

The State of Texas will also lose \$14.2 million in public housing operating subsidies while the city of Houston will lost \$1.9 million.

Decent and affordable housing for all Americans—families and individuals—is a basic building block for communities and our society at large.

We can no longer delay making housing a national and moral priority.

Health care for the poor is another area that will suffer greatly under this bill.

In addition to the unthinkable cuts to Medicaid—more than \$760 million in 2 years for Texas alone—I am most concerned by cuts to the National Health Service Corps.

This program is designed to award scholarships to students in the health professions in exchange for their agreement to spend 2 to 3 years in medically underserved areas.

Over the last 25 years, this program has helped meet the health care needs of millions of low-income Americans.

This GOP rescissions bill proposes a \$12.5 million cut in this program.

Through this program, the Community Health Center in Houston, known as Central Houston Action, and several projects at the Harris County Hospital District will be endangered.

There are currently 62 physicians in Texas who are participating in the National Health Service Corps . . . and it seems to me we ought to be looking to expand this program, not cut it.

Members of the last Congress chose not to undertake constructive health care reform . . . it remains to be seen whether or not this Congress will muster the political courage to try.

In the meantime, however, how can we possibly consider making cuts to one small program that we know works in bringing affordable, basic health services to millions of Americans in under-served regions?

Mr. Speaker, in many cases, the lives of these needy Americans literally hang in the balance.

I could go on all night citing other programs marked for cuts that have similarly critical impacts on millions of American lives and livelihoods.

And I could complain about the closed nature of debate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have employed with this bill and others thus far in this 104th Congress.

I could complain in detail about the amendments we Democrats sought to offer in an effort to protect vulnerable Americans, only to have them blocked out-of-hand by the Republican majority.

But I'll simply conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a final, heartfelt plea to all my colleagues with a conscience and a greater sense of obligation to America's future than that evidenced by the cuts in H.R. 1158.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this pernicious piece of legislation.

□ 2230

CLICHES AND THEMES IN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue the colloquy begun 2 weeks

ago with the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during that colloquy we talked about themes in politics and cliches in politics and the unfortunate fact that politics in America in the 1990's has become theme-driven.

You hear often the phrase, "They don't get it." Well, the problem, Mr. Speaker, is "They don't get it," so now the American taxpayer is going to get it, and I hope that what we have heard on this floor tonight and what we have heard in this country over the last few months has received the attention of the American people, because the American people, I think, need to hear what the opposition is saying about the Contract With America and the importance of themes like personal responsibility, stopping the micro management of the private sector from Washington, a return to true free enterprise in this country that runs throughout the Contract With America.

It seems the loyal opposition truly believes government does it better, and we on this side of the aisle sincerely believe individuals do it better, Mr. Speaker.

This new Congress is made up of people who are willing to take a stand, who are willing to challenge accepted assumptions in this country for the last 40 years, and as a result of the Contract With America, what do we get? We get stories about the 1950's, about Governors from the 1950's, about the fact you can no longer trust States in the 1950's, in the 1960's, in the 1970's, in the 1980's, in the 1990's. You just cannot trust the States.

We get gross misrepresentations of fact. We get misinformation. We get horror stories. We get phony numbers. We get scarce tactics. And, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], we get class warfare, because class warfare is the bottom line. It is what we hear time and time again, hour after hour, day after day, week after week on the floor of this House.

And an example is the School Lunch Program. Just this week, a few quotes: A Boston globe columnist wrote that the country is simply not too broke to feed poor schoolchildren. The food services director in Omaha, NE, for the west side community schools of Omaha, said it is unconscionable to allow more of our children to suffer from hunger in addition to the 12 million who do now; health and nutrition are not a priority in Washington, she alleged, quoting a Government estimate. She said school lunch funding would be cut by 17 percent.

Now, on the floor of this House, we have seen the real numbers tonight. We have seen the real numbers every day in the newspaper. The real numbers. Mr. Speaker, are that nutrition programs have been funded at a level \$4.3 billion for fiscal year 1994; under the Republican budget, they are projected to increase to \$6.78 billion in 1996, and to increase further to \$7.8 billion in the year 2000.

By eliminating the administrative costs, by cutting out the Federal middleman, by cutting out the Federal micromanager, we are giving more money to the States for nutrition programs. Those are the numbers. Those are the facts. And by the way, they are the true facts getting through to the American people, because the message coming from towns and cities and districts and counties and the people across this country back to Washington today is, "We are not buying that old class warfare anymore."

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], I know you would like to comment on that, and I yield.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], for yielding.

I guess the point I think that needs to be made in what is happening on the floor of this House, the changes that the new majority, the Republican Party, is wanting to make is that which is a return to local control and privatization of what we are doing right here in Washington right now, and I think that some of the basic messages of those who so desire a strong central government that reaches in and controls the lives of so many people is the basic message is you cannot trust anybody else but those on the floor of this House including the 2 of us, but not excluding 433 other Members of this House.

And I guess my comment is that, and to reinforce what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is saying, is that government is best done at the local level, and problem-solving is best done at the local level. I can take care of things much better in my district much better than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] could, because he probably has never been to Fresno, probably has never been to my hometown.

Mr. EHRLICH. I intend to visit this year.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You will be there someday. But you have never been. But nobody knows my problems better than I do, and I believe nobody can solve my problems better than those elected officials in my district who are on the local and State level, and I think that in reference to the reference by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] to class warfare, it seems to be the defense of those who defend a strong central Federal Government that whenever people like us who are elected and come in and try to solve that problem, we get accused of being in favor of class warfare, being against the poor, being against the middle class, being for the rich, and I am a Republican, and, "I ain't rich."

But those seem to be the arguments that are posed here, and I cannot help but go back to two things. First is, there is a deep mistrust of local elected officials on behalf of the Democratic

leadership, and there is also, in order to defend what they see as solving problems from a strong Federal Government, where if we raise your taxes a little bit more we just get a little bit more money in the Federal till, we will be able to solve welfare, we will be able to solve, we will be able to solve the dilemma of so many women becoming pregnant, unmarried mothers, we will be able to solve it, we will just spend a little bit more money on it. Implicit in that is a recurring theme that only the Federal Government can have empathy for poor people.

Mr. EHRLICH. Right. And only the Federal Government knows best what people need, not just the poor, but middle-class, working-class Americans.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Exactly. You know, I think there are probably 435 very caring people here, but I would not exclude it to us. I mean, there are thousands of elected officials out there that take their commitment to their public office just as seriously as you and I, and maybe more seriously than some people in this body. I do not see any reason why they cannot be trusted with more responsibility and, frankly, that is what this is all about.

Mr. EHRLICH. I agree. The horror stories we hear, the horror stories that we have heard, regardless of the issue, fill in the issue, there is a horror story that we hear put out night after night on the floor of this House.

The regulatory, just going back 2 weeks, with respect to the regulatory reforms that we have enacted, the regulatory moratorium bill, cost-benefit analysis, risk analysis, paperwork reduction, private property rights, we heard the same horror stories then as we hear now. Forget the issue, if it is part of the Contract With America, it is horrific, it is bad, it is anti-working people it is antipoor.

And there again, we see the analogy, the class warfare time and time again.

The gentleman will recall that with respect to this whole issue of regulatory power, micromanagement from the Federal Government, I talked 2 weeks ago about the Department of Labor and the fact that the Department of Labor has made enforcement of child labor laws a top priority over the past several years. In particular, grocers, grocery store owners all over the country are being cited for violations of hazardous occupation order No. 12 which we discussed 2 weeks ago, and that order prohibits employees under the age of 18 from operating or assisting to operate balers, machines used to compact used cardboard. Inspectors routinely go to such lengths as issuing citations based on responses to questionnaires mailed to former employees. That is how bad it has gotten in this country today.

DOL recently decided, without seeking public comment, without seeking comment from the people impacted by this regulation, they recently decided that compactors are covered under HO 12 the same way that balers are cov-

ered. Therefore, no employee under age 18 is allowed to load or operate a baler or compactor.

Now, the history of this particular order is quite interesting. HO 12 was adopted in 1954 under authority of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Its rationale was based on a 1954, 40 year, 41 years ago report entitled "Operation of Paper Products Machines" that assessed the danger to teenagers of operating certain machinery used in the paper industry. The section on balers was based on a type of machinery used on a type of machine that was common in the paper industry back then. But it is far removed from the ones used in today's modern grocery stores.

HO 12 has never been updated to reflect the changes brought about by safety advances. Today's balers bear very little resemblance to the huge machines of 41 years ago, when HO 12 was issued.

The most serious injury assumed by the 1954 DOL report, and I quote, "for a person's arm to be caught by the descending plunger should someone else operate the control mechanism, * * * could only happen with balers of that era, 41 years ago," which did not have loading chamber doors, so the accidents could occur. They cannot occur today, yet we have a regulation that lives forever, and, of course, as we have discussed in the past in our first colloquy, that seems to be the whole idea behind bureaucracy and regulation; once you create a bureaucracy, a governmental bureaucracy or a new regulation, it lives forever.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Beyond that, it is a process of justification. Then those in the bureaucracy have to justify their existence so they will come up with new programs that are less and less applicable to the real world.

Mr. EHRLICH. And more money.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And more money. I have got an example, too, if I may. This is on the eating disorders of pigeons. There is a million dollars spent on discussing the eating disorders of pigeons. I will tell you, if I had an endangered species person, I was a pigeon, and had an endangered species person following me around day to day, watching everything I did, I would have an eating disorder, too. These are things, again, another example of how when you get a centralized government that is far removed from reality in the day-to-day business, you begin to get things that are unapplicable and have no sense to our daily lives.

Now, I am not against research, you know, of one kind or another, but I think what you get after a while is stuff that is not applicable to reality, and I think that that is basically the problem that we are facing right now.

Those that are criticizing what the Republicans are doing in the House right now in the Contract With America, with the goals of achieving privatization and local control, in my mind, have a real hard time. I would be embarrassed, frankly, if I had to defend

the system that we have here in Washington right now, and yet it seems to me that with the Democratic leadership on the other side of the aisle, or however you are supposed to say it, I would be embarrassed to defend what Washington does right now, rather than saying, "Let's both agree that what is going on is wrong right now. Let's both come up with plans, and let's introduce them on the floor and go back with new ideas." Who on Earth would want to have to defend what Washington is doing right now?

It is a ludicrous system back here that is bankrupting America, enslaving the lives of poor, unfortunate people who do not know better, under a system that is just doling out money. And, you know, frankly, I think that the Federal Government is such a poor substitute for personal responsibility that I would be embarrassed to be sitting on this floor defending all of the things that the Federal Government does right now.

□ 2245

But that is all we hear. That is all we hear, and it has been interesting for us to just arrived here 70 days ago, 10 weeks ago, to hear the defense of the welfare state we hear time and time again on the floor of this House. And the fact is, and it is an observation that many of us have discussed privately, there are no ideas. There are no new ideas. There are no new initiatives across the aisle. It is the same old stuff and the American people rejected it on November 8 and they are rejecting it in March 1995 and they are going to reject it in July 1995 and they are going to reject it in 1996.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I would like to make a point too at this particular stage and that is, a lot of what you hear on the other side of the aisle from their leadership is, when our party was in the minority, we resorted to a lot of hit tactics of their leadership. We did a lot of things that they didn't like, and now they are going to turn around and do it to us, as thinking that in some means by doing that they are going to get back the majority of the House.

My point is, I think that whatever the party did before I got here is fine, but I tell you, the only reason why I am here today and the only reason we are in the majority is not because we took hits to the then majority, but because we went before the American people with a plan and we said, listen, this is what we are going to do. We promise that we will do these things I through 10. You send us to Washington, we will do it.

Now, if that is the case and I believe it to be, gosh darn it, come up with your plan. Stop hitting, stop defending a miserable losing system that we have here in Washington right now.

Mr. EHRLICH. That is a wonderful point, a great lead-in to my next point, because we were not here. We have heard the stories about how the former

minority, the present majority, was treated.

And let me relay your observation to the tort reform debate that occurred on this floor last week, and as you well know, Republicans are of different minds with respect to individual initiatives under the rubric of tort reform. But the fact is, the Democrat majority never allowed real tort reform measures to be brought to the floor of this House ever, and the American people demanded it and the Democrat majority said no, it is not important.

And what the new Republican majority did last week was bring very important initiatives to the floor of this House in the way of legal reform.

Now, as the gentleman knows, I opposed the loser pays provision, but I supported the securities litigation reform, the joint and several liability reform, punitive damages, the products liability reforms. These are reforms that the American public is demanding today. And what the Democrats seem to conveniently forget is they never allowed this debate to occur, and that is the whole idea behind the contract.

The whole idea behind the contract is not that 230 Republicans agree with every plank of the contract, but it was, we have a deal with the American people, a contract with the American people and we promise to bring these important initiatives to the floor of this House to debate them honestly, in substantive terms, so that the people of America can see a party that knows how to run the place and to restore that sense of pride and respectability that we saw the American people have lost when it comes to this institution, and I believe we have begun to do that, and the fact that we have begun to regenerate that pride is reflected in the poll results.

Getting back to tort reform and this whole theme that we are talking about, they do not get it, and a lack of individual initiative and individual pride, there is a psychology in this country, and I know the gentleman as a businessman suffers as a result of this psychology, and that psychology basically is, if some real or perceived ill befalls me at any point in society, well, there has to be a legal cause of action, there has to be a remedy, there has to be a bureaucrat to make you feel better, there has to be a regulation, and there has to be money in my pocket and it is costing all of us billions of dollars.

Now, many of us on this side know, and the American people know, there are legitimate plaintiffs in civil cases and they deserve, in some cases, major awards. But the fact is, this foundation that I am owed something, that if something happens to me, I have to have a lawyer, I have to file a lawsuit, I have to get the money, somebody has to pay for it, it goes back to this theme of a lack of individual responsibility. The American people are crying out to us saying, stop it, we are not that greedy, it is costing us too much money. We literally cannot afford it.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Can I make a point?

Mr. EHRLICH. Absolutely.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It does harken back to personal responsibility and what a privilege it is to live in a country such as America that was based on the principles of self government, and I think that somewhere in some good book it says, do not be so anxious to be suing your neighbor, and I think that the law system in this land, the court system in this land, really is a privilege, and I think that when you abuse a privilege, you end up getting restrictions on the privilege or the privilege gets taken away.

And I admire the fact that the Democrats for so many years defended the right to sue and the open legal system that we have had in the past, but I think what we are seeing right now is such an abuse of the system, and when you, through lack of personal responsibility and personal accountability for your own actions, you begin to abuse the system, you have to clamp down restrictions on that system and, to me, it is a perfect example, again, of where we have lost the idea of personal responsibility and personal accountability in this country.

Stop suing each other. We have sued each other too much. Now because of that and because we have placed such a burden on the system, we have got to clamp down on it. I think that is basically it.

Mr. EHRLICH. Just an aside, but very relevant to your point, as you know, I have practiced law for the last 12 years in the State of Maryland and I have seen one practice occur time and time again. And that practice is, in a run-of-the-mill tort case, personal injury case, a punitive damage count is included, even where there is no evidence of punitive damages.

Now, the opposition told America last week, there are not that many punitive damage judgments. The Republicans have a strident and ridiculous remedy for a problem that is not that large. We can count on the fingers of one hand how many punitive damage judgments were paid out in a particular jurisdiction. But that is missing the point. That is missing the point, because the fact that those punitive damage counts are included in complaints drives up the settlement value of cases.

Most cases, as the gentleman is well aware of, never go to trial, but the insurance company, the carrier, has to value a case, even a garbage case, at a higher figure because of the presence of a punitive damage count. Result, higher settlement. Result, cost passed on to consumer. Result, higher prices. Result, we got a big problem in this country.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You know, gentleman from Maryland, it seems to me that there are in a book somewhere, and I do not think it said Uncle Sam is my shepherd, it said somebody else, and I think that in America we have just begun to depend too much on

Uncle Sam for being a little bit more than what he is and I think that some of the Representatives in the House of Representatives over the years, probably over the last 30 to 40 years, have gotten to the point where they justified their existence by expanding the role of what Federal Government does, and unfortunately, what it has led to is a lot of tragedy, I think, and into a current situation that, again, I am embarrassed to have to defend. I really am.

We have gotten to the point in this country where it is sad, frankly, the way we treat one another in this country and based upon this overriding dependence on Federal Government, and, again, my word to the opposite party, to the Democratic leadership, is, you should be very embarrassed to defend the way things are in Washington right now. And I just got out of a budget hearing today, a markup on bills where we are cutting budgets right now, and I am here to say that nobody is being treated any better than anybody else. The rich are going to get it, the middle class is going to get it, and the poor is going to get it. That is kind of the way it is right now. And the use of the Republicans wanting to do this to reward the rich is a pathetic argument, it really is.

Mr. EHRLICH. We here hear it time and time and time again.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Reinforced by the President as well. Through all that garbage must get some common sense to what we are really trying to accomplish here, and that is, reducing Federal Government by localizing it and privatizing it, and that extends to all areas of Federal Government.

Mr. EHRLICH. And in the process, I, we are looking to your leadership to let the American people know the real facts. I hope the leadership from the Democratic party in this House will begin to engage in an honest debate. If they have nothing to hide, if they want to defend the welfare state, let's face it, reasonable people can disagree about rescission bills, about welfare reform, about regulatory reform, about tort reform. Just do not hide in the failed policies of the past. Be proactive, look to the future, join us in serving the American people, but to the extent they continue to engage in phony numbers and misrepresentations to the American people on the important issues of the day, we need to call them on it, because to the extent we indulge them, we share the blame and rightfully so.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And it is a disservice to the American people flat out. I mean, what they are doing is clouding what the issues really are on the floor of this House. I have got an issue from one of the Senators in my State regarding a balanced budget amendment, which, in my view, is necessary in order to get spending under control and to achieve privatization and localization, where at one point during that Senator's election, voted

for the balanced budget amendment, no limitations whatsoever. In the political race of that person's life, voted for the balanced budget amendment and won the election and then afterward it comes up to the Senate that person voted against the same balanced budget amendment measure. And what I would caution I think on both sides of the party is that people are going to come back to Washington, they better come here with some convictions and they better keep them once they get here because the voters are going to see right through them.

Mr. EHRlich. We talked about that 2 weeks ago. Cliches, rhetoric, they do not get it. Class warfare. Right here is where the rubber meets the road and the American people can open their newspaper, tune in C-SPAN, listen to the radio, receive our correspondence, and find out who stuck by their guns, who cast tough votes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And I would say to the Democratic party, rather than hurling stones and misrepresenting what is going on back here, come up with a plan, for God's sake. Bring it up here and let's debate the merits of it. But to use the same old tactic, admitting that maybe they worked for the Republicans in achieving the majority, which I think they are wrong, it was the Contract With America that got us the majority, do what we do, but do the things we did right. Do a plan and sell it to the American people. If they are not going to buy it, then I would suggest you change your plan.

Mr. EHRlich. You hear time and time again the Democrat spin artists, the Democrat pollsters say, Hey, no one heard about the Contract With America, it is phony, folks, it was just one of those things. It was a bad year. We had an unpopular President, whatever. But the fact is, people may not have identified the Contract With America, but they knew about regulatory reform and they knew about tax reform and they knew about a stronger national defense.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Balanced budget.

Mr. EHRlich. A balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto. They knew about these things. Maybe they did not label it as the Contract With America, but they recognized it when they saw it and they supported it and they voted accordingly and they are very happy with it.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And frankly I think that is why we are here, but I think the point, too, as to why we are here tonight is to get a point across, that point, and that is the fact that we are here for localizing government to the local level and also privatizing certain functions that Washington does, and that can't be said too many times. It just needs to be said over and over again.

Mr. EHRlich. Well, I thank the gentleman from California. I look forward to continuing this colloquy in a few weeks with the gentleman with respect to budgetary issues.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Maybe next time we will have a 1-800 number and the people can do call-ins on. I do not know.

Mr. EHRlich. I look forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to Mr. COOLEY.

TIMBER SALVAGE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about timber salvage. For those watching or listening, I would first like to define this term briefly and then outline the course of my remarks.

Timber salvage is not a difficult concept. Presently, millions of acres of our public forest lands contain trees that have been burned, ravaged by disease or insects, or blown down.

These trees, like any other crop, such as wheat or apples, lose their value if not harvested in a timely fashion. After an apple has dropped from the tree it can still be used for eating if it is picked up quickly; if it is picked up after a few days, it may only be good for cider.

Trees have a little longer timeframe and are a good deal more hardy. Depending on the type of tree, some species may be taken for quality timber a year after falling.

After that, the quality of the wood products derived from these trees decreases. The final stage of downed timber's usefulness comes after the second year as it is sold for chips to be used in making pulp and paper.

Clearly, the commercial life of this crop is limited. If we are to reap some benefit from this resource that would otherwise be wasted, then we must act quickly. This harvesting of trees is known as salvage.

In short, timber salvage is the harvesting of trees that are dead or will die shortly. These trees have value and must be harvested quickly to assure that their economic value is not lost.

Tonight, I want to talk about timber salvage and what it accomplishes for us. I have some pictures that illustrate the effects of our timber policies and the need to continue our careful management of these resources that does not preclude harvesting timber.

□ 2300

I also want to explain the provisions of the bill that will be considered this week to implement a timber salvage program. I will be joined by several of my other colleagues, if time permits. I would like to show them something here.

Here is a photograph, I hope you can pick this up, of a lava butte on October 30, 1992, before man ever came, before the harvesting was ever accomplished on this property. You can see the effects of diseased and dying timber and the effects of fire.

I want to show you the same area on December 8, 1993. This is exactly the same timberland. You can see the greenness and the ability of protecting this forestland. The only intrusion in

this entire line was the intrusion of a highway in this area.

This is good management of our natural resources. This is bad management of our natural resources.

We talk about what man has done to our natural resources, Mr. Speaker, and you can see the difference. Before man ever got involved, this is the picture we had in this particular area. In 1993, this is the results of man's intervention and what we have done to improve our forests.

The language that will authorize the salvage of timber is found in section 307 of title III in H.R. 1159.

Briefly, this will allow expedited preparation, advertising, offering, and awarding of contracts without being held up in court while the wood rots on the ground.

In the first year, 3 billion board feet are authorized to be harvested from Federal lands; an additional 3 billion board feet are to be harvested in the following year.

On Bureau of Land Management lands, an additional 115 million board feet are to be harvested each year.

The Secretary may not designate timber stands for sale that belong to the national wilderness preservation system or roadless areas in Colorado and Montana.

Section 318 provisions are written into the bill to award and release previously offered and unawarded timber sale contracts.

Environmental assessments must be prepared by the Secretary pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. If the sale fails on these counts then it will not be allowed.

Each section of land that is harvested must be replanted; the Secretary is given the authority and responsibility to carry this out.

Finally, no restraining order, injunction, or granting of relief may be given to prevent these sales. All civil actions to prevent sales must be completed within 45 days.

This is an extremely important provision that will prevent sales from being held up in court while the need for the sale becomes mute.

EFFECTS OF TIMBER SALVAGE ON THE ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT

The effects of this bill are three-fold:

First, this bill means better forest health. As I mentioned earlier when I showed the picture, active management means more and better forests.

If we allow diseased trees to stand, we are setting the stage for more catastrophic fires and the spread of diseases and infestations. In 1994, 33 young men and women, some of them from my district, lost their lives battling forest fires that consumed 4 million acres of forest land.

The American taxpayer picked up the tab—roughly \$1 billion. Had we not pursued a fire-suppression policy and paid this price, millions more acres may have been lost.

The 4 million acres that burned destroyed 3.6 billion board feet of timber. The value of the burned timber is nearly \$800 million, which amounts to the board footage needed to build 330,000 single-family homes.

It is no secret that wood burns—dry and dead wood burns even better. Lighting strikes or stray sparks from campfires that might have gone out in healthy forests become raging forest fires that consume the unhealthy trees and dead wood with the healthy growth.

Many fires are naturally occurring and even have some beneficial effects. However, the fires that become too intense, scorch the Earth and destroy the helpful nutrients, organisms, and seeds that are needed to regenerate the Earth.

U.S. forests contain an estimated 20 billion board feet of dead or dying timber. This is a huge amount of tinder.

Further, assuming the forests do not experience the ravages of fire, the biological balance is not served by having billions of board feet rot into oblivion on the ground. New growth is stifled.

Second, this bill means revenue for Uncle Sam. In a time of massive cut-backs, such as the rescissions bill we will be considering tomorrow, it is important to generate more revenue through increased commerce.

It is estimated that the salvage acreage in the bill will generate approximately \$1.2 billion in gross revenues over the next 2 years. The release of old sales pursuant to section 318 will bring in over \$115 million.

Mr. Speaker, to date, the efforts of our Federal agencies concerning timber salvage and forest health have been inadequate.

I believe this bill rectifies these errors in judgment and prevents deliberate attempts to lock up timber from any responsible management.

All this is not to mention the money saved from a reduced need to suppress fires. This could be as much as \$200 million.

Third and finally, we will keep timber workers from the unemployment lines. The tension in these communities is high. Fewer harvests mean no jobs and the destruction of the economic base in many small logging towns. As the logger goes, so goes the town.

Other small businesses in these towns depend on the timber worker to spend his paycheck. Rather than describing this as a ripple effect, you could call it a tidal wave. As timber becomes scarce, communities begin to fold.

I'll wager that most of those who oppose even the most responsible logging haven't compiled statistics on the human damage that their antics create. Broken homes, drinking problems, and abuse abound when the pressures to find work increase.

Can the damage we have done by destabilizing these timber communities be fully calculated? Doubtful.

For some mills it is too little, too late. Last week, one mill in my district, the Modoc Co., announced that it would be closing its doors. To date, thousands of workers have been thrown out of work.

This bill will at least stop the carnage. For those who remain there will be timber to harvest and process.

I have received an estimate of the economic benefits that will accrue to these communities and would like to share some of the more important numbers: Employment will increase by 22,900; wages earned by workers will total \$976.1 million; Federal income tax revenues will equal \$150 million; finally, increased payments to the States will bring in \$82.5 million.

As I conclude, remember that timber salvage will help the environment, raise \$1 billion in revenue, and provide jobs for thousands of hard-working, honest people.

When we were receiving testimony on timber salvage last month I heard a story that underscores the idiocy of the policy we are pursuing presently.

A mammoth Douglas-fir had fallen somewhere in the West—a tree whose timber would have brought \$60,000. Instead, while the bureaucrats fiddled, the tree lost its fine timber value, finally being sold for firewood at a cost to the buyer of \$5 a cord.

I believe we can manage our resources better. We must, or the next generation will answer for our negligence. Tomorrow, let us take that step and approve the salvaging of dead and dying timber.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statements of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] about the forest salvage bill. It will come up as an amendment on Thursday to the emergency supplemental and rescission package that will be before the House, and the comments the gentleman just made from Oregon are very timely, and I think the whole Nation is beginning to realize that we have in many respects mismanaged our resources over the years.

The question has come up about the Forest Service management of property many times on this floor, and I am not here to defend the Forest Service categorically. I am one who believes that the Government generally will mess up a one-car funeral, and consequently most Government agencies are certainly not perfect. But the Forest Service has a history in the main of taking a nation at the beginning of this century where we had ravaged many of our forests and turned those forests into productive forests to the point that we are growing far more timber today than we are cutting. In fact, Mr. Speaker, more die in the forest than we harvest, and that is a shame when you consider that just in the last 3 years the price of lumber for a home has gone up from \$4,000 to \$6,000 for an average couple, and it is grow-

ing, and we have to substitute metal studs, for instance, and other metal components and plastic components for wood components in the home, and that is going to cost the average family more. In addition it is going to be against the environment because when we take metal, which must be mined, first of all creating environmental problems, than it has to be smelted, using a great deal of energy, and then manufactured in a more toxic process, many times greater than wood. In the end of its life disposing of it is much more difficult than wood.

□ 2310

And the same thing with plastic. We have to import the oil from outside the country. Often it is spilled on the way here. We have to fight many times to be able to retain our source of oil. And then the manufacturing process for the plastic is often more toxic and its disposal is more difficult.

So I am saying to you if you take the environmental path, a renewable resource like wood for making the table, or the dais or the chairs that we have, or many other good products, it is much better for us to use that renewable resource of wood than it is to use finite resources such as metal or plastic.

And yet as our country grows and as more homes are needed, we have no alternative but to use some source of materials. The renewable resource of wood is the environmental resource to use. Saying that, we have two sources providing it: First of all from the private sector, from individual farms and individual tracts that are purchased, and a great deal of our forest products come from that. But we also created the National Forest Service at the end of the last century and the beginning of this century to provide fiber for our Nation.

Now, the Forest Service is under the Department of Agriculture because it is to be harvested and grown in our national forests. We have a National Park Service under the Interior Department that is not harvested. There is very little management that goes on inside national parks. We have also set aside over 34 million acres inside the U.S. Forest Service in wilderness designation that is not harvested and is managed much like the national parks. There are other specific set-asides such as wilderness designation, wild and scenic rivers, where no harvest is allowed.

We are down to probably one in five acres of the one-third of this Nation that is publicly owned that even gets any consideration for harvest. The other 80 percent of our publicly owned land is not harvested. And that certainly, I think, disputes the fact that any sort of harvest will ravage our publicly owned lands because we only give attention to approximately one out of five acres.

We need the forest and the harvest also for the economy. We talked a moment ago about the costs going up for

the average person buying a home because of the limited sales that are in this Nation now from our Forest Service and from many private lands because of the maze of regulations that have been ensnarled around them.

We know that home building, of course, is a very important part of our economy. But as we force homes higher, we are going to decrease the numbers of homes people are able to buy and we are going to hurt the economy and jobs in that way.

I often hear comments made on the floor about the forest sales go to big timber companies. That just is not true. Over 90 percent of the forest sales that are made in this country go to small family-owned organizations, all the way from the operation that may be harvesting the timber to the operation that is manufacturing it.

The major timber companies in this country, by the great portion, harvest a great portion of the timber from their own lands. So most sales that are made are small sales and they are made to small businessmen, in most cases family-owned businesses. It is just not true that there is any big amount.

They also are sold at a public bid. That means that the Forest Service advertises the timber that is for sale and the highest bid then is accepted and the Forest Service has the right to decline a bid if it is too low. So the government gets the top price in the bid process for its timber in most cases.

Now, what are we talking about tonight in this amendment? We are talking about not green timber that needs also to be harvested. We are talking about dead and dying trees. We are talking about timber that has been burned. We are talking about almost 30 billion board feet of timber in this country that will rot and die and be wasted unless some of it is harvested. We are harvesting only a fraction of it now because of the maze of regulations.

It is important for jobs, as we pointed out, because it can put in the stream in badly harmed areas in the south, southeast, in the Pacific Northwest and other areas, timber that is needed to start the mills going and to provide lumber for homes and for personal use.

But it is not just jobs that are involved. Forest health is involved. And it is a question all over this country. In the south and the southeast, pine beetles have ravaged thousands of acres of timber and used those trees as host trees to spread to other healthy parts of the forest and to spread to private lands.

We had one member of our Committee on Appropriations from Texas that pled that we try to start harvesting in his particular area because the host insects from the Forest Service were going on to private farms all around and destroying timber there.

The gypsy moth has done a great deal of damage. In the Appalachian region, oak decline. Natural disasters,

winds, storms, hurricane, and tornadoes, things of that nature have ravaged, broken down timber in the forest. And if it cannot be harvested, it is almost impossible to go in and replant those areas that are destroyed because of the twisted and broken timbers.

In the areas out west where you have had devastating fires, you bake the soil, you create a charcoal mass that goes into the streams. It is almost impossible for vegetation to come back. Certainly not selected vegetation or a species that would be harvestable, a species that would be the best species for that forest.

And so, all across the Nation, we need for forest health to address the question of harvesting salvaged timber. And this amendment that we are offering on Thursday, that will be in the bill and will be voted on on Thursday, would allow the Forest Service to go in and harvest, over a 2-year period, approximately 6.2 billion board feet of timber.

The timber would amount to, probably by that time, about 20 percent of the down and dead timber. We are increasing salvaged timber about 6 billion board feet a year due to natural disaster, so we will not be getting all of the salvaged timber. It will allow the Forest Service to make the decision of which areas are to be harvested. They can pick those that are least sensitive; those that can be harvested the quickest and with the highest return to the government.

The Forest Service professionals make this decision, not people who are buying the timber, not the mills, not the timber loggers or the harvesters. It will be made by the forest professionals. They will determine which timber will be put on sale.

We know that this will be a plus for the taxpayer, because the CBO has scored a positive return to the taxpayer. The estimates range anywhere from \$36 million the first year all the way up to \$650 million. And it would be difficult to tell exactly the positive return until the sites are selected. But we know that there will be very little effort, little expenditure, put out for these because during the 2 years of this emergency provision there will not be time for road construction or a great deal of activity to go on in preparation.

□ 2310

They will have to go to the commercial areas of the forest. And that is all this applies to, not wilderness areas, park areas, or areas where we cannot cut now, it is to the commercial areas of forest already subject to being harvested. They will have to go to those areas ready and reachable in order to harvest 6.2 billion board feet over the next two years.

So we are saying to you that far too often in the past we have allowed people to use hysteria under the guise of environmentalism, to actually harm the environment, to cost thousands of jobs in the Nation, to drive up the cost

of people's individual homes, and to hurt the environment, under the guise of environmentalism. Some of it is from individuals who are well-meaning, who just do not have the expertise or the knowledge. Some of it is deliberate hysteria, because many of those organizations take in hundreds of millions of dollars here in Washington, and by scaring people into sending money to protect something not endangered they can continue to take in those funds. That, unfortunately, is a shame.

With this bill we are using cooperation with professionals, with the Forest Service, with the best knowledge we have in managed silviculture, to go after a resource that is wasting and provide jobs, taxes, and forest health for this Nation. I hope the people of this Nation will all support us and the Members of this body when we vote on that measure Thursday.

I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland giving me the time.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I like to read old books. I was poking around the other day in an old bookstore and found a book on Executive orders, and some of the Executive orders that were issued by President Teddy Roosevelt.

Because force management is an important issue to me, I found this very interesting Executive order that was issued in 1905. It talks about the formation of the Forest Service, and it states in this order that during the year of 1908, severe droughts visited many parts of the country and forest fires were frequent and destructive. But during this time, the National Forest suffered little loss, owing to a system of patrol by which many smaller fires are extinguished before gaining destructive headway. In pursuance of the policy that the forests are for the use of the people under proper restrictions, grazing privileges, timber cutting, haying, and other small privileges are let under government supervision.

I think Mr. Roosevelt's Executive order pretty well lays out what the responsibilities of the Forest Service were and the Forest Service's relationship to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we in the West are very proud of our forest reserves, and it is my concern that we be able to bring back to this Nation the proud heritage that our fathers and forefathers left in beautiful stands of timber. We have learned our lessons from unfortunate timber harvest practices.

In the early seventies, a number of environmental pieces of legislation passed this body and were signed into law. Some of the legislation has been characterized as dooming the productive sector. I do not think so. In fact, I wish to rise this evening to defend the National Environmental Policy Act, one of the pieces of legislation which

began the movement of more environmental legislation.

The issue is not the environmental legislation that was passed. The issue is today how we are carrying out that environmental legislation. I want to read to you the purpose statement set forth by the Congress of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, known as NEPA.

That purpose and policy statement reads as follows: To declare a national policy which will encourage production and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to this Nation.

You see, Mr. Speaker, NEPA is a very important document that has been for too long overlooked. First, NEPA is the national policy which recognizes the importance of production from our natural resources. In fact, the first purpose listed uses the words "encourage production." Second, NEPA recognizes man as an important element of our environment when it states "Harmony between man and his environment." Not only does NEPA recognize man as extremely important in this equation, but recognizes that the environment is his. NEPA indicates that man has the right of possession of the natural resources, but that these resources are to be used in a responsible manner, not to be locked away without man's use. Then NEPA recognizes that man has a role to prevent damage to the environment, so as to stimulate the health and welfare of man.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, NEPA tells us that we must enrich that understanding and importance of natural resources to our Nation. While NEPA clearly defines the role of man with his environment, we as a law making body have failed—failed to provide proper management of our natural forests. The Federal agencies have diverted congressional funds to other programs such as affirmative action programs and ecosystem management programs, multiple agreements with other agencies which are diverted into programs such as ecosystem management. And while this has happened, we have allowed a huge buildup of fuel to build up on the forest floor, creating tremendous potential for fires. That is the reason for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last year in the Northwest alone we had 67,000 fires. We burned 8.135 billion board feet of timber. That is enough to construct 542,000 homes and provide 1.5 million jobs just in home construction.

After 9 years of continuous drought in the West, and without proper thinning and harvest, and contrary to the acts of Congress that established the national forests in the beginning, the health and stability of these Fed-

eral lands have deteriorated rapidly. Wild fires have devastated millions of acres.

Mr. Speaker, unless these dead stands of timber, the dead and dying timber, is removed immediately through proper harvesting and we return to a proper role of management in our national forests, there will be a tremendous amount of eroded soil to flush into our mountain streams that destroy critical spotting and rearing habitat for our endangered species, the listed salmon.

Although Federal authorities have authority under present law to remove dead and dying timber from our national forests, they have failed to do so, and this is why at this time Congress must intervene to correct this mismanagement.

Timber salvage and proper forest health not only makes good sense for the environment, it makes good sense for our rural communities, our schools, and our roads and the national Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close my comments by stating just a few things that wood provides, including rayon, photographic film, alcohol, football helmets, piano keys, on and on and on. This Nation cannot do without wood.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that this body will recognize that and we can return to a multiple use, sustained yield policy in our national forests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] in recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. SANDERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] in recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. COOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN] in recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. CLYBURN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] in recognized for 60 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. THURMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BLILEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 2 p.m. today, on account of illness.

Mrs. CUBIN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of recovering from surgery.

Mr. ROGERS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 5:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHABOT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KILDEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MANZULLO) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUYER.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. BAKER of California.