

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

Congress and the President certainly will help. He said, "I hope very much that in the construction of a disaster relief bill, Congress will not add unrelated amendments, controversial, extraneous amendments that will slow down or derail the bill." He made that point in the airplane hangar to the thousands of people who were there for good reason—because there is a tendency in Congress to add unrelated things to other pieces of legislation. I don't expect that that habit will discontinue. But it is unusual for that to happen on a disaster bill. It is not the usual course of events for someone to seize a disaster bill like this and say, oh, by the way, I have an unrelated issue that is very controversial and I think we can force the President to sign it by including it in a disaster bill.

That is not the way most Members of Congress have treated disaster bills in the past. Disaster bills deal with disasters. They have resources that are needed by victims. The Congress, by and large, has decided that they will not toy with or play with or play political games with a disaster bill. Yet, today, despite my enormous gratitude for all of the wonderful resources that are in this bill, this bill contains a couple of—especially one—totally unrelated, very controversial items that the President certainly will veto.

So what happens as a result of that? More delay. Probably another week's delay, at least. What happens to the victims of the flood along the Red River during that week? They will wait, they will wonder, and they will not have answers about their future.

It is unfair to them to do this. Now, some say—and I read in the papers in the last few days—that delay doesn't matter; there is money in the pipeline. FEMA has money and they are helping the victims of this disaster. Why are you saying that delay is a problem here?

To anyone who says that, they must be saying it without the facts. The facts are this. In Grand Forks, ND, a city with which I am well familiar because I have been there many, many times prior to, during, and since the flood, about 600 homes were totally and completely destroyed as a result of the flood and probably another 800 were severely damaged. The people who lived in those 600 homes are not ever moving back. The question is, what happens to them? They are going to have to describe a new flood plain up in Grand Forks, and those homes are going to have to be bought out, and the money will hopefully be used to build new homes somewhere else. But there isn't money in the pipeline to buy out those homes. The HUD money in this bill is not available until the bill is signed. The result is that the city can't make decisions until the money is there, and the result is that all of those citizens and families, many of whom are now split, wake up in a bed that is not theirs, in the home of a stranger that took them in, or in a motel, or in a

shelter someplace, or in a city 100 miles away, all of those people will continue to wait because the city can't give an answer because they don't have the money. And the city doesn't have the money because this is delayed.

Now, let me, if I might, go through a couple of charts to describe this point. The Grand Forks Herald runs this editorial every day. It is a city of 50,000 people, 90 percent of whom were evacuated. I have said that 600 homes were totally destroyed and another 800 were severely damaged. The Grand Forks Herald says in its editorials, "10 Days Since the Congress Let Us Down." That was actually a few days ago. But, today, they will have had a different number. Every single day, the number of days "since the Congress let us down." The Fargo Forum, 70 miles down the road, wrote "Act Now on Flood Relief Bill." It is a long editorial saying "don't delay and add extraneous amendments to this kind of legislation." The Grand Forks Herald, again, wrote: "11 Reasons to Pass Federal Disaster Bill Now." It describes the urgency and the need for the legislation.

Now, let me, just in case my colleagues don't recall—and I assume most of them do—review again how we got to where we are now. In our region of the country, we had nearly 10 feet of snow, 3 years worth of snow in 3 months. The last quantity of snow was nearly 2 feet—the worst blizzard in 50 years, we are told. This illustrates what happened during that blizzard. Telephone poles snapped like toothpicks and 80,000 people were out of power. In many cases, the power wasn't restored for some long while, despite the fact that day and night crews were working on poles. You can see these poles that were put in. These power poles were snapped off like toothpicks and 80,000 people were without power. In the middle of that, the Corps of Engineers is furiously building dikes because the Weather Service says we will now have a severe flood.

So the snow begins to melt. We have a 500-year flood.

This is farmland. It doesn't look like it. It looks like an ocean. All you can see is the barn and a silo, and water for as far as the eye can see.

This is a poster that shows one of our communities along the Red River. All of this is farmland. It now looks like a lake. This is before all of the snow had melted. This little Red River became a lake nearly 150 miles long and anywhere from 20 to 30 miles wide. That is what the citizens of this region face.

What did that look like? When that came through our town, it looked like this—a river that had no bank, a river that became part of the community in every home, in every business; Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, totally inundated. In East Grand Forks, 9,000 people evacuated, most of them with only the shirts on their backs, totally evacuated. In Grand Forks, ND, 90 percent of the 50,000 population had to evacuate, many of them with no notice at all.

So here is what the Grand Forks neighborhoods looked like—all throughout the town with water reaching the tops of automobiles.

In the downtown area we had severe flooding. Then we had a severe fire. In the middle of the flood a fire destroyed 11 buildings; parts of three blocks in downtown Grand Forks.

These courageous firefighters fought that fire in some cases working only with fire extinguishers in ice cold water up to their waists and their chests, suffering hypothermia; and parts of three blocks of downtown Grand Forks burned down.

Here is what it looks like. Here was a block. There is nothing left. In the middle of the flood it looks like Dresden.

Here is another view of downtown Grand Forks flooded and destroyed and ravaged by fire; the fire skipped throughout the downtown.

I might say to the Presiding Officer that this downtown is still uninhabited. If you go there today—and I have been there very recently—there is almost nothing going on here because there is almost nothing left. Every one of these buildings was severely destroyed, and the new floodplain in any event when it is drawn, will take a major part of the downtown and destroy it further because the buildings will be uninhabitable.

The Grand Forks Herald in the middle of all of this says, What kind of flood is this? "Red Cross Tops 1 Million Meals." How bad was that disaster: People in shelters, people evacuated all across the region, and the Red Cross serving 1 million meals.

The water is gone. That water stayed a long, long time. The National Weather Service predicted a severe flood with a record 49 feet which would have been a record of all time on the Red River; 49 feet. But it wasn't 49 feet. It was 54 feet. And it inundated everything, and literally brought both of those communities to their knees; to a standstill.

What has happened in Grand Forks now? These are some pictures that are not quite as clear. But Grand Forks now has streets. When you drive down the street, there is only a narrow path to drive down because in all of these homes that were destroyed or severely damaged by this flood homeowners are ripping all of the things out of these homes that need to be taken out; the streets are littered as far as you can see up and down the street with just this kind of scene.

The citizens who go back and take a look at what they have see this. This is a home that I stopped at not too many days ago. This is a home that is sitting on top of a car. Incidentally, I was on a Coast Guard boat. And this is in an area called Lincoln Park. We were on a boat through this area. All of these homes were completely under water. It took those homes right off the foundation. And this home now comes back and sits on top of a car. It and 600 of the neighboring homes are destroyed and will never ever be inhabited again.

In the same neighborhood, this is what happened when the flood inundated the home.

The reason I am showing these pictures, Mr. President, is some say that there is not an urgency here at all. I don't know how many have seen what happens in a flood. But here is what Grand Forks residents, when they went back to homes that are now uninhabitable, see. They see personal belongings that are unrecognizable. They see all of the appliances that are destroyed. And they see the job of taking them out to the street and putting them on the sidewalk.

Then we have people now in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks—thousands of them—who this morning didn't wake up in their homes because their homes aren't available to them. They are destroyed. They wake up in a neighbor's home, a friend's home, or a stranger's home who took them in; a motel, a shelter, in a town 10 miles or 20 miles or 50 miles away, and in some cases 100 miles away. And they are asking the city of Grand Forks, "What next?" The city leaders of Grand Forks say to them, "Well, what we are going to do is we are going to help you. The Federal Government is going to give us the resources to help you. We are going to buy out some of these homes. We are going to help some of those businesses restart. We will help some of those folks in rebuilding a new home."

I talked to a couple down at the Lincoln Park area. They lived in their home for 43 years, and had a half-hour notice as the flood waters coursed through the dikes and destroyed their entire neighborhood. Now they are living in travel trailers, wondering about their future. "What next?"

Every one of those lives is on hold at this moment waiting and watching and wondering when Congress will pass the disaster relief bill. The answer is, this afternoon.

That is the good news.

The bad news is that what Congress passes this afternoon has in it unrelated, extraneous amendments put there, in my judgment, only for political purposes—only to bait the President; only to say to the President, "Sign this." We are going to shove it right down that narrow alley and dare him to sign it. The President has already said that he won't sign this. This is an amendment that deals with Government shutdowns on October 1. It doesn't have merit.

I don't know. Maybe we should debate that. It ought not be debated on a disaster bill. And Members of this Congress know it. If any other Member of this Senate was faced with the same circumstance with their constituents whose lives are on hold and who are waiting day after day after day—if anyone else were in the same situation, they would be here to do what I am doing to say this makes no sense.

Those who have visited my State and the Northern States in our country know that we have a very short con-

struction season. We don't have 12 months out of the year to rebuild. We have a very short construction season. Every single week you lose means that part of your community begins to bleed to death. That is why this week and last week was so important. It is why next week is so important. It is why I am so upset with those who insist on putting unrelated amendments that they know will require a veto of this bill.

Mr. President, we are not the first region of the country to suffer a disaster—earthquakes, fires, flood, tornadoes all over this country. And in all of the years that I have been in both the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate I have been one who said my constituents in North Dakota want to be there to help. You are not alone when you suffer a disaster. We want to help you. I do not recall a time since I came to the Congress when in the middle of a disaster bill people said, "Oh, by the way, we are going to play this like a fiddle. We have an agenda here." This isn't about victims. It is about politics. I do not recall a time when that has happened on a disaster bill. It has happened on other bills, and it has happened on both political sides of the aisle—both Republicans and Democrats. We will probably never change that because of the rules of the Senate probably are never going to change. But, generally speaking, in most cases Members of the Congress and the Senate have not done this with disaster bills.

We are going to vote on this bill this afternoon. It contains critically needed aid for this region of the country.

There are thousands and thousands of people who are not back in their homes. Seven-thousand apartments in Grand Forks, ND, are uninhabitable right now. So the 7,000 people in the apartment complexes aren't back and won't be back until they get some answer; until some moneys are available, until the construction begins, until the money is in the pipeline to get that done. And there are those who say, "Well, gee, nothing is being held up. FEMA has money." They just do not understand it. They are plain flat wrong. Yes. FEMA has money. FEMA has money to deal with the day-to-day needs of someone who tomorrow needs money to buy a meal, or needs money to rent a hotel room. But FEMA does not have the money that gives a community the ability to make the decisions to buy out the neighborhoods, or to describe the new floodplain and help people rebuild homes and businesses. FEMA doesn't have that money. That money is not available. That money is only available when legislation of this type passes and is signed by the President of the United States.

So, if I hear one more time anyone in this Senate say, "Well, gee, there is money in the pipeline, no one is disadvantaged," I urge them to do this. Buy an airplane ticket, and I will go with you. And let's go to Grand Forks, ND. There is probably going to be a

city council meeting the night that you get there, and there will probably be 500 or 1,000 people there. And every single one of them will ask you the question: "If there is money in the pipeline, show us where. Where is the money that will allow us to make the decisions to get on with our life? Where is it?" If anyone who alleges that, again, buy a ticket, and come to East Grand Forks, MN, or Grand Forks, ND, or Watertown, SD, and tell those citizens where the money is. They won't do that because they can't. This are dead flat wrong.

They are playing a game on this bill, and they ought not play a game on this bill. They know it.

I raised the question yesterday: "Why don't you pass this bill, and then extract the emergency portions of this bill; just the emergency portions alone?" Extract that, and pass it as a separately enrolled bill. And if the President vetoes it, then at least enact the emergency portions of it so people who have been victims of a flood and fire and blizzards are not going to be victimized again by delay.

But it fell on deaf ears because that is not what people want. There are some—not all—who want something more than this. They want political points. They want a political issue. I guess they will get it. Not from me, but they will get it because they will have a veto in a day or two, I suppose. And then people will go home for the weekend having not passed the disaster relief, and then come back next week and start juggling all of this again. In the meantime, 3 weeks will have gone by at a time when it is critical for the people of North Dakota and South Dakota and Minnesota to make decisions about their future.

Mr. President, I regret taking so much time of the Senate today. I know other Members wish to speak on other issues. We will also have a chance to discuss for 2 hours the disaster bill itself in the middle of the afternoon. But I wanted those who watch these proceedings to know what the facts are.

The facts are that there have been thousands—tens of thousands—of victims of a natural disaster. That disaster was visited on them through no fault of their own; jerked out of their school; pulled out of their homes. The homes destroyed; the schools are closed.

The timing is urgent that this get done.

Let me end the way I began with two points.

One, we are enormously grateful for what is in this bill for disaster relief. We are enormously troubled by the time and the delay it has taken and will take to get this to the President for signature. My hope is that very soon all Members will understand the urgency of disaster relief for those victims who need it today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 837 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for his courtesy in securing my recognition after him.

(The remarks of Mr. BRYAN and Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 838 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me also ask unanimous consent that, following my comments, the Senator from Missouri be recognized.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nicole Elizabeth Narotzky and Margaret Joanna Smith be allowed to be in the Chamber during this afternoon.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues.

100th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOREST SERVICE ORGANIC ACT OF 1897

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, yesterday was the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Forest Service's Organic Act, so it is an appropriate time to reflect on how recent Congresses have addressed Forest Service issues.

Let me also say to my colleagues, yesterday had sent to each one of your offices a book by Douglas MacCleery called "The American Forests: A History of Resiliency and Recovery."

During the 104th Congress, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee conducted the first extended series of oversight hearings on the management of our Federal forests in almost 20 years. As these hearings proceeded, we also consulted with experts in the field of forestry management, participated in and evaluated the results of the Seventh American Forest Congress, and asked the General Accounting Office and others to evaluate the current state of the management of our national forests. As a consequence of these efforts, we have formed some conclusions about the management of our national forests,

and today I would like to share these with my colleagues.

Notwithstanding considerable contemporary controversy, the Forest Service remains a top performer among Federal agencies. The breadth of contemporary controversy over Federal forest management and the cacophony of interest group outcries from all ends of the spectrum tend to obscure the simple fact that much of the time the Forest Service carries out its duties quite effectively.

Over the decade, the quality of management employed on our Federal forests have been reflected in the integrity of the resources involved. Since the turn of the century, and particularly over the last several decades, the science of resource management has improved dramatically. Our federally owned forests are arguably managed under the most advanced scientific principles and the most stringent environmental controls that have been applied to any managed ecosystem in the world.

In a historic context, the return on this investment in scientific management is striking. Many Federal forests which some view today as pristine ecological preserves were, earlier in this century, little more than worn-out farm lots. Species of megafauna which were dangerously close to extinction at the turn of the century are now flourishing on our Federal forests.

The National Forest System provides more recreation opportunities than any other land ownership category in the country. Wood from our national forests made a significant contribution to the American dream of affordable housing for post-war America, and must still continue to make an important contribution to our national fiber needs today.

The heat generated by present-day conflicts over Federal forest management makes it easy to forget that our national forests are century-long success stories. But this perspective is essential to retain as we go about the task of addressing contemporary problems and improving on our performance in forest resource management.

Notwithstanding the barrage of negative publicity generated by the pleadings of special interests, I remain highly impressed by the commitment of Forest Service professionals of all disciplines and at all levels. Moreover, after more than 15 hearings on an array of related subjects, I am convinced that the majority of people—those not vested in a particular resource management outcome—are, after a reasonable opportunity to offer their thoughts, prepared to defer to the judgment and expertise of the Forest Service in resource management decisions. In this regard, I have reached four specific conclusions from our oversight.

First, budget reductions and downsizing have left the agency with significant management problems. Throughout the system there are national forests with critical gaps in re-

source management expertise and/or personnel shortages. I have come away from our oversight convinced that we simply must find a way to provide the agency with the resources to do the job we want done. I urge my colleagues to join me in this search.

Second, despite these current fiscal constraints and various and sundry controversies, the spirit of Forest Service employees remains surprisingly strong. This spirit shone through in much of the testimony received from agency employees, particularly during field hearings. I believe we must act now to avoid squandering this endangered resource.

Third, the breadth and quality of resource and environmental expertise within the Forest Service, even stressed by budget constraints, is nonetheless unique among related Federal agencies. For example, I have come to conclude that the Forest Service's specialists possess: as much or more expertise in endangered species conservation as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; as much or more expertise in managing anadromous fish habitat as the National Marine Fisheries Service; and as much or more expertise in maintaining or restoring water quality in rural, forested watersheds as the Environmental Protection Agency.

Fourth, in response to probative questions, we finally began to hear the acknowledgment, from other Federal agencies that this expertise exists and that the Forest Service could, in their view, be trusted to use it. I am not convinced that their actions yet reflect these words, but I was glad to hear them, nonetheless.

Most people still strongly support multiple-use management despite well publicized assertions to the contrary. After listening to over 200 witnesses from all quarters, I have come away convinced that we should continue to use our federally owned forests for a wide variety of purposes as long as these activities do not damage the lands. I believe that the majority of the populace agrees that we should protect wildlife habitat, allow recreation, permit harvesting of trees, grazing of animals, and development of minerals on these lands, and that these activities—if conducted judiciously—can be compatible. I do not believe that the "zero harvest," or "cattle free" philosophies are as widely supported as their proponents maintain. For example, at the seventh American Forest Congress, the 1,500 participants voted 91 percent to 4 percent to defeat an extremist proposal to eliminate commercial harvest on public lands.

Moreover, I also strongly suspect from what we heard that most people believe that the way to decide the best mix of uses on Federal forests lands is to give the Forest Service—particularly the resource professionals on the ground—as broad and independent a responsibility as possible to conduct studies, develop comprehensive plans, consult with the public, and then implement the results. Unfortunately,