

Reich, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, and then Secretary Lloyd Bentsen of the Treasury, all members of the Clinton cabinet, said:

The federal hospital insurance trust fund, which pays inpatient hospital expenses, will be able to pay for only about seven years and is severely out of financial balance in the long range.

The trustees, therefore, have logically called for prompt, effective and decisive action to save the fund from its own insolvency. As well the bipartisan commission on entitlement and tax reform, headed by Senator BOB KERREY and Senator John Danforth came to the same conclusion.

This impending disaster only came to light very recently. The Clinton administration had tried to sweep it under the rug. His fiscal year 1996 budget proposes no changes or solutions to Medicare's problems, and he even did not bring that up when he had the White House Conference on Aging. It was not even addressed by him.

As Medicare travels the road toward bankruptcy, President Clinton has been AWOL, absent without leadership, on this issue. He has even refused to participate in a bipartisan effort to save Medicare. Not until the Republicans had come forward to talk openly and honestly about how we can save, preserve and protect Medicare has the problem been described and the options been discussed.

House Republicans are determined to work with House Democrats to save Medicare by using new approaches, new management, new technologies to improve it, preserve it and protect it. Congress has an unprecedented opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to undertake a fundamental reform of this important Medicare Program.

One of the steps many of us are taking are Medicare preservation task forces, where we have senior citizens, people involved with AARP, RSVP, groups across our country like my own in Montgomery, Pennsylvania to make sure we include seniors in the solution. Seniors need to be served. We want to make sure we hear from them about options on making sure we protect it not only for seniors now but for generations to come.

The General Accounting Office has estimated that there is \$44 billion that is wasted on fraud and abuse in the Medicare and the Medicaid funds. As much as 30 cents of every \$1 is simply wasted or lost due to mismanagement.

House Republicans will increase Medicare spending under our proposal from \$4,700 per retiree to as much as \$6,300 per retiree by 2002. This is a 45-percent increase in Medicare spending per retiree.

We will preserve the current Medicare system but we need to develop a new series of options for our senior citizens so they can control their own future. I believe that by working together both sides of the aisle we can save Medicare, preserve and protect it

so that we can provide the best possible health care at the lowest cost to our senior citizens so they can control their destiny. And we working together with them, we will in fact have a bright future.

#### TIMBER SALVAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the Presidential veto of the timber rescission or timber salvage amendment that is part of the rescission package that has passed this House, passed the Senate, has been confirmed, from the conferees, by the House and is waiting confirmation in the Senate.

The President has promised to veto the entire rescission package, and that includes the timber salvage amendment. The salvage amendment was put together after considerable consultation with the Forest Service, with many groups; in fact, the final amendment reflected a good many suggestions from the White House itself, and still the White House wishes to veto the entire rescission package, including the timber amendment.

What we are talking about with the timber amendment tonight is to tell people what is going to be the result of that Presidential veto. First of all, we have to look at what is happening to our forests and what is happening to the jobs related to forest harvesting. Our forests are deteriorating in health because we are not managing them along the lines of our best scientific knowledge in forests. We have a well-funded special interest of environmental groups in Washington that take in over \$600 million, and they take in that money by scaring people into thinking the last tree is going to be cut tomorrow or some other fantasy in order to bring those hundreds of millions of dollars in to themselves. This does not meet with true science or with what is actually happening in the forest.

The forests are deteriorating because of the bad management that has been pushed by these organizations creating the policy over the last several years.

The salvage amendment was an effort to try to return sensible environmentalism and sensible science back to the harvest of our timber. And what else is at stake? Is it better environmental policy for us not to harvest dead and dying wood in our forests, to lose tens of thousands of jobs because we do not allow that harvest, to make the people of our country have to use alternative resources other than wood? And what is the consequence of using alternative resources other than wood?

We will make this podium, these chairs, this table out of either wood,

metal or plastic. If we make them out of plastic, then we have to import the oil from the Middle East. We have to fight to get it out, many times. We spill it several times along the way. The toxicity in the manufacturing is greater than it is in wood manufacturing. And it is much harder to recycle or to dispose of when its usefulness is over.

The same thing with metal. We dig it from the ground. A great deal of energy in the smelting process, and it is much harder to recycle than is the renewable resource of wood. Also, both of those items are finite resources; when they are gone, they are gone.

The renewable resource of wood managed on a perpetual yield basis can take our lands, our best suited lands for timber and grow over and over again the multitude of products that we need for all of our home products, paper, many resources that otherwise we would have to use finite resources.

Now, it is better for us to use the renewable resource of wood or use up our finite resources?

We are today importing over one-third of the timber that we need, over 16 billion board feet. Often this is harvested from far more sensitive environmental areas than we have available to us in the United States.

So by forcing these imports, we are damaging tropical rain forests in many cases and other more sensitive parts of land.

What we tried to do with the timber amendment, a bipartisan amendment that had the support of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, the United Paperworkers International Union, Western Council of Industrial Workers, National Association of Home Builders, Realtors, Women in Timber and many other small business organizations. It was to craft language that would provide us with 59,000 more jobs during the three years in the timber communities. It would bring in an additional \$2 billion in payroll for timber workers in communities all over this country. It would provide over \$450 million in additional tax revenue, and it would put over \$423 million returned to the Treasury directly. Two hundred three million dollars would be shared with the counties, mostly going to education, which is where the counties put funds coming from the harvest of timber.

It would also bring us a lower cost in fighting forest fires, which utilized \$1 billion in Federal cost in 1994 and cost us 32 lives in this country fighting fire.

The President plans to veto this bill, the entire rescission bill and the timber salvage provision. That would put people back to work, reduce expenditures on forest fires, and improve forest health.

Included also was section 318 timber. Many people have said that the timber salvage bill is not needed because the Government has a process now for harvesting salvaged timber. It does. But it has been used in such a way by many organizations through the appeals

process, through delaying processes, that they render the harvest in salvaging of timber useless. If timber in the Northwest, in the Southeast, the Southwest, is not utilized within 6 to 24 months, then it usually is lost as far as any practical use and the ability to salvage it.

So it must be done quickly. Appeals and other actions by special interests in this country delay it for years.

For instance, the section 318 timber, it is in Washington and Oregon, this area has already met all the environmental requirements. This is green timber but it has not yet been released. It has been waiting since 1990, over 5 years. And this meets all the environmental requirements, and it meets, it has already been approved to move, but it has been held up for over 5 years while people in Washington and Oregon are without jobs.

I think the salvage bill itself provides an opportunity to review environmental laws. It requires the secretary of agriculture to see that those laws are followed; if he feels that a tract can be salvaged following the Environmental Species Act and the Forest Acts and some other group disagrees with him, they have the right to appeal. They cannot have endless appeals. They must appeal directly to a federal judge, a district court judge and they have 45 days in which the judge will hear the evidence and then make a ruling, and then that is the end.

If he feels the environment is endangered, then he can declare the sale unacceptable. If he thinks there is no environmental damage to be done, he can declare the sale to move ahead, and that is the end of the appeals process.

□ 1900

The Forest Service itself then puts together, through professionals, the sale, and puts it out to the highest bidder. There is no forest giveaway, there is a sale to the highest bidder for the timber to be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this legislation brings in revenue, puts people back to work, uses our best science, and gives full protection for environmental laws should mean that the President should not veto this legislation, but should pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to some of the people affected by this. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I wish to acknowledge the gentleman's leadership on this salvage issue as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the conference committee. He is to be commended for the work that he has done.

Mr. Speaker, this will definitely result in a vast improvement for the quality of our forest health, which is so desperately needed in many parts of my district. In many parts of California and the Sierras, the percentages range up to one-third of dead and dying

trees. A third of the Sierras in parts are dead and dying trees.

I believe the gentleman is the only licensed forester in the United States Congress, so the gentleman has an expertise that no one else really does, not to the degree that the gentleman does. He understands what happens when we have a forest fire, and the environmental damage that that does when it burns so hot. He understands that if we do not take this dead and dying timber while it still has commercial value, then the taxpayer is burdened by shelling out money out of, I guess, the general fund to go remove these trees. There is nothing to be regained in terms of repaying the Treasury.

Is that your understanding?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. This is true, and not only that. I doubt if we could get that money expended, and the wood would not go to create jobs, in most cases, if it was harvested that way.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, because it has a no value. So at that point they are just doing something to improve the health.

I would comment, we have had a highly slanted, unfair, biased report called the Green Scissors Report, which is a coalition of, I believe, Earth First and the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste, which is, I think, just shocking in terms of the distortion that is in that report. One of the things they attack is so-called below-cost timber sales.

What I find interesting is that many of these self-professed groups that profess to protect the environment drag out the appeals process as long as they can, so they make sure that timber has no commercial value, and then, when money is spent to get rid of that timber to protect the health of the forest, I believe that counts against the overall tree program, and so it is bootstrapping. They make sure that it does not recover the costs, and then they try and show "Look what pork barrel scandal support of industry we have here, because the taxpayer money is going to support the timber industry," when in reality, their own actions have guaranteed that result.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], whose State is also involved in this, if he would talk to us about the impact in his area.

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the President will soon have on his desk legislation that would make good use of a valuable natural resources. However, without the President's signature, this resource will rot away.

Tonight I will tell Members the story of just one tree, one in thousands in western Washington State. The Forest Service estimates that over \$20 billion board feet of dead, dying, or downed

timber is now in our forests. This tree on this picture and many others like it blew down in a windstorm on the Olympic Peninsula.

This is not an uncommon occurrence in this Washington State coast. While this tree grew in a region that is perfect for its growth, the unique combination of heavy rainfall, wet soil, and high winds caused trees like this giant 500-year-old growth Douglas fir tree to blow down. Thousands of these blown-down trees are lying on the forest floor right now.

However, this tree had a chance to be different. Mr. Jim Carlson, in the picture, tried to purchase this tree from the Forest Service, to be cut up in his sawmill and sold to the public. His sawmill used to employ about 100 people. The Quinault Ranger District refused to sell this tree to him. Mr. Carlson later came back to the Forest Service and asked to buy the tree, pay money for it, the lumber to be used in the construction of an interpretive building that he wanted to build on this ranch as part of an economic diversification project. This would have allowed Mr. Carlson to get into the tourism business which, as long as we are going to put him out of the timber business, seems to me about the least we could do.

The request was also denied, in spite of the fact that provisions for this type of sale were contained in the Grays Harbor Federal Sustained Yield Unit Agreement.

The taxpayers are the big losers in this story, though. This tree contained, just look at this tree, it contained 21,000 board feet of lumber. The sale of this tree by the Federal Government to Mr. Carlson would have brought the taxpayers, would have brought the Federal Government, \$10,000 to \$20,000. Mr. Carlson would have been able to manufacture that lumber from this one tree and sell it for approximately \$60,000 on the retail market. That is the value of that one tree.

Mr. Speaker, the sad end for this tree came in a perfectly legal, though terribly wasteful manner. An out-of-work timber worker, armed with a firewood permit and a chain saw, cut up this grand old giant for \$5 a cord and paid about \$115, \$115 to the taxpayers of this Nation, instead of the \$10,000 to \$20,000 that that tree was worth when it fell.

The rest of the story, as Paul Harvey likes to say, is that this past year this timber worker had his home sold on the steps of the county courthouse, because he could not pay \$932 in back taxes, while the Quinault Ranger District that would not sell him the tree for lumber did not have enough money to purchase the diesel fuel to run their road grader.

The extreme environmentalists oppose harvesting downed or diseased timber. For those who feel good to have that fine timber rot on the forest floor, for those people, I remind them that 15 billion board feet that lies there now will rot. There are no roads to get

to it. It is not accessible, and it will rot.

I feel good about the 6 billion board feet that we can salvage. The environmentalists claim these trees are necessary for the nutrients they provide to the forest floor. However, if we check with the forestry scientists, they will tell us that 90 percent of the nutrient value is found in the crown of the tree. That is what stays in the forest when you take out the lumber. It stays in the crown of the tree, while 80 percent of the fiber is found in the trunk. That 80 percent that we need, and which can be put to good use, contains less than 10 percent of the nutrient value.

It is possible, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to have the majority of the fiber we seek from these trees and at the same time leave the majority of nutrients behind. With a sensible salvage policy, we can have our cake and eat it too, and at a profit to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of trees just like this one in the Pacific Northwest. When in full operation, Mr. Carlson could have run his mill with only 150 trees like this each year. He would employ 60 direct, full-time workers, with a payroll of over \$1 million, from a yearly sales total of \$7.5 million to \$9 million. He would pay \$200,000 to \$400,000 per year in corporate income tax, he would pay \$1 million to \$2 million in Forest Service stumpage fees. That is what the Federal Government gets directly.

His employees would pay personal income tax of over \$1 million. They would have complete company-paid medical care for themselves and their families. In addition, Mr. Carlson would employ up to 40 other people in subcontractor positions. These would include the loggers and those people that would help get the logs out of the forest.

To the State of Washington alone, this legislation would mean 7,500 man-years of direct, indirect, and induced employment. These are jobs we desperately need, as well as making wise use of a resource that would otherwise go to waste.

Sadly, if these giants are not harvested within 2 years of being blown down, or fire or disease-damaged, they are of no value as timber. They begin to deteriorate within 2 years. Thus, they are of no value to us as taxpayers. This is part of the emergency situation we face in our forests.

Unless the President signs this important legislation, giant trees like that will rot back into the forest floor from which they sprang. It is my hope that he can see the common sense in this legislation, and make the best use of our forest resources.

The forest communities all over the Pacific Northwest are dying. Our people are dying, in economic terms. This salvage timber opportunity is here now, and it is something that we deeply need in the State of Washington. We can wait no longer for consideration

and meaningful action addressing this situation. We desperately need President Clinton to help by signing the bill which authorizes the timber salvage.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Of course, he has given an exact case, something very close to home, where individual lives are being impacted by a policy that does not realize science, and does not realize the reality of forest management, but is trying to pander to an elite group of special interests in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President of the United States that if he is serious about helping working people, and if he is serious about providing a balanced budget and providing resources to carry out a number of programs that he would like to see in that budget, then we have an opportunity here to restore hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, to the budget, and to put tens of thousands of people back to work.

I was mentioning a moment ago that we have section 318 timber that has been approved. If the President signs this bill, we will get the benefit of 8,942 instant jobs, in addition to the ones in the salvage bill, because part of the timber salvage amendment includes three phases. It includes the timber salvage portion, it includes the section 318 timber that has been approved and been waiting 5 years now, past all regulations, been waiting 5 years to be put on the market, and the option 9 that the President himself recommended.

With the 318 money we will put 8,942 people to work immediately, \$313 million in additional payroll funds for timber workers, \$47 million in additional tax revenue, \$184 million returned to the Treasury, and \$61 million to be shared with the counties for whatever uses they need and see fit.

Good-paying jobs are not government-trained jobs, they are reality, they are what is needed in the marketplace. We have 151 job training programs, yet here we could put tens of thousands of people back to work without the taxpayer training.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], who also has a personal experience. He has a personal experience of what is going on in the mismanagement of forests in California.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and for all of his hard work. I believe he is the only certified forester in the House of Representatives. I thank him for his leadership in this area.

Mr. Speaker, when the President threatened to veto the 1995 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescission Bill, H.R. 1158, he stated, among other things, that he "really objected to the timber salvage provision of the bill." I was quite surprised to hear this, particularly in light of what the amendment stands for in terms of wildfire prevention, forest health, jobs, and the preservation of rural schools all over the country.

What I would like to do for the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, is outline just what the President means when he says he objects to the amendment. That is, where his priorities lie, and what that means to the rural communities in my district in northern California and in other regions throughout the country.

□ 1915

Apparently the President is objecting to wildfire prevention and forest health.

Mr. Speaker, last year nearly 4 million acres of forestland nationwide and some 375,000 acres in my district alone were consumed by wildfire. This was due primarily to the excessive buildup of natural fuels, that is, dead and dying trees in our forests.

Mr. Speaker, of the 8 national forests in my northern California congressional district, I have areas where as much as 50 to 80 percent of the trees are dead and dying due to disease, insect infestation caused primarily because of 7 out of 9 years of severe drought. In fact, tree mortality in my district is so severe that the California State Board of Forestry has declared much of the area as a zone of infestation.

When these dead and dying trees ignite, they burn with such intensity that virtually everything in the forest, live trees, riparian habitat, owl nesting sites and even the soil is consumed. This kind of wildfire brings the health of the forest to its lowest ebb. Nature is unable to repair itself for years, even if man does everything within his power to help. Wildfire also does not discriminate between animal and human habitat.

Last year the city of Loyalton, for example, in my district was threatened to be burned to the ground 3 times by the same fire. Each time the town was spared by changing winds. Next year the families who live in Loyalton may not be so fortunate.

Our salvage amendment offered the President the tools to protect our forests and forest communities from this kind of catastrophe, but apparently the President finds this proposition objectionable. Apparently the President would rather see our forests and the towns adjacent to them, the Loyaltons in States throughout the country, blow up in fire storms than remove the dead and dying trees that cause this kind of disaster.

The President apparently also objects to putting unemployed people back to work. Mr. Speaker, since 1987, 51 mills have closed in northern California due to drastic decreases in Federal timber sales and the listing of the Northern Spotted Owl. Forty-two of these mills have closed since the beginning of 1990. Twenty-nine are in my district.

These closures have literally devastated many small timber-dependent communities. Thousands of workers have been dislocated, causing unemployment to exceed 20 percent in some

areas. Welfare rolls have ballooned and domestic violence has risen sharply. It has simply been a social travesty.

When the President held his Western Forest Health Summit in 1992, he promised to help these people. What has he done since then? Since he made his highly touted promises to the people of northern California, Forest Service timber sales in the region have fallen to approximately half of their 1992 levels and to approximately one-third of their historic levels.

Year 1995 looks even more bleak for the timber communities. Of the 20 timber purchasers which currently have outstanding timber contracts in the Klamath and Sierra Provinces of northern California, only 7 of these 20 will have outstanding contracts at the end of 1995. The bottom line is, the industry is being bled dry.

How ironic it is to consider that at the same time we have a desperate need to remove the dead and dying timber from our forests, we also have a work force in desperate need of jobs. Mr. Speaker, common sense says that we have the wherewithal to kill two birds with one stone, to save our forests and put a number of people back to work. But again, Mr. Speaker, the President apparently finds this objectionable. The fact is that he is turning his back on the promises he made in 1992 and to the people to whom he made them.

Finally, the President apparently also objects to infusing money for schools and roads into depressed rural communities which have not the money for either. Mr. Speaker, 25 percent of the receipts of all Federal timber sales are returned directly to counties to fund schools and road construction. Any county school superintendent in northern California would tell you of the devastating impact reduced timber sales have had on the schools in his or her district.

Plumas County, for example, has had its annual school budget cut by as much as \$5.3 million from its 1992 levels. Siskiyou County has lost over \$1.7 million annually since 1992. These drastic cuts to school budgets which are very small to begin with, Mr. Speaker, have forced school boards to eliminate some of the most basic scholastic programs which most school districts take for granted.

Our salvage amendment would give county school districts and road funds an infusion of a projected \$380 million. This money would also help restore basic programs in rural schools. But, again, Mr. Speaker, the President apparently finds this proposition objectionable. Apparently his "people first" philosophy does not include children in poor rural communities.

So what does the President not object to? If he objects to fire prevention, job creation, and the preservation of rural schools, what does he not object to? He apparently does not object to continuing what he began the day he took office, an all-out war on the West

spurred on by environmental extremists and special interest groups, a preservationist war that apparently he will continue waging until our forests are locked up completely and the enemy, the people who have lived and managed them for generations, have been vanquished.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for his leadership in having this special order and bringing this to the attention of not only the Members of the Congress but to the American people.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to his constituency and the people of this country and his willingness to tell them the truth about what is happening in your district, and it is happening in districts all over the United States.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The President when he indicated that he would veto this bill, he made a statement, and I am quoting from it. He says, "I object to this amendment which would basically direct us to make timber sales to large companies."

The people who harvest the timber out in your area, are those the major companies, the Weyerhaeusers and the other larger corporations? In our area, it is mostly mom-and-pop outfits, they hire maybe under 100 people, they are people in the community, and most of those folks are right there in the community. These are not large companies. These are basic community small businesses.

Is that the case in your area?

Mr. HERGER. That is absolutely the case in our area. Again there is probably not any other industry that has as many small business type family organizations than in the timber business, that business which provides our Nation with our paper products, provides us with the wood products to be able to build our homes, to be able to have affordable homes, essential needs. Yet as the gentleman mentioned, these are primarily done by family small businesses.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I would suggest that the President get away from the elite environment that he is surrounded by at the White House and go out and talk to these folks and see how many businesses are involved.

Major timber companies that have millions of acres of land do not need this to produce their forest products, but small businesses do. They are being devastated to the point of tens of thousands of jobs all over this country.

I think the gentleman brought up another point, homebuilding. The average cost of a home has gone up over \$7,000 just over what has happened in the Pacific Northwest, and expected to go higher. We are using today metal studs for construction purposes as well as other metal components instead of the renewable resource of wood.

How can you possibly be an environmentalist and want to use a finite product that is hard to recycle, hard on

the environment when it is brought in and smelted and produced as opposed to a renewable resource like wood, easily recyclable and can be used over and grown over and over again?

Mr. HERGER. I thank again the gentleman for bringing this out. Again we are talking about a renewable resource. As I mentioned earlier in my talk, I have some eight national forests, all or parts of them in my district. Of that part, during the time when we were under historic levels and were harvesting, approximately 75 percent were off-limits to any type of harvesting at all. They were in preserves, they were in national parks, in wilderness areas. So we really had about 25 percent of the pie that could be harvested, and through our California laws could not be harvested any more rapidly than they were growing back.

At this point, even that 25 percent has been locked up. Maybe there is about 5 percent or even less that we are able to harvest. Again, we are talking about a renewable resource. These steel studs that you are referring to or even in our grocery store, the plastic. Plastic is not renewable. Steel studs are not renewable. But yet our forest products are renewable. Again, it is a tragedy to our environment to see this happening, that not only are our forests rotting and burning but our communities are being deprived of their very livelihoods. Again, this is a tragedy, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this out.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The gentleman makes another good point. We are not talking about any harvest in national parks. We are not talking about harvesting in wilderness areas or wild and scenic river areas. As you say, 75 percent of the national forests even are off-limits from this harvest. Only about 25 percent of the area which is already being used and harvested from a commercial standpoint, or at least eligible—it is not being harvested now—for harvesting will be impacted. A very small part, one-third, of this Nation's public lands that the Government owns today.

I would also remind, and I think the gentleman pointed out a moment ago, management of the forest and thinning of the forest is important for forest health, whether it is down wood or standing wood. There was a wire today, a green wire that came out that pointed out that aspen trees in New Mexico and Arizona are on a rapid decline.

It points out that in 1962, there were 486,000 acres and it is down to 263,000 acres now, a 46 percent decrease of aspen, and the primary reason is the aspen, and I am quoting from it, needs open spaces to grow. They need to clear the forests so the younger trees can grow out, and that can be done, according to this green wire, in several ways. One is by wood harvest. That is important in managing today's forest. If you are going to have a wealthy forest, it has to be managed, and harvest is part of that management.

I would go back and talk again about what the President said in his statement. He went on in addition to saying this was made up of large timber companies, we were directing the cuts in sales to large timber companies, and that is entirely false. I would say it is close to 99 percent of these companies that are going to be harvesting, that will be winning bids on forest sales, come from small family firms and would be classified as small businesses under all the definitions of small business.

He also mentioned there would be a subsidy to the taxpayer. The Congressional Budget Office saw no subsidy, the taxpayer was not subsidizing these sales. In fact, they saw tens of millions of dollars coming into the treasury, and I think we quoted from those figures a moment ago.

Then he went on to say that this legislation would essentially throw out all environmental laws, and that is ridiculous. If he would talk to his own chief of the U.S. Forest Service, he would tell them that the environmental laws are not being thrown out, that the Secretary is required to follow a number of the environmental laws. If there was no requirement for following them, there would be no reason for an appeal, and there is an appeal process.

I would go to the last segment in the salvage amendment, and, that is, that was inserted by the Senate. It was option 9 timber harvest.

#### □ 1930

The President himself went to the Pacific Northwest directly after his election and promised the people that he would start seeing that the forests there were being harvested. Now he cut the harvest down to approximately 20 percent of what it would be or what it had been in the past, but even that is not happening. The extreme elements who are influencing the administration are seeing that is not happening. Of the 1.2 billion board feet that were selected for harvest under Option 9, almost none of that timber has been cut since the plan was selected by the administration.

It was tested in district court, was upheld in district court in December, and the conference language would require that it now proceed and it would insulate it from further judicial review so that we do not have to subject the tens of thousands of employees to endless appeals on this process.

In real terms if we restore and bring the Option 9 procedures ahead, it would restore almost 19,000 jobs for timber workers in the communities in the so-called spotted owl areas, it would add \$664 million in additional payroll for timber workers, it would add \$54 million in additional tax revenue, and \$360 million would be returned to the Treasury; \$120 million would go to the counties to be shared as we mentioned a moment ago primarily for education.

Even the Forest Service estimates that if we do not proceed it may be

years and years before option 9 can move ahead, and that in effect is the President denying the people even that part of his promise that he made in the Pacific Northwest.

We have a section that is called the 4-D areas, a provision that legitimizes future action for the administration's 4-D section on Endangered Species Act rulings for relief of small landowners which was also included by the conferees. When the administration finishes its 4-D rules, millions of small landowners will be out from under the ESA restrictions on timber harvesting. It would free up hundreds of thousands of board feet of new timber by small property landowners.

The acceptance of this provision was basically a good-faith attempt to show that Congress is willing to work with the administration's plan to utilize section 4-D of the ESA to provide relief for small landowners.

In other words, the President has made many representations. What we are trying to do is to bring those representations to fruition. Certainly the President can support that.

The President's veto means that the administration's commitment to provide relief in timber communities will not happen. The President's veto threat and comments on the timber provisions in the rescission bill is proof that his campaign pledge to put people first has been breached.

The number of jobs in the entire rescission bill, including the salvage portion, 318 and option 9, would create over 88,000 jobs; in other words, it would put that many people who have been unemployed this period of time back in their jobs all across this country. Instead of that, the President is willing rather to see that the forests rot or burn than to see that good silviculture, good management, forest health management is put in place.

I would remind him that his promise was to help bring economic activity back to the area. His veto of this legislation will kill that entirely. His signing of that bill will give 88,000 people across this country and primary in the Pacific Northwest immediate employment.

There are numerous opportunities for us to evaluate this bill. The Congress had hearings, the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Resources had joint hearings before they requested that I sponsor this amendment in the Committee on Appropriations. We had debate in the Committee on Appropriations, we had debate upon the floor. There were 277 members of Congress who supported this bill; it was opposed by 149. It passed with almost two-thirds of this Congress' support. It passed in the Senate. It came back and was approved, the conference language in the House was approved overwhelmingly, as it will be in the Senate. And so, this is the people through their representatives speaking for what is needed in this country and what they want.

The President is vetoing it because he is being asked by a group of ill-informed special interests in Washington not to do it.

If you read the Wall Street Journal of 2 weeks ago last Friday you will see why. The environmental organizations in this town, the special interest to which I refer that take in the \$600 million and lavish it out to political special interests, were polled as to their support. The report said they were basically left-leaning, 93 percent who support the President of the United States, voted for President Clinton in the 1992 election. And he now is reaching out to pander to that very elite special interest and forget 88,000 honest taxpaying citizens who can be put back to work immediately.

I would remind them of one other statement that was made by the group, an environmental group who spoke positively about the President's threat to veto, and I am quoting the Oregon-based Headwaters organization, and it said "By preventing these clear cuts, President Clinton today saved the marbled murrelet from extinction." Now that defies sensibility. We are talking about dead timber, we are talking about timber that in many cases has already blown over on the ground, we are talking about timber that has been burned, we are talking about timber that is insect-infested. Clearcutting dead and dying timber is ridiculous, and how you could have saved anything, the marbled murrelet from taking out salvaging dead timber remains to be seen.

I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. RIGGS, whose district also is impacted by this legislation, who has real people who are suffering because of the policies of this administration and because of the veto threat of this administration.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for his extraordinary leadership in helping to steer this very important piece of legislation properly called the emergency timber salvage amendment through the House and making sure it survived the House and Senate conference committee.

I want to tell the gentleman that I am dismayed to put it mildly that the President might specifically point to our emergency timber salvage amendment as grounds for vetoing the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions package, first of all because the bill as the gentleman well knows appropriates Federal assistance, Federal aid for disaster victims in California, many of whom live in my congressional district and were victims of last winter's severe flooding, but also because, frankly, we need to ensure a greater supply to timber, and what better source than the dead and dying trees on Federal forest lands for the independent mills in the north part of my congressional district, which are

very much a part of that regional economy, and the independent mills, frankly, are almost the backbone of our regional economy and have been beset by any number of pressures in recent years, not least of which is in my view an overregulation of our Federal forest lands and a moving away from utilizing those forest lands to produce a resource that the mills can then use to turn into products and to create and to save jobs.

Let me point out to the gentleman what I am sure he has already mentioned here tonight, and that is our amendment is vitally needed for fire-suppression purposes and the health of the forests. Our amendment would save lives and save, frankly, the Federal Government millions of dollars in fire-suppression costs that have been spent combating these raging wildfires that have burned out of control particularly in the western United States in recent years.

Second, it would generate revenues for the Federal Treasury by again allowing the salvage harvesting of these dead and dying trees on Federal forest lands. Our amendment, which the gentleman was able to incorporate into the appropriations bill when it left the full committee, was actually one of the revenue-positive aspects of that piece of legislation, and was one of the measures that were used to pay if you will for the expenditures in the bill, not least of which again was Federal disaster assistance for emergency victims in California.

Second, I would like to point out, as again I am sure the gentleman has stressed here tonight, that our amendment is designed at taking some of these dead and dying and diseased trees out of Federal forest lands at a rate, frankly, that is far below the annual mortality rate on Federal forest lands, so what we have proposed here is a very reasonable amendment, one that is good for the environment, again good for forest health purposes, it is good forestry technique or silvicultural technique in that it allows the selective thinning of our forest lands targeting dead and dying trees, thinning those forest lands and managing those forest lands for again forest health and fire-suppression purposes.

I must say I am perplexed by the President's position on this particular issue. It seems like his administration has been, frankly, talking on both sides of this issue. In fact the very day before the President mentioned in his veto threat our emergency timber salvage amendment as grounds for a potential Presidential veto I has been assured by our former colleague and the new Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman from Kansas, that he as the Agriculture Secretary intended to do all that he could as a key representative of the administration to ensure that we began selling more timber off of our Federal forest lands, and as the gentleman pointed out in his opening remarks when he was kind enough to

introduce me and yield to me to me, my congressional district, the First Congressional District of northwest California, is home to all or part of four Federal forest lands. Our economy, our regional economy in northwest California is very much resource-dependent. We have traditionally relied upon the forest products industry as the primary source of steady, good-paying, industrial-type jobs, and, frankly, I would hope that the administration will reconsider their position, allow us to begin extracting that resource off of Federal forest lands for the benefit of our economies and the benefit of our local communities in our congressional district, in your congressional district, and in many congressional districts across the country.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Would the gentleman perhaps consider this question: If the President signs this rescission package, he will put 88,000 people back to work, and these are good, high-paying jobs, that is why we have at least three or four union endorsements here, we have the National Home Builders, we have many organizations endorsing this.

At a time when unemployment is relatively high across the country and especially high in the Pacific Northwest and other areas that would be impacted greatest by this, why would the President not sign a bill that would put 88,000 people back to work, would improve the forests' health, would actually by his own Forest Service admission, would really create a healthier forest? Why would he not do that?

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman would yield, I would be the last one to speculate for the administration on this particular question, and I know that the gentleman's question is somewhat rhetorical in nature. But he makes a very, very good point.

First of all we are talking about jobs that are not easily replaced in the local economies of resource-dependent communities. And I cannot fathom his motivation, except for the possibility that the President is afraid of frankly antagonizing a core constituency in the national Democratic Party, and that is the more militant environmental element which has made professional environmental activism a movement in America in recent years. They are the forces, the entrenched forces of the status quo on this particular issue. They are the ones that are frankly saying let those dead and dying trees rot on the forest floor rather than use those trees as a resource to produce a value-added product and again ensure good paying jobs in the forest products industry and the communities that depend on that industry as the primary source of their economic livelihood and economic well-being.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. A little while ago I mentioned the study that was published in the Wall Street Journal a couple of weeks ago pointed out this special interest in Washington of the environmental movement, and

this is to be distinguished from genuine, honest, working people out there that are concerned about the environment. I have three children, I am concerned about the environment.

□ 1945

Many people across the country are concerned. I am talking a special interest here that takes in over \$600 million by frightening people and does not come close to putting out the truth of what is happening. It is an organization that, according to the Journal report, is very far left. It voted 93 percent for Mr. Clinton in 1992. I know it is a special interest group that backs him.

But pandering to that group at the expense of these tens of thousands of wage earners out in that part of the country and doing it against the recommendations that he made himself, promises he made himself, with option 9 and other promises to get these people back to work, I cannot understand why he is picking this very left-wing group over this large part of America's working people, labor unions that want to go back to work, members, others, and I am just confused as to why this administration would pander to this small, elite group as opposed to mainstream America, why he would fly in the face of nearly two-thirds of the House of Representatives.

This was a bipartisan effort.

To get two-thirds, we had over 70 Democrats who voted and worked hard for the bill. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] was particularly helpful to get the bill passed; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], others were involved in this, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and it is all of us who are looking to help these working men and women get their jobs back, high-paying jobs in most cases, to get them back in the mainstream economy, and here the President is threatening to do that, to veto it. He is threatening because of the pressure from a group that does not know a sourwood from a white pine.

I had one of them testifying in the Committee on Interior the other day who testified he was an environmental educator. After he told me all the things that were happening in the forest, the world was coming to an end, I tried to ascertain his qualifications. I found out he did not have a degree in anything, and his practical knowledge was void. I asked him what portion of the country was owned by the Federal Government. It is about a third. He did not have a clue. I asked him how many acres were in the U.S. Forest Service system. It is 191 million acres. He did not know. I asked him how much of that 191 million acres could be harvested today. He said it all could. Less than 25 percent of it can be harvested today.

What I am saying is, with that kind of misinformation, the President would do well to listen to the working men and women in California and Washington and Oregon and other parts of this

country as opposed to listening to a very elite special interest group that is giving him very bad information.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point, and I would simply add that again the hard-core professional environmental element, which again has become, giving, I guess, the devil its due, a well-organized and well-funded movement in this country in recent years, having lost this debate through a fair and open process at the full Committee on Appropriations level when the bill was marked up, in fact, when the gentleman's amendment was voted on on an up-or-down basis, having lost the debate out here on this House floor when we debated at some length the merits of the gentleman's emergency timber salvage amendment, then employs a back-door mechanism, goes to the White House and convinces the certain figures in the President's administration that he really ought to veto this bill, which, as the gentleman pointed out, passed the House with strong bipartisan support, and I want to say that the President, frankly, is not, in my just intuitive sense here, he is not heeding his instinct. He is not doing what I think, frankly, he knows is the right thing.

I mean, after all, this is a President who campaigned on a promise of putting people first. Well, I want to point out to the President that the independent timber mills of this country have launched a new campaign called Putting Family Businesses First, so if the President met his campaign rhetoric, if he really does believe in putting people and families first, he can begin by reconsidering his threat to veto the gentleman's outstanding emergency timber salvage amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. That falls in line with the President's declaration that these are large companies. These are not large companies. These are small, family-size businesses.

#### THE REAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], my friend and colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just sat here listening for the last hour as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] did, and my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mr. CLAYTON] talking about environmental extremists and environmental extremism.

The fact is that 70 percent of the American public wants to see not weaker but stronger environmental laws, and the real extremists and the real radicals in this environmental debate are not people that support the

clean water laws and not people that support the clean air laws and not people that support public health laws, but the real extremists are a good many Republicans in this body who literally want to privatize some of the national parks, sell the national parks to large corporations, want to roll back a lot of the environmental laws, clean air laws, safe drinking water laws, laws that affect, that we have built a consensus in this country around that have given us the best public health in our history, that have given us the best, strongest laws in the world to protect our citizens against everything from breast cancer to tuberculosis. We have done that well in this country in the last 3 or 4 decades, something I am proud of.

I live in Lorain, Ohio. My back door looks out over Lake Erie. Twenty years ago, Lake Erie was declared dead in many parts. Part of the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught on fire.

Because of the efforts of the U.S. EPA, because of the commitment of a lot of people in Lorain, Cleveland, Medina, and all of northeast Ohio and other areas, we as a Nation were able to clean up that lake, so my daughters, Emily and Elizabeth, can now swim in Lake Erie, and other people, we drink the water, we can enjoy that lake recreationally, and it helps create jobs. It helps attract people to the Great Lakes to build their businesses and build their industries and employ people.

The extremists and the environmental issue are not those 70 or 80 percent of the American people that want clean air, pure food, safe drinking water for their children and their families and their grandchildren, but the people that want to sell off the national parks and allow the chemical companies and other polluters to write the laws that dismantle the best environmental laws in our history and the best environmental laws in the whole world, and that is what concerns me when I hear this kind of debate on the House floor.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] I must agree with you. There is nothing radical about wanting to know what is in the air we breathe, what is in the water we drink or what is in the food we eat. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

#### CELEBRATING THE MOTOR-VOTER LAW

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to applaud my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for organizing this special order and his dedication and commitment to the cause of voting and the rights of civil rights. He has an impeccable reputation, and those people who know of his record know that, indeed, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is a long-distance runner in the struggle for civil rights and the opportunity for basic rights that the Constitution af-

fords all Americans, the right to vote for all our citizens.

He has faced all manner of discouragement, and yet he has never been discouraged. I just want to thank you, I say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], for not only this special order but for the life that you have lived and showing that America should be there for everyone and living the life that is exemplary, what you are. And so I am delighted to participate with you.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for those comments.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The right to vote is a precious right because all rights derive from the voting right. Freedom of speech, which we know as the First Amendment, has far less meaning without the right to vote and to elect those persons who will uphold that fundamental freedom.

Freedom from illegal search and seizure, which we know as the fourth amendment, has little meaning if those who hold elective office do not stand up and protect those basic freedoms.

The term due process, the fifth amendment, providing important procedural safeguards, guaranteed by the Constitution, become mere words if those who we elect fail to protect them.

And the equality of treatment under the law, the 14th amendment, is a platitude we talk about that becomes a living reality only when, now only when, those we vote into office become champions of those rights.

The Constitution is a living and breathing document that gets its life from people we elect.

It is, therefore, clearly the best way to safeguard all of our rights is to exercise our most fundamental right, and that is the right to vote. And the first step in exercising that right obviously is to register. We in Congress have made registering to vote easy. The National Voter Registration Act of 1993, the so-called motor voter bill, was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton May 20, 1993.

The motor voter act took effect January 1 of this year. It requires basically that we get our drivers license, we can register by mail, any time we get public services, those three areas allow us to register very easily. With this simplified registration, we expect citizens will register to vote.

Indeed, in North Carolina, since implementation of the motor voter law, some 88,000 new voters have registered, 88,000. The reason for the simplified registration procedure is actually to encourage more people to participate, and we know there has been a declining participation of citizens in elections, so we need to do that.

One author has said the deadliest enemy is not really those who live in foreign lands but really it is within ourselves. I want to say to you, JOHN, that the same thing could be applied to us in our own community or in our own private life: The deadliest enemy is not