preferable to the alternative. Tajikistan's population has not known peace since the country became independent. The understanding between the government and the opposition may finally have laid the groundwork for the broader reconciliation that will be needed for enduring stability.

Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the obvious humanitarian imperatives, it is in the United States interests that Tajikistan's peace accord succeed. War-torn Tajikistan lags behind most other New Independent States in building democratic institutions. We should encourage the reconciliation process and urge that the planned elections take place as scheduled and that they be as free and fair as possible. It would be especially useful for IFES, the Washington-based International Foundation for Election Systems, which has done such important work in helping local authorities organize elections all over the world, to be involved with Tajikistan's Central Election Commission. Hopefully, conditions will permit other United States NGO's to begin working with political parties, and gradually help put back on track the democratization in Tajikistan that was so tragically interrupted in 1992.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GEORGE S. ANSELL

#### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 15, 1997*

Mr. SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the exceptional contributions Dr. George Ansell has made for America's higher education system. As the president of the Colorado School of Mines, he has announced his retirement. Dr. Ansell is truly dedicated to the higher education system and the students he serves. Under the leadership of Dr. Ansell, the Colorado School of Mines has emerged as one of the West's premier institutions excelling in engineering, applied science, and earth sciences.

Dr. Ansell has broadened the college's scope to include high academic achievement and quality research, and insisted on seeing each strengthen the other. The Colorado School of Mines was recently recognized by the National Science Foundation for institution-wide reform in undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology. The selected colleges are now considered national models of excellence by the NSF.

Dr. Ansell, born in Akron, OH, in 1934, grew up in New York, attending the elite Bronx High School of Science. He attended Rensselaer Polytechnical Institute on a Naval ROTC scholarship, receiving a bachelor's degree in metallurgical engineering in 1954, and later a master's degree in metallurgical engineering, and a Ph.D. in metallurgical engineering in 1960. He served as an engineering officer in the United States Navy from 1955 to 1958, and physical metallurgist on the Metal Physics Consultant Staff, U.S. Naval Research Laboratory—1957–58. From 1960 to 1984, he was a faculty member at his alma mater, RPI. He became chairman of the Materials Division, RPI—1969–74, dean, School of Engineering, RPI—1974–84, acting dean, School of Management, RPI—1980–81, and finally, president of Colorado School of Mines in 1984.

Dr. Ansell leaves the Colorado School of Mines with a legacy of excellence. His efforts have truly enhanced the institution. His leadership there will be sorely missed. His never-ending quest for academic perfection has truly left its mark.

I thank Dr. Ansell for his contributions, on behalf of the State of Colorado, and I enter into the RECORD a quote by Dr. Ansell that expresses his sentiments about the Colorado School of Mines:

It has been a great privilege for me to have served as president of Colorado School of Mines. My tenure has been filled with exciting challenges and opportunities to promote the vitality of this outstanding institution.

My proudest achievement has been improving the quality of an already outstanding institution by: increasing the number of underrepresented minorities from three percent to 14 percent of the undergraduate student body, increasing the number of female students to 25 percent of the entire student body, insuring through fundraising that any student who has the desire and the ability can attend CSM, regardless of his or her financial means, expanding the base of the school's first-rate faculty, and revitalizing the campus physical plant with state-of-the-art facilities. Colorado is fortunate to have

in its midst a university which has the commitment and dedication of such an excellent Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, and outside benefactors, together with its extraordinary student body and alumni.

Mr. Speaker, the faculty, students, and all who have worked with Dr. Ansell are better people because of his integrity, leadership, and dedication to the Colorado School of Mines family.

**QUINCY LIBRARY GROUP FOREST  
RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC STABIL-  
ILITY ACT OF 1997**

SPEECH OF

**HON. DON YOUNG**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 9, 1997*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union 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:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, with a vote of 429 to 1, the House has overwhelmingly approved Representative WALLY HERGER'S bill, H.R. 858, the Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery and Economic Stability Act of 1997. While Representative HERGER introduced the bill and the bill had bipartisan support, it really belongs to the Quincy Library Group, which is a coalition of local environmental group leaders, local timber firms, local business people, local government officials, and local labor union leaders. So that everyone knows what the Quincy Library Group agreement is, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of the agreement immediately following my remarks.

The bill was overwhelmingly approved because of Mr. HERGER'S bipartisan approach and because it is solution-oriented. It resolves forest conflict instead of promoting it. The bill embodies a new way of thinking about the Nation's forestry problems, the solutions for which come from the people who live in communities within our public forests. Thus, it draws on the community wisdom that our Government is supposed to be about. Our Nation is a government of the people because the people give us their wisdom.

Never in my years of serving as Alaska's only Congressman in this House have I seen such overwhelming support for a forestry bill and I truly believe that this level of enthusiasm results from the fact that everyone wins with the collaborative approach that the bipartisan sponsors and supporters have taken on this measure.

We did not come to the floor today with 429 votes. We would have probably received around 270 votes by my count on the Young substitute to H.R. 858, but that did not deter the sponsors of the bill and me from making further accommodations in the spirit that the Quincy Library Group agreement. We wanted to make people comfortable. We made ac-

commodations to Representative MILLER, the ranking member of the Committee on Resources and a person who I have grown to respect as a friend. We made many accommodations that Representative MILLER brought to us from the administration, which over the years has often supported the Quincy Library Group. Before that Mrs. CHENOWETH made some 50 changes to the bill in the subcommittee and in the full committee, many in response to administration and interest group concerns, before the bill was reported. I asked Senator FEINSTEIN, the lead on this issue in the other body for her recommendations and I incorporated those recommendations into my manager's amendment.

Because some modifications were made here on the floor, I want to explain them. I want to explain how the final Young substitute that we just agreed to differs from the Young substitute that appeared in the RECORD as amendment No. 1. I also want to explain some of the major amendments that were adopted in the committee and subcommittee.

The substance of the bill is Section 2. Section 2(a) is simply the definition of the Quincy Library Group agreement, which forms the basis of the bill. My amendment No. 1 and the final product agreed to by the House included clarifications that the library group agreement is for ecologic and economic health of lands and communities. This is a community stability proposal, which by its nature concerns ecologic health of the land and economic health of the communities. These are mutually exclusive and the Quincy plan integrates them. Ecologic health and economic health is what sustainable development is all about.

In subsection (b), the Young substitute basically requires implementation of the Quincy Library Group plan and, in particular, a cornerstone of the plan that is referenced in subsection (d) involving strategic fuelbreaks and group selection harvests. In subsection (b) where we direct the Quincy program, we added a proviso that required one environmental impact statement. We also added a requirement that the environmental impact statement be completed within 200 days of enactment.

The Young amendment No. 1 contained a subsection (i) that was mostly removed because we added the single EIS in subsection (b) at Mr. MILLER'S urging. However, I want to be clear that my substitute would have provided for a total of five EIS's over the course of the pilot project, one for the entire 5-year program including the first year's site-specific segment of the program and one site-specific EIS for each subsequent year's program. Mr. MILLER requested that I remove that provision and do only one EIS. We agreed to a 200-day timeframe for the EIS. The Quincy group has waited long enough for their consensus to reach the ground. This means that within 200 days after enactment, the program will be implemented.

We made no changes from my substitute, amendment No. 1, in subsection (b)(2) where the pilot project area is explained. The total acreage of the national forests that the pilot project covers is about 2.5 million acres. However, one key to the Quincy proposal is that fuelbreaks and other subsection (d) activities are only eligible for part of that 2.5 million acre area. Specifically those activities will be carried out on lands that are "Available for Group Selection" as identified on the QLQ map. This

is a cornerstone of the agreement because the land base was essentially that which would leave the roadless areas out of areas that would receive fuelbreak, thinning, group selection, and other silviculture treatments under the QLQ plan. "Available for Group Selection" area is about 1.6 million acres. Areas outside of the "Available for Group Selection" were essentially those recommended over the years for protection by local environmental groups that are participants in the Quincy Library Group and by national environmental groups.

My original substitute, amendment No. 1, would have gone the extra mile to ensure that the areas outside of those that are "Available for Group Selection"—the roadless areas for which environmental groups have long sought protection—would not be eligible for subsection (d) fuelbreaks, would not be eligible for any road building, and would not be eligible for any timber harvesting activities. The provision that would have done this was subsection (i)(5)(A)(i). This would have ensured that while the pilot project was being implemented or eligible to be implemented on the ground, the "Off Base" and "Deferred" land areas (essentially the roadless areas) would be ineligible for timber harvests, road building, and subsection (d) activities. That was my proposal in amendment No. 1, but Mr. MILLER required that it be removed, which in my view may lessen the protection of the roadless areas.

Subsection (c)(1), which removes spotted owl habitat from eligibility for harvest stayed in the compromise version. So did the riparian protection that was added in full committee. I might add that the riparian protection is straight from the Clinton Northwest Forest Plan, which was composed by scientists including the ex-chief of the Forest Service, Dr. Jack Ward Thomas. Personally, I think that this riparian protection may be too stringent, but it is part of the Quincy Library Group agreement and part of existing law that the Quincy group wants to follow. That is why it is in my substitute. It is part of the deal.

Mr. MILLER asked that I remove the provision that would have allowed more funding to be recommended and provided for riparian restoration projects, which I believe are an important part of the Quincy Library Group Agreement. The provision, subsection (c)(3), was removed.

The Quincy group's plan envisioned compliance with laws that ensured proper harvesting techniques and ensured forest standards would be met for management activities like fuelbreak construction. Nevertheless, we added a proviso that ensured that the resource management activities would be implemented to the extent consistent with the Federal laws that apply to such activities. This would included the interim guidelines for the spotted owl. Should final guidelines for the owl become effective, they would apply instead. This change makes the requirement of subsection (d) no less of a requirement than it was before. It simply means that in meeting the requirement of subsection (d)(1) and (2), for example, that the laws that guide good forest management and other applicable laws that would guide forest management activities apply to the carrying out the activities. The change does not make subsection (d) hollow.

Now for subsection (d). It requires fuelbreaks on not less than 40,000 acres and not more than 60,000 acres within the pilot