

Y4
Ag 8/1
76/49

1010

93/4
Ag 8/1
76/49

PROHIBIT REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF FOREST SERVICE EMPLOYEES

GOVERNMENT

Storage

MENTS

30 1973

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.J. Res. 729 and S.J. Res. 134

SEPTEMBER 25, 1973

Serial No. 93-AA

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

23-560

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky,
Vice Chairman

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
E DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
B. F. SISK, California
BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana
ED JONES, Tennessee
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
DAWSON MATHIS, Georgia
BOB BERGLAND, Minnesota
FRANK E. DENHOLM, South Dakota
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., California
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi
CHARLES ROSE, North Carolina
JERRY LITTON, Missouri
BILL GUNTER, Florida

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California,
Ranking Minority Member
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
WILMER D. MIZELL, North Carolina
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
LAMAR BAKER, Tennessee
CHARLES THONE, Nebraska
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
EDWARD YOUNG, South Carolina
JAMES P. JOHNSON, Colorado
EDWARD R. MADIGAN, Illinois

FOWLER C. WEST, *Staff Director*
JOHN F. O'NEAL, *General Counsel*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Associate Counsel*
JOHN RAINBOLT, *Associate Counsel*
L. T. EASLEY, *Press Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS

JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana, *Chairman*

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
BILL GUNTER, Florida

GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
LAMAR BAKER, Tennessee
CHARLES THONE, Nebraska
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho

(II)

CONTENTS

House Joint Resolution 729, a joint resolution to prohibit any reduction in the number of employees of the Forest Service during the current fiscal year.....	Page 3
Statement of:	
Campbell, Hon. J. Phil, Under Secretary of Agriculture.....	3
Haalck, Henry, director, Federal Timber Resources, National Forest Products Association.....	36
Tilton, George, associate general counsel, National Federation of Federal Employees.....	21
Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee:	
Johnson, Reuben L., director of legislative services, National Farmers Union, letter of September 27, 1973.....	42
Kimball, Thomas L., executive vice president, National Wildlife Federation, letter of September 26, 1973.....	40
Towell, William E., executive vice president, American Forestry Association, letter of October 3, 1973.....	43
Walker, Laurence C., chairman, Committee of Professional Employment, Society of American Foresters, letter of October 24, 1973.....	44

CONTENTS

Page	
3	
3	
36	
37	
43	
40	
42	
42	
42	

PROHIBIT REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF FOREST SERVICE EMPLOYEES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. John Rarick [chairman] presiding.

Present: Representatives Rarick, Vigorito, Gunter, Goodling, Baker, and Symms.

Also present: Representatives Teague and Poage [chairman, full committee]; Hyde H. Murray, associate counsel; John Rainbolt, associate counsel; Steve Allen, staff consultant; L. T. Easley, press assistant; and Betty Prezioso, staff assistant.

Mr. RARICK. The subcommittee will come to order.

We are holding hearings today on H.J. Res. 729 and an identical Senate-passed bill, S.J. Res. 134, legislation which would require the U.S. Forest Service to maintain the level of permanent, full-time employees during the present fiscal year at not less than 450 above the June 30, 1973, permanent full-time personnel ceiling.

The subcommittee recognizes that the President, in his recent housing message, remains committed to the objective of the Housing Act of 1949: that is, "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." The subcommittee is also cognizant of the President's remarks yesterday when he received the findings and recommendations of his Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment, a portion of which was:

To meet our current and future needs for lumber, the Panel recommends that timber sales from national forests be raised to and maintained at allowable harvest levels wherever market demand is sufficient and so long as adequate funding is made available. This is an objective with which the Forest Service concurs, and I endorse it.

The subcommittee is aware that the President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment has recommended that this increased harvest of timber on national forest lands be accompanied by more extensive and intensive management so as to protect the environment and insure an adequate supply of timber for all Americans.

We are also aware that the President's Advisory Panel has recommended that—

The President require Federal land management agencies, especially the Forest Service, to undertake management practices to direct and control all nontimber uses made of the lands; to recognize that the day of unlimited public use of Federal recreation areas is over, and that recreation and other nontimber uses

will have to be controlled and managed, just as management has been applied over many years to timber growing and harvest and to grazing use.

We are aware of the tremendous importance of the Forest Service and its diversified operations. The Forest Service currently has some 187 million acres of forest land under its control. It is charged with operating under a multiple-use concept requiring consideration of timber harvesting, recreational activities, conservation of fish and wildlife, water management, watershed development, and grazing.

We are aware of all of these operations, and we recognize that the Forest Service has been charged with increasing timber harvest on national forest lands by 10 percent or 1 billion board feet, yet the administration has proposed to reduce the level of permanent full-time employees of the Forest Service almost 1,600 persons. We are concerned over this and would like to inquire if the Forest Service has sufficient personnel with which to carry out its assigned duties, much less attempt to implement the recommendations of the President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment.

We know that Chief McGuire of the Forest Service, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, admitted that the reduction in personnel would lead to a "less intensively managed" program. We wonder, therefore, if the administration, in insisting that every agency within the Federal Government face a reduction in personnel, is not being penny wise and pound foolish.

We recognize that an investment in timber production is an investment in America and its future. Again, quoting Chief McGuire in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, "for every dollar expended in our timber programs the Treasury gets back about \$4 and the counties get back about 25 percent of that in payments in lieu of taxes." This is an investment that must be protected, and the Forest Service is charged with this responsibility.

The workload on the national forests has been expanding at a substantial rate in virtually every use. The national forests have truly come of age as more and more Americans look to these 187 million acres for pure water, stable soil conditions, clean atmosphere, plants, and animals in order to provide a full measure of commodity and non-commodity uses.

The question is: Are these 187 million acres of the national environment being as intensively managed as they should be to fully provide for these resources now and in the future.

There is little doubt the cost of living and the cost of doing business has risen appreciably for this past decade and significantly these past few years. On a constant dollar basis, the budgets for the Forest Service have not kept pace with this rise, and the budget now before the Congress requests less money than was provided last year. Thus, in the face of inflation, less money will be available, both in terms of current dollars, and in terms of constant dollars, the decline is even greater.

We feel it is our duty to see that the Forest Service has adequate, trained, full-time personnel to do the job assigned to it and to do it well. Otherwise, future Americans must pay for our mistakes.

(S.J. Res. 134 is identical to H.J. Res. 729 introduced by Mr. Rarick, for himself, Mr. Vigorito, Mr. Melcher, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Foley, Mr. Baker, and Mr. Sikes, the text of which follows:)

[H.J. Res. 729, 93d Cong., first sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION To prohibit any reduction in the number of employees of the Forest Service during the current fiscal year

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the number of permanent, full-time employees employed by the Department of Agriculture to carry out the activities of the Forest Service shall be maintained at not less than four hundred and fifty above the June 30, 1973, permanent, full-time personnel ceiling authorized for such Service by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RARICK. With us today from the Department is the Honorable Phil Campbell, Under Secretary of Agriculture. He is accompanied by Phil Thornton, Deputy Chief of the Forest Service.

Mr. Secretary, we are delighted to have you and Mr. Thornton with us. If you have a prepared statement, we would be happy to have you proceed.

STATEMENT OF J. PHIL CAMPBELL, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY PHILIP L. THORNTON, DEPUTY CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAMPBELL. Thank you, Chairman Rarick. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your subcommittee on the House Joint Resolution 729.

I will read a very brief prepared statement and make a few remarks and then be happy to answer any questions which you may have.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to appear before you today to express our views on House Joint Resolution 729. The intent of this resolution is to prevent any further reduction in Forest Service personnel below the authorized levels of June 30, 1973.

For fiscal year 1973, the Forest Service was assigned a personnel ceiling level of 20,404 permanent, full-time employees. Subsequently, the Secretary and the Director of the Cost of Living Council announced that in calendar year 1973 the Forest Service would increase its timber sales offerings by 1 billion board feet. To assure that this increased sales program could be accomplished, the Secretary authorized an additional 450 positions for permanent, full-time employees. This brought the authorized Forest Service personnel level as of June 30, 1973, to 20,854. We presume that it is this figure which would be maintained by the resolution.

In the past year, Members of Congress have expressed much concern about reductions in Forest Service personnel at a time when demands on the resources and services of the national forests and the agency as a whole are increasing. We appreciate this strong interest in Forest Service programs and share this concern.

However, we do not believe that House Joint Resolution 729 is appropriate, because additional staff is not required to continue

essential services. Enactment of this resolution would not be consistent with the administration's objectives. It does not take into consideration the difficult budgetary situation facing this and all other departments of the Federal Government. Specifically, it seeks to solve Forest Service personnel problems without regard to the impacts of this action on other departmental programs.

We believe it is undesirable to establish by statute a required minimum personnel level for a single agency. We believe there are some potential deleterious effects of such legislation which we want to bring to your attention. For example, the practical effects of House Joint Resolution 729 could be to create surplus employment in the Forest Service. If the resolution is enacted, as now worded, the Forest Service would be required to maintain the 20,854 personnel at all times. To assure that employment never fell below the statutory personnel levels, the Forest Service would need to set employment levels above the minimum in anticipation of vacancies created periodically by retirements, transfers, and resignations. More importantly, establishment of a statutory minimum employment level would impair the Secretary's ability to manage the Department within a total personnel ceiling.

As you are aware, the conference committee for the 1974 agriculture appropriations bill recognized the impact created by raising personnel levels in certain departmental programs. The conference report included a statement of "particular concern" that, as necessary increases occur in individual agricultural programs, such as the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, corresponding decreases in personnel are imposed on other agencies "to the detriment of those other programs." This would certainly be the case if House Joint Resolution 729 were enacted.

Since other USDA agencies have, like the Forest Service, already absorbed personnel reductions for fiscal year 1974, the imposition of additional reductions would place an unfair burden on them and seriously jeopardize some essential agricultural programs.

We believe the Department and Forest Service manpower levels are adequate to meet fiscal year 1974 program objectives. We acknowledge that we are not operating our various agency programs at optimum levels and, like all other Federal departments, we wish we could. But optimum levels of manpower and funding are not possible in this difficult budgetary period. Each Federal agency must assist in the overall effort to reduce Federal spending and thereby help curb inflation.

In conclusion, we believe it is essential that the Secretary retain the authority and flexibility to manage personnel ceilings within the Department. In our view, this is the only way to assure orderly and equitable programing of goals and resources which will produce effective agricultural programs.

Now, I would like to make a few brief comments, also, Mr. Chairman.

We think that the Forest Service has been a very efficiently well-organized, capable, dedicated Service. We are very proud of the personnel in the Forest Service. They are being buffeted about from all directions, from environmental groups who take them to court in regards to the increased timber sales offered by the Forest Service; and I think there are about a dozen court cases presently tying up activities of the Forest Service.

We also have demands on the other side of the fence pressing on the Forest Service, groups wishing more timber to be cut in order to make available more housing for the needy and also to meet the general housing needs of the Nation in the private sector, and the public sector as well, where it is promoted by the Federal Government.

But nonetheless, under very trying circumstances, we think the multiple-use concept being carried out by the Forest Service is being done on a real fine basis by a highly professional group of skilled administrators.

Now, with regards to personnel needs, I must say that they certainly do shift and change, not only in the public sector but in the private sector as well. I know when I began farming, I had three full-time hands milking 18 cows. When I got electricity and bought a milking machine, I did not still need three full-time hands to milk 18 cows. I needed about one hand to milk 35 or 40 cows. So with the changes in technology and the changing world in which we live, we have different needs and have to be able to have flexibility in the use of personnel.

I had a similar experience in the administration of the Georgia Department of Agriculture. When we went through a reorganization because we were very poorly set up, we had a reduction in personnel from some 830 people down to 770 people. At the same time, we put 100 persons to work on meat and poultry inspection and had 20 scientific people employed that were not previously employed, veterinarians, chemists, and so forth. So that we had 120 people doing jobs in the department that had not been previously done, although we had a reduction from 830 down to 770 people. But with cross utilization of personnel, we were doing a much more efficient job and giving much better service.

I merely point out the fact that any organization, whether it be the corporate structure, whether it be a farmers' cooperative, or whether it be a governmental agency, must take a look regularly at its utilization of personnel. Otherwise, they do not keep up with the changing world. And we believe that the executive branch should have this flexibility in order to get the optimum use possible.

And if we do have such a resolution as this passed, it could be very detrimental to other agencies within the Department of Agriculture by pushing down the personnel ceilings in those areas, such as agricultural research, Farmers Home Loan Administration, and so forth.

I would be very happy to answer any questions that you may have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

We appreciate your presence this morning and the remarks that you have offered.

May I ask, since you refer in several instances in your testimony to the fiscal year 1974 program objectives, can you tell the committee when these objectives were established, roughly what time of the year, what date?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, these objectives were set or established in the past. They certainly were not established last week. They were established prior to and during the budget-making process. We have to establish our objectives in the budget-making process, so that these 1974 objectives would have been first established, prior to the President's budget message to Congress.

Mr. RARICK. Is it safe to say that these budget objectives for 1974 were probably established some time in 1973?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; just as we now are looking at our objectives for 1975, in preparation for the President's budget message to Congress in January. So there is a 12-months' lead time.

Mr. RARICK. The 1974 objectives may have been established in 1972, then? Probably September 1972?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; they could have been. That is correct. That was the beginning period. Of course, as we go along and have to make changes, very often we send supplemental requests to the Congress because of changed conditions when necessary.

Mr. RARICK. In other words, these objectives are flexible, then?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct.

Mr. RARICK. Was one of the objectives for the further reduction of full-time employees in the Forest Service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. RARICK. Now, Mr. Secretary, are you aware of any changes in the 1974 program objectives as a result of the President's housing speech?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we did come back, as noted in my testimony, with a change in the Forest Service objectives by an addition of another 450 positions to the Forest Service. And with the most recent items that have come forward, such as, the President's housing speech and then, just in the last 24 hours, the special study that is coming to the press, we will again have to look at our objectives in the light of current, ongoing demands in our society with regard to the supply of timber. Of course, we are in a down phase right now with regard to housing starts.

Mr. RARICK. Has there been any change in the objectives as a result of the President's housing speech?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not yet.

Mr. RARICK. Now, the 400 and—what did you say—50?

Mr. CAMPBELL. 450 additional positions, which is a shift and a change from the original position level that was established prior to the President's budget message.

Mr. RARICK. Well these employees mainly be designated or assigned to the tasks of increased production?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. RARICK. Harvesting in the forests?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Increased sales offerings, yes; in order for the private sector to do the cutting.

Mr. RARICK. Then, their assigned duties will probably be to cruise the timber and be present at the cutting and the selling?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, to prepare the timber for the bids that must be taken. They are out making cruises and estimations of the amount of timber in blocks and making determinations as to what timber should be cut and then seeing to it that the site is properly prepared and put on the market for bids from the private sector.

Mr. RARICK. Is it safe to assume that none of these additional 450 men will have any duties which would relieve or participate in the normal assigned mission of the Forest Service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that is a fair statement; yes.

Mr. RARICK. And how long do you estimate these additional 450 employees would stay with the Service—until the additional reduction is terminated?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, as long as they are needed; yes. It could be that situations and circumstances change, and we would continue to need additional timber cuts. That would have to be determined by the needs in the future. We cannot project that far in advance.

Mr. RARICK. Then, in considering the level of the full-time employees of the department, we should handle this additional 450 as a separate increment. Is that right?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, they have already been put into our 1973 figures, as well as our 1974 figures. They are already included in our ceilings that we have; they are included in the number that I gave you of 20,854, which was prior to July 1 of this year.

Mr. RARICK. But in the wider discretion of our leaders downtown, this sum can be there today and be gone tomorrow, or whenever they decide that the increased timber production requirement is over. Is that not correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, that is correct; yes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, the report to the President by the Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment contains a recommendation that the Forest Service budget be increased by some \$200 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have not read that report yet personally. I will ask Phil Thornton.

Mr. THORNTON. Yes; that is one of the 20 recommendations in the report. The President's comment on the report was that the timber task force would look at each of the major recommendations and take what action they deemed necessary.

Mr. RARICK. The present appropriation this year, I believe, that just passed the House in conference was \$387 million, roughly, was it not?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, the budget has so many components, I am not sure which piece you are looking at.

Mr. RARICK. I am talking about the appropriation of funds that the House and Senate conferees have agreed to.

Mr. THORNTON. Well, \$477 million is the figure I have.

Mr. RARICK. \$477 million. Then this additional \$200 million, is a sizable recommendation by the President's panel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; that would be a sizable increase.

Mr. RARICK. And, of course, they do not say how this money is to be used. But we would assume that it would be on salaries and much of it would be designed for additional Forest Service employees, would it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would feel certain that, if this recommendation is accepted by the administration, which it has not right now—this determination has not been made—but if it were accepted, it would doubtlessly call for more employees, and the administration would necessarily make that adjustment in the employee ceiling, as we did in the 1973 situation.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, as I understand your figures, you indicate that the authorized personnel level as of June 30, including the additional 450 employees for the timber reduction, is 20,859.

May I ask you what we actually have as full-time employees at the Service at this time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. At the present time, we have 19,435.

Mr. RARICK. 19,435?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. RARICK. And that does not include any of the 450?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, the 20,854 is the allowable ceiling which was effective June 30, 1973. And this 19,435 are those that are actually on the payroll. Your allowable ceiling and the number on the payroll very rarely are the same figure, because you have retirements and resignations, and you are in the process of hiring. So the personnel ceiling and the actual employment are never actually the same figure.

Mr. RARICK. I understand there is a certain attrition.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And then, we are in the process of hiring most of the time, too.

Mr. RARICK. What I meant was, we are using 450 additional employees in the personnel level as indicated June 30, and that the additional employees were not included in the number you say that were actually employed by the Service.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, as of today, we do not have—we are not up to that 20,854 figure, as of today.

Mr. RARICK. These additional 450, then, will not be transferred or reassigned from the Forest Service? These are new employees that will probably be recruited or employed from without the Service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Phil Thornton would like to make a comment on that.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, that additional 450 people for producing this additional board feet of timber offerings are on board now. Some of them are new employees and some of them are people transferred from other jobs who are capable of taking on this assignment. So they are in that figure of 19,435 on board now.

Mr. RARICK. What kind of special training, or what kind of employees will these 450 be?

Mr. THORNTON. The timber cruising and timber sales preparation and all the activities that go with that.

Mr. RARICK. In other words, none of them will be people with any expertise in recreation or watersheds or other multiple-use projects assigned to the Forest Service?

Mr. THORNTON. There will be relatively few of these categories of personnel involved in the timber sale operation. A few of them would be.

Mr. RARICK. I did not mean to dominate all the questions.

Mr. Baker, have you any questions you would like to ask the Secretary?

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for coming up to try to help us resolve a problem with which we are genuinely concerned.

The mandatory ceilings which have been imposed by the administration for departments across the board are a concern to me, just like minimums are a concern to me. I'm thinking of the problem which we have had in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it is the reason I support this legislation.

The TVA has a personnel ceiling imposed on it, and they cannot get the mission accomplished, they say, with the number of employees

that they have been allowed under the meat axe of chopping off 5 percent or whatever the reduction is. So they hire construction workers for 11 months and 29 days as temporary employees, lay them off for 2 weeks, hire them back—the same men. They do not have any continuing employee benefits, no insurance, no retirement benefits that are accrued. To me, this does not seem to be the way to run an organization.

I do not want to hire one man more than we need, and I do not know how to really reconcile the problems here on both ends of the scale. Never do I want to see a department perpetuated for the purpose of employing people. I want the people to be for the necessity of the job.

How do you consider that the basic determinations should be made or have to be made?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Congressman, I cannot comment on the situation in the TVA, but I would say that, in the Department of Agriculture, I feel that we have not failed to deliver in any of the agencies as a result of our restrictions on personnel. We have reduced from possibly a high in the neighborhood of between 85,000 and 88,000 down to about 78,000 in the Department of Agriculture, and yet I do not feel that we have failed to deliver any services of any of the agencies of the Department, as a result. I think we have a much more efficient organization and continue to deliver in the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service and many other agencies of the Department.

Now, it has been rather stringent at times. But necessity is the mother of invention, and very often this makes us scurry around and find new techniques and find better methods of doing things, such as in the eradication program on brucellosis. We formerly pulled a blood sample at the auction barn and had to use all this amount of labor to hold the calf; one pulled the samples of all the calves going to market. Now we use a back-tagging system, and we no longer pull the samples at the auction barns. We pull the samples at the slaughterhouses when all of these cattle go through the slaughterhouses, and we already have the labor there. It is a labor-saving situation. So a little bit of constraint really makes you more efficient.

And, as I said in my testimony, the same thing happens in the private sector, in the corporate structure. They have shakedowns to shake out the deadwood every now and then. And we do not feel in in the Department of Agriculture that these constraints affect the delivery systems within the Department. And if we do have a stringent situation, we go and ask for relief, just as we did in the Forest Service, and we were given 450 more people to add before the June 30 deadline came. When we are really faced with a severe situation, I am convinced that we will have a lift of the personnel ceiling level and be able to take care of it.

Mr. BAKER. What has been the high in personnel levels in the Forest Service within the past 3 or 4 years?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I have the figures here before me. In 1963, there was just about the same number in the Forest Service that there are today—10 years later. There were 19,236 authorized, but there were only 18,879 on the payroll, whereas today we have 19,435 on the payroll.

The high point was reached in 1967, when there were 22,470 authorized, and they actually exceeded that by having 22,574 on the payrolls—100 over the level. That was the high point.

The next year they dropped down by about 200 or 300 employees. And then they have been up and down in a range between that 22,000 and the 19,000 figure for the last 8 or 10 years. So we really have not got much difference.

Now, of course, the multiple use concept and the multitude of visitors in the recreation areas have put a strain on the Forest Service. And, of course, an increased timber cut have been asked for.

But the high level was 22,574, which was about 100 above the actual level of personnel authorized.

Mr. BAKER. What has contributed to the ability to reduce by 3,000 the employees from that high point to the present level?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What has contributed to it?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, personnel restraints imposed by the administration in the last 3 years. They have been reduced in the last 3 years for that reason.

Now, there was a reduction in 1969 down to 20,823. I cannot tell you why that was. We were in half of that fiscal year; the other administration was in the other half. But I know in 1971, we were back up to 21,515; 1972, down to 20,685. So that I would say that the main cause to come down a couple of thousand in the last 2 or 3 years has been the personnel constraints.

Mr. BAKER. Has this been the result of operating economies rather than a curtailment of services? What has been sacrificed by the reduction of employees?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we feel as though the Forest Service has still been able to carry on its multiple use concept, I would say. I would much prefer Phil Thornton to answer this, because I am not fully knowledgeable; after all, the Forest Service covers a substantial portion of the United States and this is a lot of personnel. But I do know one area that I will mention and then ask Phil Thornton to elaborate.

I think that, at times, we do not feel as though we have had as many people as we needed to do a real first-class job and to care for the recreational areas because of the multitude of visitors in the national forests for recreational purposes. It is actually a larger figure than visits to our national parks in the Interior Department. Phil, would you comment on that?

Mr. THORNTON. I would like to elaborate on that.

The way we have met this challenge of a decreasing number of people and increasing programs and responsibilities is through a number of approaches. One is to use contracting or outside people to do the jobs we have previously been doing ourselves. For example, in our attempts to get down to the ceiling for 1974, we are using commercial instead of in-house maintenance facilities for equipment more so than before; 30 of our 77 equipment maintenance shops will be closed. That is one example of what we do to cope with this need.

We are using commercial, State, or prison shops to make our signs, whereas in previous years we did that ourselves. In equipment development and testing, we are contracting more of that out to commercial testing laboratories. In some States, the State forestry organizations

provide fire protection in some areas. To the extent possible, we are shifting that workload to them, and nursery stock production is being shifted to State nurseries. These are examples of the kind of things we are doing—contracting and getting the job done through other people than our own.

Mr. BAKER. One last question, Mr. Chairman.

Have the overall budget levels been reduced in the ratio with the reduction of employees?

Mr. THORNTON. I have some figures on that, if I may, for the record. These parallel the manpower figures that the Secretary just gave you.

For example, in 1963 our program dollars in millions was \$420 million. In 1967, for example, it was \$512 million. The high point was reached in 1972, with \$751 million. And we just talked about the current situation. The estimated 1973 comparable figure is about \$870 million. So that the funds have been going up and the people have been going down.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Symms?

Mr. SYMMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to, if I could, direct a couple of questions to Mr. Thornton.

Mr. Thornton, I am sure you are aware of the problem we have in the Pacific Northwest of the tussock moth, and particularly in the national forests that border my district in Oregon. And that the tussock moth is now appearing in Idaho, in the national forests of the Clearwater and the Nez Perce.

How do problems like this affect the Forest Service as far as manpower needs and so forth, where we have 800,000 acres of dead timber, say, in the Umatilla and Wallowa National Forests, and we have to make salvage sales on them?

How does this affect the Forest Service in doing its operation? Does this put an additional load on the Service?

Mr. THORNTON. This is a good example of the kind of additional workload with which we have to cope every year. This year it happens to be the tussock moth, and another year, it could be another kind of problem—rehabilitation after a fire, for example.

There is a constant need to readjust and reprogram our efforts the best we can to meet that particular kind of situation. If it gets large enough, as Secretary Campbell said, we go and seek additional manpower and funds to do a particular major job like that.

Mr. SYMMS. Something that I would like to see happen would be to have this committee take a trip out there and have a look at that firsthand to see what the Forest Service has been putting up with.

But is it a safe statement to say that the requirements put upon the Forest Service by the passage of the NEPA Act of 1968 have been a tremendous additional burden upon the Service as far as filling out environmental impact statements on timber sales?

Mr. THORNTON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMMS. And how much more of a job is it now to prepare a timber sale than it was, say, 5 or 6 years ago?

Mr. THORNTON. It is much more difficult now because of the greater concern for environmental protection. For example, the fact that we are getting farther back into the timber. Since the easy jobs are more

or less done, each timber sale gets to be more difficult than the one previously.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I am sure you are aware of the fact that in the Pacific Northwest we have large tracts of overmature timber which are more susceptible to disease and insect threat and a shortage of access.

But how have the cuts in funding for access roads affected the ability of the forest supervisors to go in and cut the timber that needs to be cut as opposed to having to cut what is closest to the road, making timber sales that pay for the roads as they go?

Do you follow my question?

Mr. THORNTON. I think so. I think that illustrates what I was saying about the easier sales having been completed, and now, to get additional sales on the market, it takes more of a road program than previously.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I think the problem that bothers me is that we give the Forest Service the responsibility to effect a multiple-use concept and tell them to go out and manage the forests in multiple use, consider recreation and other aspects of it, and then we turn right around and cut funding for the access roads. Then the only way that a forest supervisor can sell a tract of timber is to put a large block up, which will pay for the road.

And I would just like to ask you how have the bids been taking place? Is it only the larger companies now that are bidding on the big sales of timber, or are we selling more big tracts of timber, as opposed to smaller, say, a million board feet—how many 1-million-board-feet sales are being offered compared with 10-million-foot sales?

Mr. THORNTON. I cannot answer that. I would be glad to supply it for the record.

[The following information was subsequently supplied by the Forest Service:]

The table that follows shows the number of sales sold in Region 1 of the Forest Service (Montana and northern Idaho) during the first and second quarters of calendar years 1971, 1972, and 1973. For comparison purposes, the percentage of sales in the second quarter of each year shown, through two million board feet (2,000 MBF) size class was: 1973, 92.9%; 1972, 86.5%; and 1971, 91.1%.

ANALYSIS OF QUARTERLY SOLD REPORTS—REGION 1, 1ST AND 2D QUARTERS ONLY, CALENDAR YEARS 1971-73

Size, class, code, and description	Number of sales, calendar year—					
	1st quarter, 1971	2d quarter, 1971	1st quarter, 1972	2d quarter, 1972	1st quarter, 1973	2d quarter, 1973
1—Nonconvertible.....	2	3	0	3	2	9
3—Through \$300.....	189	512	97	528	289	702
4—Over \$300 through \$2,000.....	29	49	21	62	36	41
5—Over \$2,000 through 2,000 MBF.....	14	27	13	55	15	62
		(591)		(648)		(814)
6—Over 2,000 MBF through 5,000 MBF.....	9	20	2	43	1	23
7—Over 5,000 MBF through 15,000 MBF.....	7	33	6	54	2	34
8—Over 15,000 MBF.....	2	5	0	4	0	5
		(649)		(749)		(876)

AVAILABILITY OF NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER—SALES OFFERINGS TO SMALL BUSINESSES

Analysis of timber sale purchases by small businesses in the first half of 1973, shows that they did not purchase their base share of offered timber sales.

[In percent]

Period	Base share	Small businesses purchases
Calendar year 1971.....	48.7	52.6
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972.....	45.2	45.8
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1972.....	47.3	56.4
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972.....	43.9	39.5

Because small businesses did not purchase at least their "base share," a timber sale set-aside program has been implemented for the second half of 1973. This program reserves selected timber sales, in marketing areas where needed, for purchase by small businesses only. For the second half of 1973, the reserved volume will be over one billion board feet (1.058 MMMBF). This set-aside program is authorized by the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631).

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, for the record, that from the information I have and from the time I have spent in the national forests in my district in the month of August, that only the larger companies are able to bid on the timber now, because we have put so many requirements upon the supervisors as far as filling out environmental impact statements and preparing timber sales that they can hardly afford the manpower time to put the little tracts up for sale. So we are by-passing salvage sales that we should be selling, in many cases, in order to sell big tracts.

And in this process, we have to pay for the road as we go through the timber sale, which hurts the county governments because they lose part of their share of the stumpage returns. And that 25 percent that the counties get, the road-building operation comes off of that. And I think that this is a problem that many Members of Congress fail to see.

When I think of the development of natural resources, I wonder if it is not pennywise and pound foolish not to do a little better job in the national forests than a poorer job. And I would just like to impress on our minds how many dollars we get back in the Federal treasury from timber sales, as opposed to how much we are appropriating.

Is this thing a good paying proposition or not?

Mr. THORNTON. Yes; it is a paying proposition. Looking at the timber functions particularly, it far exceeds the money required in preparing and administering the sale.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I appreciate Mr. Campbell's testimony, I appreciate your knowledge of your modernizing your diary, and being able to use one man to milk 35 cows when you used to have three. However, I wonder if we haven't given the Forest Service additional requirements, rather than less requirements, in the past 5 years. Do you think that is a fair assumption?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, there is no doubt that they have had additional requirements imposed on them, the ones that you brought out. Most noteworthy are the environmental statements that must be prepared. It takes a lot of manpower to do this.

We are not complaining necessarily about the environmental statements, but this does impose a lot of extra workload on the Forest Service. Of course, the same thing applies to other agencies as well, but more to the Forest Service than any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I realize it affects other agencies as well; however, are other agencies actually in the business of producing a renewable resource like the Forest Service is?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. I threw another phrase in. I said, "The Forest Service more than any other agency." This additional workload for environmental statements affects them more than it does the other agencies of the Department.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, of course.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And there is no other agency that is producing a renewable resource, as you have said. Of course, we work with the farmers throughout the United States, who constantly have a renewable resource in the crops on their land each year, which are annual, and their livestock, and so on. But this is the only agency that is actually in the production of a renewable resource.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I was just wondering about the 30-percent increase in timber cut. Maybe I should direct this question back to Mr. Thornton.

If I understood the chairman correctly in his statement, the President said yesterday that he wanted to increase timber cuts by 30 percent, is that right, this year? An additional billion board feet. Do you have those figures?

Mr. THORNTON. He did not say it that way, Mr. Symms. If I could read one paragraph from his statement?

Mr. SYMMS. Yes, I would appreciate it.

Mr. THORNTON. "To meet our current and future needs for lumber, the panel recommends that timber sales from national forests be raised to and maintained at allowable harvest levels wherever market demand is sufficient and so long as adequate funding is made available. This is an objective with which the Forest Service concurs, and I endorse it."

That is the pertinent paragraph.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I would be the first to say that we have many, many acres standing of overmature timber in the Pacific Northwest that should be harvested. However, when we cut the availability of access, so that there is no way that a forest supervisor can say, well, you can take a million board feet from this place, and a million board feet over here. I am trying to get this in my mind, how are we going to do this, other than large sales which cut out all the small bidders?

In the Boise National Forest, for instance, which I am very familiar with, we have only two companies now which are able to bid on the timber which is offered for sale, because the smaller operators cannot put up the capital necessary to build roads which meet the very stringent requirements put on by the Forest Service. Now incidentally, this is another subject. We do not want to differ too much as to how good these roads should be. I personally think that in many cases the requirements for the roads are too great, and it costs too much money to build a road just to haul timber out on. However, in some areas there is another argument to that. Because of erosion, and so forth, we do need to have gold-plated roads, so to speak.

But I think that it almost becomes an impossible task to ask the Service to produce more timber and on the other hand, cut the access. We have places where we have deficit sales take place, where the timber will barely pay the freight on the roads. It is at nearly a break-even point. And for the record, Mr. Chairman, a deficit sale, where it costs more to build the road than it is worth to bring the timber out, more than the timber will bring, happens in many cases because the access is such a problem.

And I had another question I would like to ask Mr. Thornton. We have a national recreation area in Idaho—it is not in my district—the Sawtooth Recreation Area, which was passed last year, and I would just like to ask Mr. Thornton how the Forest Service reacts when all the politicians come out to a place like the national recreation area, and vote to develop a great area for people to come and have recreation, promote it all over the country, and give it a great deal of Agriculture attention, and then turn it over to the Forest Service and tell them to manage it, and of course, they have already been managing it for the last 15 years. But they have put an additional burden of literally thousands of people coming into that area. How many more people does it take to manage a national recreation area, say, in the Salmon National Forest, prior to the time that law was enacted?

MR. THORNTON. I cannot give you a figure on that, Mr. Symms. You point out a very real problem. I guess it is this optimum level of program activity that Secretary Campbell talked about. We certainly are not operating at the optimum level at the Sawtooth area. We know what to do there; we just have not had an opportunity to do it.

MR. SYMMS. Of course, I am one Member of Congress. I am sorry that these things were changed from the classification that they had before, because before that time many people did not know where the Sawtooth Recreation Area was, and it was nicer for us in Idaho. However, I think it is a real problem that we can afford, people coming in by the thousands, really, to camp, and they are looking for recreation. Are we cutting back our recreational ability drastically to meet these timber supply needs with the management service now? Is that the policy?

MR. THORNTON. I would not say drastically, no. But one of our high priorities, of course, is visitor health and safety so we do our best to accommodate that need. There is an impact on the recreational use where the visitations are low and the maintenance costs are high.

MR. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I would say further that I think it would be very beneficial for this committee if they could—I know that the time is always short for Members of Congress—but if we could possibly go out to the Pacific Northwest, and actually have a first-hand look at some of these problems, where we have 800,000 acres of dead and dying timber. We have 80,000 new acres of infestation in Idaho. We have 800,000 acres in eastern Oregon that are already dead, that are dying directly as a result of the inability of the Forest Service to be able to carry out the job that they already know how to do, because of all the Government regulations that we have put on the Forest Service.

And I think that we have one agency of the Government tying the hands of another agency. In the case of the tussock moth, EPA says

the Forest Service can't manage the forest where they know how, and the EPA says the Forest Service does not know how to take care of it, so they are giving them the benefit of their knowledge. I think it would be very helpful for this committee, in trying to make a proper action on this legislation, to go out and have a short tour, myself.

Would you want to comment on that? Or maybe this is an improper forum to bring it up, but—

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Symms, I think your point is very well taken. Of course, one of the reasons we are here this morning is that should we be successful in any mobilization against the tussock moth, we are still going to need more Forest Service employees to be able to go into any program of eradication. I think we have one of the bills before the subcommittee.

Mr. SYMMS. If I could ask one other question to Mr. Thornton, Mr. Chairman, I would like to, if the committee would indulge me. I have a bill before the committee also, which would increase the size of ranger sales. Now, am I correct in saying that ranger sales have been drastically curtailed in the past year because of the limited amount of timber that they can supply, as opposed to the large timber sales? Have the ranger sales been curtailed a great deal?

Mr. THORNTON. I do not believe so, Mr. Symms. I could be wrong, but I think we have had standard ranger sale authorizations for some years. We are interested in raising that authorization.

Mr. SYMMS. The bill before the committee would raise the amount of timber that a ranger can sell from \$2,000 to \$10,000. I am not sure that money is the right criterion to use. It maybe should be so many board feet. I am not certain about that, of course. For lack of a better method, we put a dollar figure on it.

But I think that the point that is often missed by OMB and the administration with regard to managing these natural resources is the low intensity which we are giving the national forests, as far as intensive management as compared to, say, what Weyerhaeuser Lumber Co. is doing. Do you think this is a true statement, that we have not been able, and do not have the access, so that a supervisor could really give intensive management to the Forest Service, the thinning of the trees, for instance, all of the agricultural practices that go with increased production? If we could give intensive management to the national forests, do you think it is safe to say that we could increase the timber availability by 30 to 40 percent?

Mr. THORNTON. I think that is a reasonable projection. It is more than access, of course, in terms of forest management, as you point out.

Mr. SYMMS. Access, availability to people to go out and thin out the bad trees, and cut timber before it dies, and this type of management.

Mr. THORNTON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMMS. Now, in this particular instance, if we were doing this type of job, the Treasury would actually stand to gain from this, not lose, the Federal Treasury, is that right?

Mr. THORNTON. That is right.

Mr. SYMMS. And that would mean that, if we would do a little better job of managing it, we could probably get a few more bushels per acre, as I would say, growing apples, and in the long run we would pay back all of our additional expenses and make more money out of it?

Mr. THORNTON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMMS. And have better access for recreation, better access for good timber management, better watershed control, and entirely do a little better job. In essence, Mr. Campbell, this is the problem I have with the OMB's attitude about the Forest Service and the job they have to do with the large number of acres that are involved in this. It seems to me that we are looking at a 500-year management plan, which I hope we are, not just 2 to 4 years or something, so we can balance the books and make it look right. That this may be a place that if we make cuts, in the long run the American people are going to be the losers, as far as watershed, access, and the whole thing.

Would you want to comment on that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have talked considerably about alternative approaches to an annual budget. We are not in a position to discuss that now. We operate on an annual budget basis, which, of course, is actually at times an 8-month budget, and we are just not in a position to discuss any other form of budgeting currently. And I think that, really, what you are discussing gets into longer-term budgeting in order to make long-range plans. Weyerhaeuser, I am sure, operates on a much longer range than an 8 or 12 month budget. They probably also carry out some practices which may not pass an Environmental Protection Agency examination. They may do a considerable amount more of clearcutting. I do not know what their practices are. I have not studied their operation. I am sure Phil Thornton probably knows what they are. But they may be able to weed a lot of practices that, maybe, the Forest Service, at the present time, feels they cannot, for many reasons I have already given, pursue. But I am sure the Forest Service knows a lot of better ways to do a lot of things than they are currently doing, if they just had wider latitude than they have.

And this is not a criticism directed at any particular direction. We live in a total society, and we have to take into consideration the feelings of all the segments of that society, and as I said in my opening remarks, the Forest Service is being badgered from every corner. I know of no agency being attacked from as many different sides as the Forest Service, and for them to be as unflappable as they are, and as cool and calm, for the administration to be going on about their business, is certainly a great tribute to a bunch of real professional people, in my opinion.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, thank you, Mr. Campbell.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say that I think the problem we have here is, we keep giving the Forest Service more requirements to study proposed wilderness areas, we also give them the forest National Recreation Area to manage, we tell them to raise the cuts on timber, but we cut the availability of funds for the roads, so that they cannot actually open up the roads to get to these sites, forcing them into a position of having to do a second-best job. When in many cases they know better how to do it, but because of an inflexibility of the bureaucracy, it is difficult to accomplish this, and the Congress is unwilling to meet this problem head-on. I think it is this kind of political expediency that often comes up with housing shortages and things such as this.

So, in view of that, I think it would really be helpful if this committee could, before acting on this legislation or any other, take a trip out and see where all this timber is and what some of the problems

are with the lack of access, the pests and insects that are threatening the forests.

And I thank you for indulging so much of the time of the committee at this point.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you, Mr. Symms.

You asked a question earlier about an increase in the allowable cut. Each one of the members this morning, thanks to the Clerk, has a copy of the Presidential Advisory Committee report on timber and the environment. If you would look on page 4, at paragraph 8, you would see the recommendation that the panel expresses for increasing the overall cutting rate in the range of 50 to 100 percent. And they proceed further to indicate that on the four forests that they had analyzed in the report, they felt the annual harvest rate should average 39 percent more than is now proposed in recently prepared Forest Service plans. You will find this report quite interesting.

Mr. Secretary, the main opposition, as I understand it, that you have to the legislation before us, is the feeling that we must maintain budgetary cut proposals, which is being initiated by the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I would not state it exactly that way, Mr. Chairman. I think that the executive should have the flexibility to raise and lower personnel, not just lower, but raise it as well. Because if the situation demands, the executive branch will put the personnel in, as we added 450 in fiscal year 1973, to the ceiling already given to the Forest Service.

Mr. RARICK. Do you know of any other agency in the Department that has an ongoing program such as the Forest Service, that has as many demands placed upon it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we have another agency that has had demands placed upon it, where we have had to increase their personnel ceiling each year as we were decreasing the other agencies' personnel, which, of course, did not put more strain on the agencies that were having to be decreased, and that is our meat and poultry inspection programs. Under our Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, we have had to pick up additional meat and poultry plants each year. We have had States that stopped inspecting. And as we have done this, we have had to increase the personnel in this particular agency, and this caused some reduction in some other agencies. But we have been able to work this out.

As I have said, we in the executive branch will put the personnel where needed and when necessary, we will have a lifting of our total Department ceiling. This occurred in 1973 with the addition of the 450 positions to the Forest Service. This was not taken out of the ceilings of the other agencies in the Department. This was an add-on to the Department's total ceiling.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, let me say this. I do not have a reputation for being a big spender of the taxpayers' money. In fact, in many instances I have supported the President on his budgetary cuts, including support for many of his vetoes. But I do want to remind you, that we are elected Representatives of the people, and we constantly receive pressures from the American people, who feel that they own the forests, and that we are not giving them the many benefits that they feel they have a right to expect from their own forest lands.

So, while the President has the executive authority to maintain and execute the laws, we in Congress feel that we have some responsibility in deciding what must be done, and review, at least, whether we have the manpower to do what the people are demanding be done on their forest lands.

It just does not make economic sense to me that everything domestic must succumb to cuts as inflationary, while foreign aid and overseas programs have not been determined to be inflationary or been impounded or cut by OMB as inflationary.

I think that when we come to comparables, if we understand that the Forest Service has in the field right now 16,037 employees—and that is not counting those in Washington—16,000 employees administering 187 million acres of land, then we have one Forest Service employee to every 11,660 acres. And if I was a farmer who owned 11,000 acres of forest land and was responsible for maintaining and seeing what was going on in timber sales, I would feel that I was overextended as far as giving efficient management to that tract.

Let me ask directly the question that I think is really behind these hearings and the legislation before us. Do you feel that the number of employees the Forest Service now has, considering the additional cut of roughly 1,600 people that the Forest Service can adequately and efficiently maintain the role assigned to it in addition to the new burdens being placed on it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I have said previously, we would have some strained situations with regard to doing as good a job as we would like in the recreation areas, and some other areas, as has been brought out. But on the other hand, we feel as though we can make personnel adjustments, in order to help keep the total budget in the black and still not squeeze the Forest Service, just as we do with each of the other agencies, which also are administered by the Department.

Mr. RARICK. Do you know of any other agency we have where the more money we spend, the more money we get?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we are talking about being able to do the job and the objective, Mr. Chairman, answering your question, the job and the objective. Admittedly, there are certain areas where we will not do the optimum job. But on the other hand, in order to fight inflation and try to have our total budget balanced in the black, we feel as though we can do an adequate job with the Forest Service, and if we are not doing an adequate job and are not getting enough timber cut, well, additional personnel will be put there to do so. We just lack the flexibility to do the job as it is needed with the personnel when the time comes.

Mr. RARICK. Of course, I think this is the concern that the committee has, and I would like to direct the Secretary's attention to a similar question which was put to Chief McGuire at the time of the Senate hearings. And his answer was:

It depends on how you define adequate, I guess, Mr. Chairman. We do know that, for example, the recreational use of the national forest system is growing at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. People have more leisure time and they are using it more for outdoors. Now, we either have to accommodate these visitors, or we have to close down our facilities and turn them away. We are approaching the point in some places where we are simply going to have to close down because we cannot properly handle the increased visitor load. There are other examples, perhaps, in connection with water-related recreational developments, new reser-

voirs, impounded waters going in where the reservoir is filled, and yet we have not yet been able to put in the recreational facilities for people to utilize that recreation resource, so there are other areas where this is also happening. We all recognize that there is a backlog like this. For example, in the reforestation effort, we have a backlog of work to be done there. We have a backlog of work to be done in improving the range for livestock, in rehabilitating watersheds that have been damaged by fire in the past. It is obvious you can not do all this work in 1 year or even, perhaps, in a short time. I think we all recognize the need for the work to be done. But the question is, how are we going to finance it? How soon can we afford to get the job done?

In addition to this status report by the Chief of the Forest Service, there has been the testimony of increased litigation—court suits. We are going to need Forest Service people as court witnesses. This will take them from their other duties. They have these various environmental studies. Mr. Symms indicated the problems of making the new cuttings which have been recommended, now, accessible to the purchaser. And one of the other recommendations by the panel is that the Forest Service now conduct a complete survey of allowable cut determinations.

So, all of this seems to point out that if we are going to keep the Forest Service at least up to par and to take care of the new demands on it, that we should be increasing the number of personnel rather than even considering holding them at the present level.

Am I not correct that we are talking about maintaining an adequate forest service operation for the American people?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have stated, and I will state once again that, if certain of these recommendations of this panel are accepted by the administration, the administration will proceed in that direction when the decision is made. Well, if it requires more personnel at that time, I am certain the decision will also be made, as it has been in the past, to increase the Forest Service personnel level.

Mr. RARICK. Of course, this is what we are trying to do now. We are not trying to put any maximum ceiling on employees. We are only, for the protection of the American people, considering a floor, and saying that we feel that good forest management and operations of our national forests, dictates that we should not go below this specified number.

As far as the problem with OMB, and of course, this has been a battle of priorities, between the legislative and the executive, the President in his press release yesterday, dated September 24, relating to the report of the advisory panel, indicates at the bottom paragraph of the first page:

I have asked the Timber Task Force, under the leadership of the Office of Management and Budget, to assess this report carefully, and to put into effect as many of its major recommendations as they consider practical.

With the new ongoing program that we have, certainly I would see nothing wrong with this legislation. In fact, I would feel that the President, and OMB, and the rest of the leadership would look cheerfully upon it and would be hoping that we hasten passage and come up with the additional finances.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to answer this way. You have other Members of Congress who feel just as dedicated to, and just as interested in, the other agencies of the Department of Agriculture, in the Farmers Home Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, in the Agricultural Research Service, and all of the many

different agencies, some 20-odd agencies. And if each committee of Congress set out to write a ceiling below which the executive should not go in any fiscal year, I think the increased inflexibility would so stymie the Government that it would not be able to operate efficiently.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, we certainly thank you.

Does anyone else have any questions?

[No response.]

Mr. RARICK. We appreciate your presence this morning, and I am sure the members have enjoyed being able to ask you questions, and have enjoyed the benefit of your responses. We thank you very much.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is always a pleasure to be here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RARICK. Our next witness this morning is Mr. George Tilton, associate general counsel of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington.

Mr. Tilton, we are happy to have you with us this morning, and look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE TILTON, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. TILTON. Mr. Chairman, I will depart from the text that was prepared for this committee as much as possible, since it is already a part of the record.

I feel a distinct advantage in following the Under Secretary in his presentation. It was most useful, and I would like to comment on a few of the things that were testified to this morning.

One of which was that the Forest Service has been able to reduce the number of employees used because of contracting out, for example. As a union, we have had tremendous experience with contracting out, not only in the Forest Service, but in all other sectors of the Government. And in the Forest Service we represent approximately 40 units, out of, I believe, a total of 150 in the Forest Service, and we do have considerable input from employees.

In one area, at least, in the Forest Service, that I personally know of, the Forest Service has contracted out reforestation projects. I have personally talked to employees of the Forest Service about this particular aspect. They have told me that reforestation projects, when they are contracted out, are more expensive, not less expensive, especially in terms of the net result. The Forest Service does a better job than the contractors. Moreover, it has not been proven that contracting out is cheaper or gets the job done better.

I think it would be appropriate for this committee to look at the question of whether or not the contracting out of functions is "cheaper and also more efficient in terms of the mission of the agency." The Secretary stated that he felt the Forest Service was doing an adequate job. I, in the last 3 months, have visited several States and talked to Forest Service employees. I have been in Montana and Idaho. I have been in communication with employees in the States of Alaska, Oregon, and Washington.

I have asked them this particular question, and they have told me that they do not feel that the Forest Service is presently able to accomplish the mission of the agency, and I think they are right.

There is another aspect that I would like to touch on. If there is a reduction of employees—I believe, Mr. Chairman, you quoted the number of 1,600—this will necessarily entail some consolidation of Forest Service districts.

This again, we think, is uneconomical. In fact, we have one study which was performed by the Forest Service which demonstrates beyond any doubt that the consolidation was more expensive.

I specifically refer to a consolidation of Forest Service districts in the State of Alaska. This consolidation was effected for the purpose of streamlining the Forest Service. However, it was proven by internal documents that the consolidation ended up costing several hundreds of thousands of dollars extra. And one of the reasons for the consolidation that we found later was that the timber industries were in favor of this.

Mr. Chairman, as a union we are concerned with job security, which this resolution would provide; but we think that beyond the issue of job security there is a far larger issue, and that is the issue of the public interest, and of the mission of the Forest Service.

We do not think that the Forest Service can adequately perform its mission if these cuts are permitted. Appropriate to the discussion this morning about the recent report that timber increases or timber cuts should be increased, the Washington Post this morning has an article dealing with this subject, and dealing with the report that was issued.

And the report, the administration report, says that there should be an increase cut only if the Forest Service is given enough money to manage the cutting properly.

Now, it seems to me that the administration cannot have it both ways. If they want to increase the cut, they have also got to at least maintain the present level of Forest Service employees. And I think that this resolution is the appropriate way to do this.

Now, the Secretary testified that he felt the administration should have flexibility. Well, this seems somewhat akin to Executive privilege; and I think this is an appropriate function for the Congress to determine exactly how many employees are necessary. And we strongly support this resolution.

That concludes my statement. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. RARICK. We thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Tilton, and are happy that you would appear in support of the Federal employees this morning.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, one brief question. You question the economy and efficiency of the use of contractors and what not, the approach that is being made to accomplishing the mission of this program and other programs.

How would you reach the determination on efficiency and economy within a given project?

Mr. TILTON. That is a very difficult decision to arrive at. I can only speak in terms of the effects that we have seen. The one example I have in the Forest Service I said was a reforestation project which ended up costing at least as much as the Forest Service would have cost had Government employees done it. However, in terms of yield,

the yield was much, much less than that of other projects which were accomplished by Forest Service employees in other areas of the Government.

We have seen and documented cases where the job is not done as well. There is a certain dedication, I think, by career employees, a desire to do a good job. Oftentimes when you have a contractor come in their employees do not have the same dedication. They do not do the same job. Oftentimes they are paid very, very low wages.

I think when we are dealing with a mission as vital as that performed by the Forest Service that we need people that will do a good job and do a conscientious job. The Forest Service employees are very dedicated employees; and I think they do a good job.

I do not think that same job is done by a contract employee.

Mr. BAKER. Do you not consider that this has to be a management decision though?

Mr. TILTON. I think that the Congress can make a policy determination as to whether or not this should be a management decision. I think the Congress would be perfectly justified in determining that the mission of the Agency is of such importance that it should be accomplished by Government employees.

I think I would support Mr. Symms' suggestion that the committee go out in the field and look and actually examine the conditions.

Mr. BAKER. Do you subscribe to a policy of performing in the most efficient and economical manner generally?

Mr. TILTON. As a general rule, I think we would subscribe to that, with the proviso that efficiency as we see it is not—or absolute efficiency is not necessarily the goal of a democratic society.

Mr. BAKER. You are proposing that we as a legislative body assume the role of the executive branch, if I understand you.

Mr. TILTON. No, sir. I am not. I would propose that the Congress take a close, hard look at the way the Forest Service is managed. In this connection, I think that if you examine the question of contracting out, I think that would also be—I am not suggesting that Congress assume the management of the Forest Service.

Mr. BAKER. I look at this matter of employee determination—management determination across a broad spectrum. Earlier this year the employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity banded together to pressure the Congress into continuing the Office of Economic Opportunity for one purpose—to maintain their jobs.

Without regard to the job the Office of Economic Opportunity was doing, I do not think that this is a proper exercise of employee initiative other than just to keep their jobs. I do not blame anybody for wanting to keep their jobs, but if we are going to approach it objectively, we have to think about it for what is done most efficiently and economically.

Mr. TILTON. I agree with that; and I would also agree that there are perhaps many areas of Government that can be efficiently cut back. I merely say that I do not think the Forest Service is one of those.

I know nothing about OEO. Perhaps it could or could not be cut back. If the whole reason for maintaining the agency is to maintain the job of an employee, then, of course, it would not be justified.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Tilton.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you, Mr. Tilton. We appreciate your presence and the questions and answers you have given.

At this time I would ask Under Secretary Campbell if he would return for some questions.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, if I could intercede, would Mr. Tilton be kind enough to stay so I could ask him questions? If you want to go on with Mr. Campbell, go ahead.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, would you come back? I had earlier discussed this with you, but we do have other members present. And I know that a number of the members of the Agriculture Committee are concerned relative to the treatment of the forestry incentive program, especially in view of the conference report on H.R. 1689, the agriculture appropriations bill filed on September 20, 1973.

In relation to the forestry incentive program in the Agriculture appropriation bill, we find this language, "the conferees direct that the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service administer the so-called forestry incentive program in conjunction with the tree planting program that the Agency has administered since 1926."

At the time that the Agriculture Committee added forestry incentives to the Agricultural and Consumer Act of 1973, it was our specific intention and understanding that the forestry incentives program would be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary and handled at his discretion but that the supervision would be by the Forest Service of the Agriculture Department.

I am wondering, sir, can you tell us what effect this language will have as far as the program, or what we can look forward to, since the language appears to contradict the intent of the Agriculture Committee and the Congress?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, a considerable amount of thought has gone into this, has been put into this by the Forest Service, by the Secretary's office, by the budget authorities, by the other agencies in the Department—the Soil Conservation Service, I am sure.

We became aware of this language when it was published after the conference of the House and Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department.

Mr. RARICK. We can assume, sir, that it was not recommended by the administration?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. It was not recommended by the administration; but we became aware of the language when it was published in the Congressional Record. Our budget people may have heard of it 6 hours before it became public notice, because they do have contact, you know, with the appropriations staffs, but most of the time we are not aware, except on very short notice prior to publication, of what these conference committees do.

We did not recommend this. On the other hand, we do not look upon it as a deterrent in any way to the incentives program.

We hope that landowners will begin to look on trees as a crop generally. This is the attitude of the Secretary's office and the Forest Service, and this is also the attitude of the State forest departments—many States have excellent State forest departments now—and we have been in close contact with them.

And our desire is that the landowner know what he is doing when he sets out trees, knows how to manage them, knows how to get the most

out of them, and knows how to grow them under the best conditions; because they are a renewable resource and are, in effect, a crop extending over a period of years, depending upon the geography as to whether it is a relatively short number of years or a relatively long number of years.

We have some areas of the United States—you happen to be from one, Mr. Chairman—where it is possible to grow timber to be harvested in less than 20 years. And lately some of the private timber firms have begun to fertilize the trees, which may cut that by additional years.

So we feel as though the landowner who is unskilled and unknowing, who is participating in an incentives program from the government to plant trees, should have the advice of professional foresters, and that the Forest Service should be involved, that the State forest departments should be involved, and where necessary the Soil Conservation Service be involved, in order to draw a work plan on that farm for the utilization of the land as to its best use with regards to annual crops, or livestock pastures, or the planting of trees, and the conservation and use of renewable resources.

So we are looking at a situation where many of the different experts in the Department, in different agencies, can be utilized at the local level to the benefit of the farmer, not only experts in the Federal Government but in the State agencies as well.

Now, insofar as the ASCS offices are concerned, I would look at that language as an instrument for the utilization of the agency as a source of funds, in that they have handled funds. And of course, the State and county ASCS offices do not carry experts on their staff to give advice to the farmers. On the other hand, the Forest Service does not operate in every State in the Nation to a great extent, and to a very small extent in some States; so that they do not have access with their personnel to all of the landowners that would be involved.

Every State does not have a Forest Service that is capable of giving personal service to the landowner. On the other hand, you do have the extension service with State forestry specialists on their staff.

So there are many different sources of getting aid, assistance, and advice through professional foresters to these landowners. And I would look upon this particular passage, without conferring with anyone further than I have—just in looking at it and knowing what it says—that this would be an instrument for funding, rather than a use of technical experts to aid and assist and advise the landowner.

Mr. RARICK. Well, Mr. Secretary, the problem we face is that if it was proposed that the administration of the forestry incentives program be turned over to the ASCS—and both the Forest Service and the ASCS are agencies under the Agriculture Department—now, the same language does not earmark any specific amount of money to go into the forestry incentive program, so apparently it is just a blanket, one-shot drop in the ASCS appropriation.

If such authority were to come over to the Department of Agriculture, would your people assume that the forestry incentive program is to be administered by the ASCS; or is there discretion whereby these funds, or a portion of them could be transferred to the Forest Service and assigned as intended under the original law, the authorizing law, the Agriculture and Consumer Act of 1973?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, it, of course, is possible for one agency of the Department to contract a sound agreement with another agency of the Department to do work; and this has occurred in the past with agreements between agencies. We even cross departmental lines. We work with the Environmental Protection Agency with regard to the transfer of funds back and forth between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency.

So this is possible, but I would not publicly today in this hearing state what level or what amount, or what arrangement we would work out; but I have given you the thoughts that we have had on this subject as to the utilization of the Forest Service and the State forestry departments, because they are the ones that do have the expertise, and ASCS does not have technicians. They are merely an office for operation of a program without having specialists to go out and give advice to the farmers as to what to do or how to do it with regard to any particular crop or livestock.

Mr. RARICK. Well, does the ASCS want this forestry incentive program?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know whether they want it or not. They can certainly handle the funding of it through their office with no difficulty as far as funding is concerned. It would not require any additional personnel for them to handle funding; but they could not give to the landowner the advice that he needs. And we would not expect them in any way to do this, because they are not equipped to do it. All they are equipped to do, frankly, is handle funds.

Mr. RARICK. To your knowledge has the Forest Service not allowed for additional employment of qualified personnel to handle the forestry incentive program?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Have they allowed for this?

Mr. RARICK. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, again I point out to you that the Forest Service is not in a position, because of the geographic location of their personnel, to give any advice to a substantial portion of these landowners, because the Federal Forest Service could not operate in many of the areas where the landowners would be planting trees. And this is where your State forest service comes into the picture, and where your State extension specialists come into the picture.

This is partially federally funded, and we do have funds that go from the Federal Forest Service to the State forest departments for their aid and assistance in two or three different areas.

But no provision has been made as of right now for additional personnel; and I would hope that no additional personnel would be needed to handle it—a simple forestry incentive program with advice to be given to the local landowner, where many times you are going to have to fall back on your State agencies because the Federal Forest Service does not operate in that area.

Mr. RARICK. I understand that. I believe that was in our bill as passed. The arrangements would be made with the States.

But to your knowledge, sir, was the Forest Service looking forward or making plans for any role that they could administer?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We certainly hope they still are.

Mr. RARICK. And they had, I believe, made arrangements to implement the bill with whatever personnel and assignments they needed to do this, had they not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know. I could not answer that question.

Mr. RARICK. Well, I have been given a personnel assignment where they anticipated using some 11 people to originate the program. On the other hand, the ASCS has made no arrangements and was doing nothing in anticipation of administering the forestry incentive program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, the ASCS should not have to do anything in order to handle the funding. They can do so without any additional increase in personnel.

They would be able to handle the funding under this language that is in the appropriations conference report. I still look on that merely as an ability for ASCS to handle the funding only, which would require not a single extra person.

A forestry incentive program should be able to be carried out without great increase in cost.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, do you have any questions?

Mr. POAGE. I would like to ask, since we have had questions with reference to how the Department views these conference reports.

Now, if I understand it, there is language in this report that is different from the language in the legislation as passed in our bill. I recognize that the Appropriations Committee must deal with the funds that would be available for any of these programs.

I do recognize that the rules of the House, wrongly in my opinion, allow you to legislate on appropriation bills simply by saying the funds here shall be used to finance any program and do so and so—in effect, allow legislation.

I think that is wrong, but we cannot cure that here today.

But now, just what weight does the Department give to these conference reports? It is in there. It is in the statement of managers of the conference committee that tells you how to administer these.

Do you consider that binding on the Department?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, we regularly go to the General Counsel to give us his opinion in each case, depending on the language in the bill and how it is worded. And very often the General Counsel will tell us, "Well, that is not binding." And, of course, I am not a lawyer, which the chairman knows, but in most instances the General Counsel will say that the language is not binding; and in some cases he will say, "Well, that is so written that I do not know how you can get around it." Maybe he gives us a runaround answer, but still that may be the answer he would give us. And we have to take each one as a separate case as to that particular language for legal interpretation.

Mr. POAGE. Do you know whether you are going to consider this as binding or not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I will repeat what I just told Congressman Rarick, that in this particular case we knew nothing about this language until maybe 4 or 5 hours before it did appear in the Record; you know, we have our budget officer who is in contact with them, but we were not aware that this language was to be there. We did not request that this language be there.

On the other hand, we do not think that this language is restrictive—and I am giving an off-the-cuff opinion. I have not talked to the General Counsel about it. I look upon this language only as a method of funding. The ASCS is not set up to give technical advice to land-

owners. They are merely an office for the administration of the program. They have no specialists; they cannot give advice, and we do not want them to give advice to farmers on how to plant their crops, how to do a better job of production, and so forth. We may encourage them to plant trees, but that would be about as far as we would go.

We have had discussions on this, and if there is to be an incentive program, and if the Department is to carry one out, we very much have to have the Forest Service involved in it because they are the ones in the Department that have the specialists and the technicians.

But on the other hand, they do not operate in every State substantially in the Nation. They do not operate in every county where the landowners will be. So that we must give the funds to the State forest departments, where they do have a sufficient staff in that State and in the counties, and to the extension service, back to the State agency where they also have forest specialists, in order for them to give the technical knowledge to the landowner.

Because we feel as though an incentive program partly paid for by the taxpayers' money should be one that would give guidance to the landowner because timber should be looked upon as a renewable resource and a crop now. We have not been giving the same degree of advice to the landowners planting trees as we have in the productive side of our cash crops and our livestock, where we know we have had a great effort with our county agents and vocational teachers over a great number of years. They have given us this great efficiency which we have in American agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Well, I do not find myself greatly disturbed over the proposition of letting the payments be made through the ASCS office. We now recommend soil conservation activities are financed through the ASCS office. The Soil Conservation Service policies or gives advice in connection with the structure such as a dam, but does not handle opinions.

That is not the matter that is disturbing me. The matter that is disturbing me is that I do not see any money here to carry out this forestry program. It seems to me that if these payments are to be made, they are going to be made out of the conservation program funds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I made a statement, Mr. Chairman, that I am not prepared at this time—I did not come up to testify on this. But I did tell Chairman Rarick that I would be happy to discuss it.

I am not prepared at this hearing to state that we are ready to go forward with an incentive program at a certain level and that we are going to arrange it between the different agencies of the Department thus and so. I am merely giving you our thinking and our thoughts as to how it can work and operate, and I am not able to discuss with you program levels at this time.

Mr. POAGE. Well, now, is it not correct that—or, am I not correct in assuming that if we follow the policy that is set out here or suggested in this report, that you will be having an agency handle this program without any money? There was no money appropriated for this.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is nothing in the 1974 budget specifically requesting funds with regard to a forestry incentive program because that bill had not passed at the time the President's budget was submitted to the Congress.

Now, of course, we are in the process of developing the 1975 fiscal year budget.

Mr. POAGE. That's right.

Now, is it my assumption that we have the right to assume that when the President approves a bill authorizing a program, that he contemplated spending some money. If it is a program that costs money, that he is contemplating spending some?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Else he should not approve it.

Now, at least that is my old-fashioned philosophy, that if he does not like the program, and when Congress proposes a new one, he has the right to veto, and if he approves it, then it seems to me that he has, by implication, committed himself to approve the expenditures of the funds necessary to carry out the program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not say that we are opposed to the incentive program, that we are not going to offer any request. I just said that I did not come at this time to this hearing to be able to tell you any program level.

Mr. POAGE. I understand, but what I am trying to get at is this conference report that we vote on tomorrow does not, if I understand it, contain any money to carry on a forestry incentive program, unless you take it out of the funds that are appropriated in that bill for the conservation program.

Now, is that not right?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. POAGE. You said the Department did not suggest this, and I was told from another source the Secretary himself did suggest it.

Now, maybe I am wrong.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have just outlined the fact that so far as we are concerned, the ASCS offices have county outlets in practically every county for the delivery of the money.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the logic of it. I mean, I understood you to say that the Department knew nothing about this until a short time before it was presented, and they did not discuss or suggest it or anything of that kind.

And I am in no position to say who is right and who is wrong.

I just wanted to say that I had been given information from another source that the Secretary himself said that this is the way he would like to handle it and did suggest it to the Appropriations Committee.

I may be completely wrong, and you are in a better position to know about that than I am. But I do want it understood that there is a question there of who did suggest this program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think our objective is the same as to a tree incentive program, but I'm not prepared to state at what level we are willing to go forward at this time, because we haven't prepared a budget for one.

Mr. POAGE. Now, the legislation that this committee passed, the House passed, and the Congress passed and the President signed did not suggest taking money away from the conservation program to carry out a forest incentive program. It suggested a complete separate operation.

Now, are you telling us that the Department at least is still considering the advisability of financing this new program by cutting down on the soil conservation program?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I am not suggesting anything at this moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Well, then what do you think is the way it should proceed?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We are in the preparation of the 1975 fiscal budget now for the recommendation to the administration to be included in the President's program, and I certainly cannot discuss that now, which the chairman realizes.

Mr. POAGE. I am not talking about 1975.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, insofar as 1974 is concerned, we do not have any supplemental request presently that has been forwarded to Congress.

Mr. POAGE. You have not asked for any, I know.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. Now, I understand that, but there is authority to ask for it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why, certainly.

Mr. POAGE. And the President has signed the bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And indicated he thought it was a good thing.

Now, it is my feeling that if the President signed the bill for a new program, and indicated he thought it was desirable, then that carried with it the advisability of asking for the money to finance it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That depends on your time frame. You could have a bill that only has 6 months to go until the next fiscal budget was sent up, and why not wait and put it in the next fiscal budget? But I cannot comment now on the possibility of us sending up a supplemental as opposed to having it in the next budget.

Mr. POAGE. I just think we are seeing here that there is a probability that the administration is going to sabotage either the forestry incentive or the conservation programs, both of which have been signed in the last few months, and has no intention of carrying out one or the other of them, maybe neither. Is not that about where we come to?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Secretary, you have commented about the Forest Service not operating in every State in the Union. I believe they operate in 44 States, Puerto Rico, and one of the other territories.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, but they operate in a limited way in many of these States.

Mr. RARICK. Well, what I wanted to remind you was—I am sure that your lawyers have seen this—our report on the Agriculture and Consumer Act of 1973, page 41, as specific committee intent with relation to the forestry incentive bill.

It provides that the expected benefit to be derived from enactment of pilot program for forestry incentives, section 1009, not be dissipated through the establishment of the programs in every State. What we were hoping to get is a pilot plan, a trial program, looking for experience, rather than just dissipating it to every State in the Union.

We are interested in trial production of timber for lumber harvest to make available for our housing industry for the American people.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And I think were you not also interested in, Mr. Chairman, utilization of private lands that could be producing trees that are not now producing trees? I think this was of interest to the committee, as I understand it.

Mr. RARICK. What we were hoping, as borne out by our intent, was a trial ongoing program, and if successful that we could go into a permanent program. Paragraph 3 on intent, still on page 41, says this: that the administration in carrying out the provisions of title X including development of guidelines, regulations, and administration structure, will keep the respective committees of Congress fully informed on a timely basis of the progress and conduct of the programs established under this title.

These statements of legislative intent all relate to the forestry incentive program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, we would be very happy to do this, to keep the committees informed of progress as it goes along.

Mr. RARICK. Well, I am hoping that you will convey this intent to counsel over at the Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Let me ask also, did not the Congress in the passage of the same bill recognize that the Forest Service does not operate in every area, and did it not also indicate that the intention was for the State forestry departments to be utilized?

Mr. RARICK. We did so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because the Forest Service does not operate in every State.

Mr. RARICK. What we indicated was that we intended a trial basis for producing timber, and we did not want to proliferate money on programs in every State. This was to be a pilot plan/program for experience mainly to see if we could do this successfully.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question in this area?

Mr. RARICK. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. For my information, could not the conference include the amount of money that they considered was proper in their judgment without waiting for the Department to make a specific request? Do we have to place the total burden on the Department, or are not the conferees of the Appropriations Committee as responsible as is the Department?

Mr. RARICK. The conference report has been written and filed, and comes up for a vote tomorrow.

Mr. BAKER. Correct.

Mr. RARICK. I would assume that the conferees could earmark a certain portion of the funds, but they did not. They merely say that they are putting the forestry program under the ASCS.

Mr. BAKER. Well, in my mind, I was trying to establish the proper assessment of the burden.

Is it a burden with the Congress and the Department rather than the sole responsibility of the Department to make their request, or am I misinformed?

Mr. RARICK. What we were trying to find out from the Secretary, since both of these agencies are under the same parent, if there would be any way whereby funds could be transferred, or if there was going to be an interdepartmental fight. If once the money got over there, as the chairman suggested, are we going to rob Peter to pay Paul?

In other words, if there is no money even though the authority was delegated and the Secretary were to say we are going to take some money out of the ASC funds for the forestry incentive program, then could we not expect the ASC people to start hollering that we are using their money. These are the problems that we are running into.

I would hate to put the responsibility anywhere, but we have to vote on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. BAKER. You said, if the Secretary would say that the money were to come from other place; the Secretary did not say this.

Mr. RARICK. No, he did not say that, but both agencies are under the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Secretary takes money from one program to put into another program, we can expect one group to be happy and the other people claiming the Secretary is pirating their program.

It is unfortunate that the conferees did not specifically identify the money in their funding.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RARICK. Well, Mr. Secretary, what do you propose, if anything, that we members of the Agriculture Committee do?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is up to the administration insofar as the incentive program is concerned. It has been passed. It is in the law. It is up to the administration to make a determination as to funding level. And any future requests it might make in the appropriate channels, in the budget messages that are sent to the Hill whether they be the annual budgets or whether they be special requests.

Mr. RARICK. I refer particularly to the legislation tomorrow. Would it be possible for you to check with the counsel and Secretary Butz to determine that if we go ahead and vote favorably for this legislation, there can be arrangements made so there will be money available to the Forest Service to proceed as outlined in our bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not believe that this language prohibits that. I would be willing to say that here. I do not believe this language prohibits what you have expressed as a desire in the bill.

Mr. RARICK. But you have indicated it depends upon Secretary Butz.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As to funding levels, of course, funding levels have to be determined by administrative policy; and the 1973 act was passed subsequent to the President's message, so we had no request there.

Mr. RARICK. Well, I think it most imperative that you would be able to let us know something soon. We could remove or try to remove this language from the report. But if we did that, then, of course, there would still be no funds available for the forest incentive unless a supplemental came up.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will not argue with the chairman as to voting on a conference report, but I do not know whether you can amend it or not.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, we can vote to recommit it to conferees, and they can put it in.

Mr. RARICK. Well, in reality of course the Forest Service appropriation is handled by the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not sure at this stage, Mr. Chairman, that I would have any particular advice under the circumstances and in view of the complexities of the problem.

Mr. RARICK. Would it be possible to see if you could give us some kind of opinion from the Department so we would know what we are faced with tomorrow?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, what specifically are you referring to with regards to an opinion, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. RARICK. If this language in the conference report is mandatory, or if it is possible for the Department to make a transfer of funds and if they would consider this.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, insofar as a transfer is concerned, I am certain we could do that. I can answer that already, because I had this question before. Transfer can be made between agencies of the Department.

But insofar as this is mandatory, I will ask the General Counsel and transmit this answer to you as to whether or not this is mandatory language.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Symms, do you have anything?

Mr. SYMMS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RARICK. We appreciate your coming back. We only wish we could get answers that are more certain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for not providing better answers.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Tilton, I believe Mr. Symms had some questions he wanted to ask you.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Tilton, in your testimony on the first page, your quote from what you said; you said unfortunately these resources are also covered by large industrial interests and particularly the paper companies. These interests are engaged in carefully planned comprehensive efforts to open huge tracts of public forest to private exploitation. The key element in this plan is the reduction of the Forest Service manpower.

Where did you get that information?

Mr. TILTON. Well, it comes from a variety of sources.

I think we can safely say the timber companies—and by the way, we are not opposed to the orderly development of our timber resources. We also appreciate the needs for housing, and proper management.

We have been advised by some of our people in the field that they feel that this is what is happening, that they would like to see the number of Forest Service employees cutback, because if it is cutback it will obviously make it easier for exploitation.

Mr. SYMMS. The reason I asked you that question, your phraseology here, "private exploitation," who do you suppose is going to have the most to lose if we do not do a good job of managing the natural resources in the national forest? Who is going to feel it first?

Mr. TILTON. Eventually—

Mr. SYMMS. Eventually, the people. But who feels it first?

Mr. TILTON. The lumber companies.

Mr. SYMMS. They are going to feel it first, are not they?

Mr. TILTON. Most certainly, they will, which again I think points up the need for a strong Forest Service.

Mr. SYMMS. I think, Mr. Tilton, a point that I would like to ask you; I do not quite understand how you could get such a very biased statement here. I think it would be interesting for you to stay and listen to the statement of the National Forest Products Association. You will find out that I represent a district where 42 percent of the people in my district making a living in the forest products industry—in my State, rather. I think my district may even be up to 50 percent.

But I think it is rather interesting to note that the people who lobby me the hardest for improving the job and health of the Forest Service are these large forest products companies, and it is large forest products companies like Boise-Cascade, Georgia-Pacific, to mention a few; and Pack River Lumber Co. They are always telling me that one of the big errors in our whole value judgement of managing the Forest Service is the only people left to bid on the timber are the big companies. They are the first to recognize this.

And as far as this exploitation, I just do not understand where you get the idea that this is exploitation of our natural resources—

Mr. TILTON. Frankly, I can see your point. As I said, we are not opposed to exploitation or development if it means that—

Mr. SYMMS. You are not opposed to exploitation? You should be.

Mr. TILTON. If you put it in the context of development, is what I am trying to say. We do not want to see anything, any unordered development. This is the feeling we get from our people, who feel that there has been some slippage in the orderly development.

Now, whether this is correct or not, I frankly am not qualified to say. This is the feeling that we have received.

Mr. SYMMS. I think the point I would like to make with you is rather than put in your testimony, you would probably be more effective before this committee if you did not use words like exploitation—the record will clearly show that the larger timber companies in this country in the forest products industry own approximately 13 percent of the standing timber of the country, and from that they harvest 33 percent of the needs to fill the markets for the needs of the United States; and that is all on a sustained yield basis.

And you will find that this is not exploitation—it is just an improper word you are using—maybe there may be politicians who would like to exploit the national forest or certain groups, but certainly not large lumber companies who have the most to lose if we do not get our reforestation programs going, and keep this on a sustained yield basis.

Mr. TILTON. I certainly agree with the Congressman on that. Perhaps exploitation if we use the terms—

Mr. SYMMS. What I still have not got, where did you get this idea? You must have gotten it from somebody.

Mr. TILTON. Well, I have been all over. Well, not all over, but I visited Montana and Idaho. I have had conversations with other people in other States, such as I believe—your State is Oregon, I believe.

Mr. SYMMS. Idaho.

Mr. TILTON. Idaho, very well. I have been to Idaho. I have had conversations with other people in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington. And they indicated to me that they felt—

Mr. SYMMS. Like they, who are you speaking of?

Mr. TILTON. Well, we represent employees in 40 different units. This has been some Forest Service employees, other people connected

with the industry. This is a feeling that I am transmitting is all I can say.

Mr. SYMMS. It is interesting though that you would say that these interests are engaged in a plan, a carefully planned comprehensive effort to turn over huge tracts of forest to private exploitation, and the key element in this plan is the reduction of Forest Service manpower; when that is just the opposite of all of the testimony that the forest products industry has always put before this committee and the members of Congress.

Mr. TILTON. Well, I noticed that this morning when I read their testimony. Frankly—

Mr. SYMMS. But when you go out and talk to these, you do not talk to these people in forest products companies, I take it.

Mr. TILTON. No; we are not in that business frankly. I think we have to call them as our people tell us about them.

Now, whether we were right or we were wrong, I am nonetheless trying to report what our people feel. Now, if I am wrong, and I hope I am, I sincerely hope that there is no effort along this line, if I am; I would be very, very happy.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, I am sure that you did not mean it when you said that you were in favor of exploitation either. I certainly would not like to have anybody who thought that they wanted to exploit the national forests—

Mr. TILTON. Exploitation, I think, in terms—I think the word has a broader meaning than that classical sense of a rip-off, if you will, in the terms of development, if you will use it in that particular sense; certainly not, neither I nor anyone that I can think of would favor exploitation as the word is commonly used. Least of all me.

Mr. SYMMS. Well, you say you wouldn't—either you or anyone you think of, but you accuse the private lumber companies, that they would like to exploit, I guess your exact words are protect the public forests from exploitation.

Mr. TILTON. Well, I think that is true to a certain extent. I think that there has been too little concern for conservation. I think this has been demonstrated.

I think that we look at the recent report that suggests that an extra 1 billion board feet; I think is a form of exploitation, and it may well be that the timber yield can be increased. I am not a forester, but nonetheless, when you are talking in terms that large I think there may well be an element of exploitation.

And I think also timber companies would be the first, at least initially, to benefit from that.

Mr. SYMMS. I think the point that the record should show is that probably the timber companies could make a case for having practiced good conservation on a sustained yield basis better than we have in the national forest, and that they have been the last people who have wanted to see exploitation. Most of the companies that have stockholders hope that their company still has a paying stock 100 years from now as well as now.

And I think that one of the problems we have had in managing the national forest, we always have too short-sighted objectives to gain; where the private companies have a long-range management plan, because they intend on having stock for their grandchildren.

Mr. TILTON. Mr. Congressman, I sincerely hope—

Mr. SYMMS. And your use of the word "probably," would make your testimony a little bit more convincing to the committee, if you would not paint with a broad brush to these lumber companies who in many cases have done a good job of conservation.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is all I wanted.

Mr. TILTON. Mr. Congressman, may I say I worked for a lumber company at one time during my college days. It was Weyerhaeuser, and I actually think that they were very good. They had excellent conservation practices, far better than any in my home State of Montana, for example.

I do appreciate the fact that in many of them—I would hope the majority of them—are indeed interested in conservation.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Tilton.

We have one more witness this morning.

Mr. Henry Haalck, director of the Federal Timber Resources, National Forest Products Association.

Would you identify the gentleman with you?

Mr. HAALCK. Yes; the gentleman with me is Bill Marschalk, our legislative counsel at NFPA.

Mr. RARICK. Fine, we are happy to have you with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF HENRY HAALCK, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL TIMBER RESOURCES, NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM J. MARSCHALK, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAALCK. May I first underscore Congressman Symms' remarks regarding Mr. Tilton's statement on the issue of exploitation?

I would like to preface my statement by commenting on Mr. Tilton's testimony. There is one item I would like to discuss if I may comment on it at this time before presenting my statement. On page 2 of Mr. Tilton's statement, he states, "Testimony by the timber companies indicated their strong support for this move because reorganization would have facilitated the conduct of their business with the Forest Service." In fact, the forest products industry in the Albuquerque, N. Mex., area was opposed to the proposed reorganization because it would have split the States of Arizona and New Mexico which are part of region 3—Arizona going to the California office, and New Mexico to the Atlanta office.

Again, I don't know where he has obtained his information, but I believe that for the most part the forest products industry did not favor the reorganization as stated in Mr. Tilton's testimony.

That is all I have to say in commenting on his testimony.

I am Henry G. Haalck, director of Federal Forest Resources of the National Forest Products Association headquartered in Washington, D.C. Our association is a federation of 25 regional and wood products associations representing the forest products industry throughout the Nation.

The forest products industry generally supports the two joint resolutions, House Joint Resolution 729 and Senate Joint Resolution 134, that would prohibit any reduction in the number of employees

of the Forest Service during the current fiscal year. The bill would set the number of Forest Service permanent, full-time employees for fiscal year 1974 at no less than 450 above the June 30, 1973, ceiling as authorized for the Forest Service by the Department of Agriculture.

While the forest products industry supports curtailment of further Forest Service personnel reductions for the remainder of this fiscal year, the industry is not certain what constitutes an adequate manpower level to carry out future national forest programs. In our opinion, a thorough analysis of Forest Service personnel needs for future fiscal years is necessary to make a proper determination. Therefore, we recommend an amendment to the House resolution which would direct that a study of Forest Service personnel requirements be undertaken and completed by June 30, 1974. Such a study should investigate the interrelationships between user demands on various national forest resources and the number and mix of the professional staff.

Our support of the resolution to halt the decline of the Forest Service employment ceiling is based on our assessment of recent developments relating to national forest administration. In our opinion, some of the past personnel cutbacks had an adverse impact on the national forest timber sale programs as well as other National Forest resource programs. According to the Senate Report No. 93-337 of July 19, 1973, accompanying Senate Joint Resolution 134, Forest Service personnel ceilings have been constantly declining since fiscal year 1967. I think there was an exception in 1971. During the same period, national forest resource program levels continued to increase due to increasing public demands for national forest resources.

This continuing demand for more National Forest resource development and use is also reflected in the fiscal year 1974 Presidential budget request for most Forest Service programs and subsequent congressional appropriation actions to fund such programs. To illustrate, Congress has recognized the desirability and need to accelerate the reforestation and timber stand improvement program over the next 10 years. The objective is to step up reforestation of an estimated 5 million acres of nonforested lands and accomplish timber stand improvement of approximately 13.5 million acres of commercial forest lands. Even though some of this work can be contracted by the Forest Service, there still is a need for more Forest Service supervisory personnel to prepare and administer such contracts and, also, supervise additional manpower used on projects that cannot be contracted.

Another aspect that needs careful consideration in determining appropriate employment levels is the personnel requirement to prepare environmental statements. At the direction of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Forest Service has been preparing environmental statements for projects, programs, and plans considered to be major Federal actions having a significant effect on the environment. Since many national forest resources are an integral part of the environment, a large number of proposed actions on national forest lands are subject to such statements. Interdisciplinary teams of Forest Service specialists with expertise in various resource fields and basic disciplines are needed to assure that alternative

projects, plans, or programs are subject to thorough analysis before sound recommendations can be developed. During the past 2 years, the number of environmental statements required for resource development and use has substantially increased. It is expected that this increase will continue, and therefore, the need of additional, well-qualified personnel exists.

The Forest Service is currently developing a draft environmental statement on "The Forest Service Environmental Program for the Future," a 10-year program from 1975 through 1984. In the tentative program draft of January 1972, proposed program levels for all resource uses and supporting activities show a marked increase over current levels. These proposed program levels require additional manpower as well as increased funding. Therefore, to reduce the current employment ceiling by the end of fiscal year 1974 to a level equal or nearly equal to fiscal year 1962, seems inconsistent, since the expected fiscal year 1975 goals are higher than the current goals.

Since there is a lack of information for assessing current and future Forest Service manpower needs, we suggest an amended resolution providing for a study during the current fiscal year to analyze appropriate employment ceilings.

As an interim measure, we support the proposed ceiling as outlined in the resolution before your committee.

I thank you for this opportunity to present this statement.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you very much, Mr. Haalck, for an excellent statement and the suggestion that you made on an amendment to the legislation.

In that regard, since the bill has already passed the Senate, if it were amended, then it would have to go back to the Senate, and result in additional delay.

May I suggest as an alternative that we proceed with the legislation as is, and have separate legislation for this additional study on manpower requirements for the future?

Mr. HAALCK. I think that would be acceptable.

Mr. RARICK. And that way we would not have any additional delays, if we are able to get this legislation moving in the House. I am sure you gentlemen have both been able to see the latest timber panel report that is out. While there is a strong recommendation for additional funding, there was not any study on manpower requirements and recommendations.

Mr. HAALCK. I think that is correct.

Mr. RARICK. But I certainly think you do have good ideas, and I'm glad to have you present for this testimony.

Mr. Symms, do you have any questions?

Mr. SYMMS. I just wondered if the gentlemen wanted to comment on anything further of the exploitation comment that was made by Mr. Tilton from the Federal Employees Union, or if you are satisfied.

Mr. HAALCK. I believe that your discussion with Mr. Tilton on the subject of exploitation as a key element in reduction of Forest Service manpower adequately explains that this is not the forest products industry's position on this. We appreciate the fact that the Forest Service has been operating effectively in some program areas in the past years, even though they have operated under a reduced manpower

ceiling. What we are concerned with now is how to determine the most effective manpower ceiling. This is one reason why we suggest such a study, because at one point efficiency falls off. You probably pass efficiency at some point where the Forest Service no longer accomplishes the full program as Congress has directed. In this morning's testimony, there are indications of additional personnel cutbacks. The current programs for fiscal 1974 provide for a reduced manpower ceiling, and may mean even further cutbacks in future fiscal years.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I just might thank the gentleman for the testimony, and say further that it is always interesting to me to note that in one particular national forest that I represent where we have only two major lumber companies which are able to bid on the timber sales that have been put up for the last 18-month period because of the amount of capital required, that it has been those two lumber companies that have been in my office telling me the error in the overall plan, and that we should have had more access roads so that the little people, the small loggers could have an opportunity to bid, and it is these two people who are doing the bidding, who are lobbying the hardest to get the thing back to where we could have smaller loggers bidding on these timber sales, and it is always interesting to me that some people can always see the problems that the greedy capitalists face, but they can never see the problem that the greedy socialists face.

And I think there is quite a hypocrisy that takes place there. And I think the record established that very well this morning, that there are two sides to this problem, and in many cases these greedy capitalists are accused of things that are just simply not the case.

Mr. RARICK. Well, I think it has been quite interesting, Mr. Symms, that as you use the words, these greedy capitalists that are at least in favor of having more manpower to manage our natural resources. I think the greedy socialists have not opposed this, that many of them feel that under the multiple use requirements, that we are expecting protection of our national forests, and that calls for Federal employees and foresters there and professionally trained people, managers and supervisors.

So, at least this is one area that we all seem to be agreed upon, everyone except the administration.

You might find interesting the Secretary's comment on what happened to our forestry incentive bill as far as the money. We have the money in another agency. He also felt that the Secretary should have wide discretion as to how much of that money should be taken out and how it would also be shifted around.

If, of course, this was correct, there would not be much need for a Congress, unless we wanted to continue to bear the title and the honor of being a rubberstamp Congress. Rather than having a leadership or responsibility to our people, we just fall in line and march down whatever path that has been predetermined.

But I think in view of the President's strong statement on the need for carrying on the housing programs which do require timber, and planning for the future, and this very strong report by the advisory panel on the environment which unfortunately is certain to come under attack by many of the environmental groups, there is an indi-

cation of a change in the direction by the leadership, that we do more to preserve our national forests and encourage private landowners to grow timber also.

So I think that we may be on the threshold of a new era in our renewable natural resources, and also private forest development.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your interest in this and for having these hearings this morning, because it is a matter that we are very much interested in in my State.

Mr. RARICK. Thank you gentlemen both for being here. We appreciate your testimony.

Is anyone else present this morning who desires to testify on the legislation before the subcommittee?

There being none, the committee stands in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the subcommittee was recessed.]

[The following letters were also submitted to the subcommittee:]

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1973.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Forests, U.S. House Agriculture Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your September 25, 1973 public hearing on H.J. Res. 729 and S.J. Res. 134 to prohibit any reduction in the number of employees of the Forest Service during the current fiscal year.

For your information, the National Wildlife Federation has expressed its great concern several times about unwarranted Federal agency manpower reductions. Within the past six months, Federation representatives testified, upon invitation, before Congressional appropriations subcommittees and pointed out the inadvisability and incongruity of attempting to reduce Federal spending by effecting manpower cuts concomitant with assigning additional tasks of increasing complexity to the U.S. Forest Service and other Federal agencies. That kind of budget exercise can only result in further degradation of the Nation's natural resources. A resolution adopted at the Federation's 37th Annual Meeting in March, 1973 also addresses the subject. Copies of the pertinent testimony and resolution are enclosed.

Finally, a Federation spokesman was included in a group of representatives from leading national conservation organizations which met this past spring with key officials of the President's Office of Management and Budget to express their commonly-shared concern about the proposed inordinate, untimely manpower reductions in the Forest Service.

Hence, the National Wildlife Federation's position in this matter is quite clear. We request that a copy of this correspondence be made a part of the official hearing record on H.J. Res. 729.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Vice President.

The three statements referred to above were copies of testimony presented to two different committees and may be reviewed in the printed proceedings of those committees. They were statements of Col. Kenneth R. Hampton, conservation liaison for the National Wildlife Federation, and Louis S. Clapper, director of conservation for the National Wildlife Federation presented before the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on May 10, 1973, and a statement of Col. Kenneth R. Hampton presented before the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the House Committee on Appropriations on May 8, 1973. These statements are also in the committee files. The resolution referred to above follows:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION 37TH ANNUAL CONVENTION,
WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 15-18, 1973

RESOLUTION NO. 1—MAJOR CONSERVATION ISSUES, 1973

From knowledge as an association of independent state organization and their affiliated local groups, the National Wildlife Federation is of the firm conviction that an alert and fully-informed public will demand sound management of natural resources. Public education is the solid foundation upon which conservation practices must be based.

Overall, the National Wildlife Federation continues in its belief that contamination of the environment by water and air pollutants, by toxic chemicals, by solid wastes, and by noise, along with unwise practices relating to the extraction of minerals, and the harvesting of timber, and grazing of livestock, the loss of natural areas, and the protection of endangered wildlife, constitutes the major natural resource problem of the age.

It is in light of this background that the National Wildlife Federation invites the attention of all Americans to what it considers the major conservation issues of the year, 1973:

Funding for resources and the environment

The National Wildlife Federation views with continuing alarm and distress the conflict between the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government over funding in the Budget proposed for the 1974 fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973. Noting with dismay the proposed elimination of some agricultural and open space programs together with reductions of great severity in water pollution control, agriculture and forestry, wildlife management, and recreation funding, this organization fears that considerations for a quality type of environment and attendant life styles are being subordinated to those of far less public interest and benefit. Therefore, it is recommended that those interested in a clean environment express their sentiments on priorities in the most vigorous manner possible to the President.

Energy

The National Wildlife Federation continues firm in its belief that the United States must give the highest possible priority to the early development of a national energy policy, one recognizing the urgent need for massive research efforts into both the development of safe sources of energy in abundant supply and to conserving finite sources of fossil fuels. This organization is of the conviction that current emergencies relating to fuel shortages can be relieved without resorting to measures which would degrade the environment or unnecessarily damage or destroy natural resources. It is believed that research must be accelerated and concentrated upon the development of solar power and safe nuclear fusion as the most promising solutions in the search for infinite sources of energy.

Land use

The development of a sound national energy policy is closely tied to the development of an equally sound national land use policy. The development of fossil fuel sources such as coal, oil, and gas and the location of nuclear power plants presents potential hazards of the greatest magnitude to natural resources and the environment, and these activities should be undertaken only in context with a national land use policy which considers all values. A national land use policy, however, must go beyond energy to produce a coordinated approach toward providing necessary facilities and services for the public without sacrificing considerations for a quality type of environment.

A clean environment

The National Wildlife Federation views a clean environment as being absolutely essential to a quality type of life, both in the United States and throughout the world. Consequently, this organization recommends that urgent attention be given to efforts which control air and water pollution and curb noise. This organization also continues firm in the conviction that many environmental problems can be eased if monies from the Highway Trust Fund are made available to municipalities for mass public transportation facilities, billboard removal, and junkyard control.

Wildlife

The National Wildlife Federation continues to be directed towards an energetic effort to unify all wise use and preservationist forces in action programs designed to conserve, maintain, improve, and preserve wildlife habitat and open space—the key to optimum numbers and variety of wildlife. However, this organization continues to express its concern and dismay over the development in this country of a “protectionist” attitude which would replace sound scientific management of wildlife featuring the concepts of conservation, or wise use, with emotion. This organization is convinced that the management of wildlife must remain the responsibility of experienced professionals trained in the Nation’s finest educational institutions, who are the best equipped to determine whether open hunting seasons can be conducted on harvestable surpluses without harm to overall wildlife populations or whether they should be accorded complete protection. While recognizing that the welfare of wildlife resources must be paramount in any wildlife conservation program, the National Wildlife Federation believes that both hunting and protection are desirable and necessary as wildlife management tools when so determined by professional wildlife managers.

Land and water conservation fund

The National Wildlife Federation fears that the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which has proven to be of incalculable value in providing outdoor recreational opportunities for millions of Americans, is in greatest jeopardy. Not only are monies accruing to the Fund being impounded, but the program has been distorted and directed away from the original concept of securing outdoor recreational opportunities. As a result of these unfortunate developments, the Nation may lose “last-chance” opportunities to acquire unique and irreplaceable parks and monuments, seashores and lakeshores, recreation areas, national rivers, and properties to preserve endangered wildlife.

Protection for N.E.P.A.

The National Environmental Policy Act, in a few months, has proven to be an invaluable tool in requiring that all levels of government assess the full effects and implications of existing Federal programs and projects. Now that the introductory or transitional period is nearly over, the implementation of N.E.P.A. has entered a new phase: planning. For the first time, assessments of alternatives are being considered in the planning stages—as they should be. Now, however, it appears that a concerted attack may be launched in the Congress to weaken N.E.P.A., either through emasculating provisions or by exemptions for special interests. The National Wildlife Federation, therefore, call on all concerned environmentalists to join forces to resist any attacks which may be launched against N.E.P.A.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1973.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
Chairman, House Agriculture Subcommittee on Forests,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: You may include this letter in the record of hearings.

We of National Farmers Union commend your efforts to provide the U.S. Forest Service with the personnel and budget to maximize its multiple-use administration of the national forests.

I was present at the hearing you conducted on this matter on Tuesday, September 25 and heard your opening statement. I want to commend you for it. Our organization would like to be associated with your comments.

The central issue regarding personnel for the Forest Service is that they be adequately staffed to protect the public concerns and interest.

It was interesting to note that cutting forest personnel has not reduced the overall budget. Work previously supervised and carried out under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service is being performed under contract.

I was very happy to note that your leadership was supported by other members of your Subcommittee. I mention specifically Congressmen LaMar Baker and Steven Symms. It was apparent from the questioning of Congressman Symms, for example, that inadequate personnel to handle the marketing of timber augurs to the benefit of large timber corporations that operate nationally such as Boise Cascade and Georgia Pacific. Limiting sales to large timber tracts, as has become an increasing practice, gives an unfair advantage to these large timber buyers.

Consideration must be given to the small timber companies that operate locally in the marketing of timber by the U.S. Forest Service. In order that due consideration be given to these small timber companies, there must be a sufficient number of marketing personnel to handle the additional work load involved in marketing small tracts of timber.

National Farmers Union, for the reasons cited, fully endorse your interest in assuring needed personnel to the U.S. Forest Service. We, therefore, join you and other members of the Subcommittee in support of House Joint Resolution 729. We urge the Subcommittee to approve the resolution and send it to the full Committee for its consideration.

Sincerely,

REUBEN L. JOHNSON,
Director of Legislative Services.

AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1973.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: The American Forestry Association wants to be on record in support of H.J. Res. 729 (S.J. Res. 134) which would prohibit any further reduction in the number of employees in the Forest Service during the 1974 Fiscal Year. Short notice of the hearing and previously scheduled travel kept us from testifying last week.

If the Forest Service is to increase allowable cut, as announced by the Administration, and if it is to fully carry out other environmental responsibilities, further manpower cuts would be disastrous. An Areas of Agreement Committee that The American Forestry Association sponsors, composed of national conservation leaders and representatives of the forest industry, testified before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees this Spring on the seriousness of manpower and budget constraints. To do the job expected of it, the Forest Service simply must be given the money and the personnel needed. Cutbacks in both already have caused serious curtailment in vital programs. In addition to the Appropriations Committees, our Areas of Agreement Committee also took this message to the Office of Management and Budget. We renew our plea to both the House and Senate Committees responsible for forestry matters.

The enclosed editorial related to this issue appeared in the June issue of "American Forests." Although the lumber and plywood price situation has changed somewhat since then, the personnel needs of the Forest Service have not, except increased due to announced Administration policy for increasing harvest on the National Forests. Evidence already indicates that professional manpower has been shifted from forest planning, recreation, wildlife and other National Forest programs in order to achieve the higher cut. Further reductions in employees can only do great harm and should not be allowed.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President.

Enclosure.

[From the American Forests, June 1973]

LET'S QUIT CONFUSING THE ISSUES

Lumber and plywood prices are staggering. Since January 1, 1973, Douglas-fir 2x4's are up 25 percent, interior sanded plywood is up 98 percent. February alone saw the wholesale price index of all softwood lumber increase by 8 percent. The cost of an average house has jumped \$1200 or more in three months due to lumber prices alone.

The reason is simple enough—the inflationary prices are caused by demand. Demand is high and available supply is low. Construction is up and supply is limited. It's happened before, in the fall of 1969, for example, but prices fell sharply when the supply situation improved. They will fall again, either from a let-up in demand or improved supply.

But industry spokesmen are proclaiming loudly that the only answer to the demand-supply-price problem is increased timber harvest from the National Forests. And the Administration has ordered a 1.8 billion board feet increase.

This would be trying to solve a short range problem with a long range solution. Although it is true that 52 percent of all the nation's merchantable softwood sawtimber is on the National Forests, this is not the solution to today's temporary price inflation. Even if the harvest of sawlogs from federal lands were doubled today it still would not affect the available supply for a year or more. It takes that long to get a timber sale through all the details of planning, marking, bidding, cutting, and hauling to the mill. It can and often does take longer, with additional time lost in mill storage, sawing, trimming, planing, drying, packaging, and transportation to market. According to Forest Service officials there already are 50 billion board feet of sawtimber, including that from Alaskan forests, in the works between sales authorization and manufacture. This is nearly five times the annual cut, so how could a 1.8 billion board foot increase added to last year's 10 billion feet have any effect on current price? Obviously it can't, but it does have implications for the future.

Allowable cut is based upon conservative calculations that will keep the National Forests on a sustained yield production of timber. Currently, allowable cut is 13.6 billion board feet per year. Last year's cut was 3.6 billion feet below the allowable and in recent years there has been an accumulated 10 billion feet allowed but not cut. The National Forests can easily maintain a cut of 11.8 billion board feet per year. This is not the real problem. To accomplish the higher cut, however, will mean that the Forest Service will have to divert more manpower and money to increased timber sales. This can come only at the expense of other management activities such as land-use planning, recreation, wilderness classification, wildlife, and other multiple use programs unless, of course, the agency is given more money and manpower to handle the increased timber sales.

The budget-manpower situation already is serious without this increased harvest. Forest Service appropriations totalling \$52 million have been impounded for the current fiscal year. The 1974 budget has been cut \$117 million below 1973. To work within this budget, no new employees can be hired above the GS 9 grade level, and the Service must drop additional 600 full-time employees in 1974, bringing its total work-force down to 18,800 from a high of 22,600 in 1967. Like all other federal agencies, the Forest Service has been cut 25 percent in its data processing services which are vital to the record keeping involved in managing vast acreages.

More time and money should be going into better total land-use management, not just timber sales. The National Forests of this nation are a valuable public trust. They should help provide the timber we need, but not at the expense of balanced use. Good planning and management now will bring the federal lands up to full capacity production of all the goods and services they can provide. To divert energy and time to an activity that can have little if any immediate beneficial effect only takes it away from the total conservation programs so vital to the future welfare of the National Forests. Let's get the Forest Service more money to do its whole job, not concentrate its limited funds on commercial activities.

The answer to the lumber price situation is not simple. Obviously, it will not be solved by an increase in government timber sales, not now, at least. An embargo on log exports might help some, but even this would take time. Transportation bottlenecks are a problem too, and improvement here might bring some immediate relief. But, let's quit confusing the issues. Let's not let today's price-supply situation, serious though it may be, panic us into an action that can only delay what is best for our public lands. Let's get on with the job of total land-use management and bring our National Forests up to their full capacity of both goods and services.

W. E. T.

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1973.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
Chairman, Forest Subcommittee, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: This responds to your call for opinion on the resolution passed by the Senate and introduced by you into the House to prohibit any reduction in the number of employees of the Forest Service during the current fiscal year.

A directive of the President has increased the harvest on the national forests under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. No doubt the harvest can be increased without affecting the environment. However, to do so will require increased numbers of employees for that agency. I understand the Forest Service's full-time professional complement of foresters is now at the 1962 level, some 3,210 fewer than in the peak year of 1967. Rather than fewer, this agency—which has a good record of capability and dedication—should have increased staffing in order to provide the needed fiber for America's future.

Recreation areas within the national forests are being closed because of inadequate financing. These recreation areas, developed with tax and trust-fund money, were provided by the taxpayer and for the taxpayer. On some, visitors pay to use these lands. However, proper administration of recreation sites requires service personnel. The forestry profession is prepared to provide those people. To do so will necessitate the President's office reconsidering its position concerning employment levels.

Hopefully, the resolution of both Houses, requesting at least a partial restoration of authorized personnel, will be favorably received by the President.

Respectfully,

LAURENCE C. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Professional Employment.

○



