

colleagues to stand up and voice their opposition to the treatment of the Chinese Government toward their own people. Mr. President, I urge this administration to rethink a narrow-minded, nearsighted, and unengaging solution to human rights abuses.

For 16 years—for 16 years—the United States has extended MFN status to China, and in doing so, we have tacitly endorsed everything from forced abortions to the sale of dangerous weapons to our enemies.

I was talking to one of my colleagues early this week, and I told him that I have looked for 3 years for some scintilla of evidence that engagement has worked, I would like to vote for MFN, but I have not seen any evidence at all that this policy has improved the condition of the Chinese people or improved the human rights situation for those being oppressed in China. His response to me was, "TIM, it takes time."

Mr. President, time has run out for the thousands and thousands, who, today, find themselves in prison, and the families who have lost loved ones because of the oppressive regime that rules China.

The United States must stand for something once again. The debate is about more than dollars and cents. It is about our values as a nation. Others of my colleagues have said, "Well, we can't tell them what to do domestically." I would simply raise the question that it seems to be that the evidence is mounting daily that they have sought to tell us what to do domestically through influencing American elections.

Eight years ago, the world looked on in awe and admiration for those thousands of students who stood with courage in Tiananmen Square. Tiananmen Square must not become a haunting but fading memory to the world and to the American people.

So I ask my colleagues this question: Does not a little part, a little piece of the soul of this Nation die every time we turn away and allow freedom to be extinguished anywhere on this globe?

Let us make a difference. We must confront China's abuses. The price of not doing so is simply too high.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE- MENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1469

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate begin debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, the supplemental appropriations bill, and there be 2 hours for debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member or their designees, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, no further debate be in order, or motions to recommit, and the vote on adoption of the conference report occur at 5:05 p.m. this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. And, without objection, rule XII is waived.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am also asked to report to the Presiding Officer that all Members should be on notice that a vote will occur at 5:05 p.m. this evening on adoption of the supplemental appropriations conference report.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. SHELBY pertaining to the introduction of S. 831 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1897 ORGANIC ACT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to advise my colleagues that yesterday, unfortunately, we were not in morning business so I could not make this statement, but yesterday marked the 100th anniversary of the passage of the 1897 Organic Act which created the Forest Service. On that day, June 4, 100 years ago, Congress passed the Forest Service Organic Act which allowed the first on-the-ground management of the forest reserves.

Prior to this date 100 years ago, forest reserves totalling approximately 17 million acres had been established in 1891 and 1893. In the spring of 1897, another 21 million acres of forest reserves were added to the system. This latter addition was the result of a Presidential Commission on National Forests established in 1896. The commission included notable scientific and conservation leaders at that time.

However, the addition of the second round of reserves was sufficiently controversial that Congress moved in early 1897 to attach an amendment to the 1898 general appropriations bill to eliminate the reserves and transfer the 21 million acres back into the public domain for disposal. Outgoing President Grover Cleveland pocket vetoed the bill on his last day in office. This created a situation in which the Government had no money to operate and the new President, William McKinley, quickly called Congress into an extra session on March 15, 1897, to reconsider eliminating the reserves.

In this special session of Congress a compromise was framed which took the form of the Forest Service's 1897 Organic Act and which restored the 21 million acres of forest reserves. I think it is rather ironic, Mr. President, as we consider today various and sundry conflicts over salvage riders and the management of various forests, including

the Tongass National Forest in my State, that 100 years ago Congress had the same kinds of conflicts. But the national forests that we have today serve as a living testimony to our ability to resolve those conflicts.

My understanding is that other Members will join me today, Senator SMITH and probably Senator CRAIG, with regard to further statements on the significance of this particular date, June 4, 100 years ago, 1897, and further elaborate on the circumstances and conditions of the forests and the transition that has occurred in that 100 years.

However, I think it noteworthy that there are many changes in the names, many changes in the boundaries of the national forests in the years that have followed that event 100 years ago, but the basic land areas that were set aside in the Western States between 1891 and 1907 are still with us today. From 1907 until today another 44 million acres have been added to our national forests, mostly in the Eastern States. These lands, for the most part, were old, worn out farms, lands that were cut over, but today represent some of the most important forested recreation and timber producing areas that we have in the Eastern United States.

The Organic Act of 1897 allowed for the organization and active management of the reserves by forest rangers rather than no management at all, which had been the case from 1891 until that time. The well-known and revered Gifford Pinchot was hired on June 25, 1897, and he recommended the adoption of three basic goals for the management of the forest reserves. The first was permanent tenure of forest land; the second was continuity of management; and the third was the permanent employment of technical trained foresters. Because the tradition within the Department of the Interior was to hire political appointees rather than technically trained foresters, Pinchot was successful in 1905 in securing the transfer of the forest reserves to the Department of Agriculture where it is today.

I think it is a little bit ironic that today the new Chief of the Forest Service is a political appointee who most recently served in the Department of the Interior. Nevertheless, technically sound management continues within the Forest Service.

The major section of the 1897 act was a statement of reason for establishing the forest reserves. The act stated, "no public forest reservation should be established, except to improve and protect the forest within the reservation, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessity of citizens of the United States." Let me repeat that: "securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessity of citizens of the United States." That was the purpose.

Mr. President, for the most part of 100 years of management of the reserves, the Forest Service has relied extensively upon the double provisions of water flows and timber. Today, however, with ecosystem management as the Forest Service envisions it, improving and protecting the forests seems to have taken the forefront. I, for one, believe that all three criteria are important to assure that we can continue the balanced, predictable, and sustainable management of our national forests.

One interesting difference from the way the world seems to work today is the way the Forest Service was able to complete the implementation regulations for the Organic Act by June 30, 1897. Today it is difficult for the agency to produce regulations in 25 months, let alone get the job done in 25 days, which is what they did in 1897.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Organic Act, which established the philosophy of active management of the forest reserves, the first national forest timber sale occurred in the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota in 1899. This sale was offered in the spirit of the then recently passed Organic Act because Gifford Pinchot believed that the science of forestry could be applied to manage the forest reserves on a sustainable basis.

We will be displaying a photograph as I speak. I think it is noteworthy, Mr. President, to recognize the significance of what this represents, because I have here for my colleagues' attention an enlarged photograph of the first timber sale that occurred in the United States on national forest lands. This is how it looks today, Mr. President. I think you will agree that this photograph shows a healthy, well-managed forest, which 100 years later confirms Pinchot's belief in forestry and the renewability of the resource. Since the time of that first sale, forestry and forest practices have progressed exponentially, reflecting modern knowledge and technologies and a heightened concern for ecology and all of the ecological functions of the forest.

This picture is an actual portrayal of the area in question today. This area in the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota was cut in 1899. I am going to have an easel put up so that during the remainder of my remarks it can be viewed.

Finally, Mr. President, the Organic Act of 1897, although modified many times by the Congress, set the standards for the management of the national forests for an entire century. The vast national forest lands were set aside, and they are still in existence to this day. Controversy about the management of those forest lands, of course, continues, much as it did a century ago. The national forests are still under attack from some quarters. Management is being pressured to change. Special-interest groups are highly polarized. But the fact is that there are national forests, and I think it speaks

well that 100 years ago a young country with vast resources would save and manage millions of acres for the people, and that is just what we have done. Were we less forward-thinking people then, as some people seem to believe we are today? If we were, there would be nothing left to argue about. But that is not the case.

In conclusion, Mr. President, for the most part, the legacy of the Forest Service for the last 100 years has been responsible stewardship by dedicated professionals within the Forest Service.

Finally, as a commemoration of today's anniversary, I am sharing with each of my colleagues a most important book on forest ecology called "Pacific Spirit: A Forest Reborn." This book, which was written by Dr. Patrick Moore, is going to be given to each Member of this body. Dr. Patrick Moore is a forest ecologist and is one of the cofounders of GreenPeace. That is a rather interesting reference. Here is a cofounder of GreenPeace writing a book on forest ecology—"Pacific Spirit: A Forest Reborn." It is interesting that Dr. Moore now advises the Forest Alliance of British Columbia, an industry-sponsored organization in Canada. Some Members might think it ironic that I would send my colleagues a work by a former GreenPeace activist and founder of GreenPeace. But Dr. Moore sums up his position in this way:

As a lifelong environmentalist, I feel the need to speak out because I cannot agree with claims made to the world by some of my environmentalist colleagues about the total destructive impact of forestry in general and clear-cutting in particular.

It is the final irony today, I guess, that it takes a founder of GreenPeace to speak to us on the proposition that clear-cutting has value and is an adequate and recognized means of timber harvesting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Am I correct that I am to be recognized under a previous unanimous consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator has 30 minutes.

#### THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I don't think I will use the entire 30 minutes. I wanted to come to the floor of the Senate today to speak again about a piece of legislation that we will take up in about an hour and 45 minutes. It is a supplemental appropriations bill to provide resources and money to help those who have been victims of a disaster in our country—especially, and most importantly, the disaster that has occurred in our region of the country, the Red River region, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

There are moneys in this bill for other regions as well, and there have

indeed been other disasters, although none quite as substantial as the one that has occurred along the Red River; that is why this bill is so critically important to us.

I was a conferee on the conference committee and, last evening, the conference committee reported out the bill, H.R. 1469, an act making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and for overseas peacekeeping, and so on. It is emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters. That is the purpose for this bill. Congress will consider that, as I indicated, in about an hour and 45 minutes.

I want to make two points today. The first is short, and the second is a bit longer. The first is this: Inside this piece of legislation is a substantial amount of help, an enormous amount of additional resources that will go to a number of regions of the country, especially our region, to try to help the victims of the disaster that visited our region. We are enormously grateful for that. There are many Members of the U.S. Senate, on both sides of the political aisle here, who pulled together and rolled up their sleeves and said, "Let us help." The help in this bill is substantial. It is very substantial, and it will help our region in a manner that I can hardly describe. So we are enormously grateful to every Member of this Senate and this Congress who helped us get to this point. That is the first point. Thanks to everyone who helped.

The second point is this: The resources inside this legislation are only going to be available when the President signs the bill. Time is urgent to deal with the needs that exist in our part of the country and to respond to the victims of the massive flooding that occurred in the Red River Valley. The reason I mention that time is a serious problem is because, 14 days ago, the Congress left for the Memorial Day recess and left this bill unfinished, and so 14 days have elapsed since that time. Now it appears that Congress will pass this bill this afternoon, and it contains unrelated, controversial items that almost certainly will be vetoed by the President because he has said time and time again that if it contains especially the central item dealing with Government shutdowns, he will be constrained to veto the bill.

I rode with President Clinton on Air Force One to Grand Forks Air Force Base one morning, and he visited with several thousand people who were then living and sleeping in an airplane hangar, a series of four hangars, sleeping on cots because they had been evacuated from their homes. Two cities, Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, were nearly totally evacuated due to the flood waters that destroyed the two communities. Thousands of people were in airplane hangars sleeping on cots, wondering what would come next. President Clinton came that day. One of the points he made was that the