

was successful in August of this year in obtaining a verdict on behalf of one of his other clients against the cigarette industry. The landmark case *Carter v. Brown and Williamson Tobacco Company*, tried in Jacksonville, showed that juries will not forgive the cigarette industry for its carelessness and deception in refusing to warn its customers or to develop safer alternative products.

I have donated my time to the fight against tobacco and to protect children from becoming involved in this dangerous drug. Lawton Chiles, Florida's courageous Governor, has asked me to address the Florida Legislature. I have appeared numerous times for the American Cancer Society, the Tobacco Free Coalition, Citizens Against Tobacco, the Duval County Public Schools ZIP program, the Monroe County (Key West) School System, the Cancer Survivors for Life. I have at my expense appeared on national and local television and radio shows.

I now understand, and wish to place into the record, some of the shocking facts that the Carter jury saw, which reveal how the industry put profits over people, stonewalled its critics, and concealed scientific evidence from the public and its customers. The attached article entitled "Mass Destruction: A Medical, Legal, and Ethical Indictment of the Cigarette Industry" authored by my attorney, Norwood S. Wilner, and my physician, Dr. Allan Feingold of South Miami Hospital, outlines my understanding of these terrible facts.

I call upon the lawmakers of this country to protect our children from this dangerous substance. Tobacco products should be regulated as the addictive drugs they are. Tobacco advertising should be eliminated or strictly curtailed. I call upon the tobacco industry to compensate its victims, its former customers, who are suffering and dying from its products. Thank you for permitting me to appear before this committee.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Tallahassee, FL, August 12, 1996.

Mr. ALAN LANDERS,
Lauderhill, FL.

DEAR ALAN: On behalf of the citizens of Florida, I wish to thank you. As a former model for cigarette manufacturers, your compelling testimony before the Florida Legislature of cigarettes' insidious poison, and the perverse marketing of this product to our youth is a true "profile in courage". Your personal message made the difference in our winning 1996 Legislative battle against Big Tobacco.

Your critical help, combined with the American Cancer Society, American Lung Society, and the American Heart Association, permitted Floridians to beat back over sixty (60) high paid lobbyists and a million dollar media campaign designed to distort the truth. In biblical parlance, "we smote them with the jaw bone of an ass."

Alan, thank you again. We will need your help in the future, and I am glad that I can count on you.

Warmly yours,

LAWTON C. CHILES.

JANET SACKMAN

Janet Sackman was born on September 3, 1931 in New York City, New York. In 1946, at age 14, Mrs. Sackman began working as a photographer's model, and soon became the Lucky Strike cover girl. At the request of a tobacco executive, Mrs. Sackman learned to smoke at age 17. He advised her that she should learn to smoke in order to learn to hold a cigarette, and look more natural when being photographed.

In 1983, Mrs. Sackman was diagnosed with throat cancer, and underwent a laryngectomy. In 1990 late doctors found cancer in her right lung, and Mrs. Sackman had a portion of that lung removed.

After her illness Mrs. Sackman vowed to begin speaking out against smoking. She has made numerous appearances worldwide in order to educate the public regarding the health hazards of cigarette smoking. •

PUBLIC LANDS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

• Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this month marks the 20th anniversary of Congress' passage of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 [NFMA]. As many of you know, at the beginning of this Congress we embarked upon the first sustained oversight of the implementation of the NFMA, and the related statutes and regulations that govern the management of Federal forest lands—both those managed by the U.S. Forest Service, as well as by the Bureau of Land Management.

During the course of last year and this, our subcommittee held 15 hearings, receiving testimony from over 200 witnesses concerning the status of Federal forest management. We then participated in, and reviewed the results of, the Seventh American Forest Congress before finalizing our conclusions. These conclusions are summarized in a June 20, 1996 letter that I sent to Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman. Since the transmittal of this letter and its subsequent circulation, we have received a number of letters, calls, and comments from various individuals both inside and outside the federal land management establishment. Generally, they have been: First telling us that we are accurate in our diagnosis of the problems associated with federal forest management; and second urging us to address some of the problems and opportunities described in the June 20 letter.

At the conclusion of our oversight hearings earlier this year we invited the administration to provide us with ideas about needed changes, basically making good on the commitment that Secretary Glickman made when he was confirmed by the Senate in March 1995. In the June 20 letter, we again offered to entertain the administration's proposals. On August 1 we received a response indicating that no proposals were ready to tender. We are distributing a copy of the letter and the Secretary's response to you.

Last week, I met with the Secretary to see whether the administration was close to offering a proposal of any sort. Not surprisingly, they are not—nor will they be anytime before a certain date in November that seems to figure heavily in all of their planning.

I also asked the Secretary whether he imagined that—if we were to introduce a legislative proposal before that magic date—we might have a thoughtful and substantive discussion detached from partisan wrangling and political recriminations? He thought not. What a surprise, but more the pity.

Without being overly critical, I think we have to question both the seriousness of the administration's approach to these issues, and the depth of the Secretary's commitment to constructively engage Congress on Federal forest management. But I want to emphasize that my mind and my door are still open. As we move forward, we would still be happy to see a legislative proposal from the administration to put alongside what we propose.

WE MUST CHOOSE A COHERENT PHILOSOPHY UNDER WHICH OUR FEDERAL FOREST LANDS SHOULD BE MANAGED

Today, I want to review the basic approach we took to our oversight task. In evaluating the need for change, we started by evaluating how well our current statutes are working. Then, having established that change is imperative, we stepped back and tried to evaluate the overall philosophy under which we want our Federal lands to be managed.

We chose to reaffirm the multiple-use mandate that has guided the management of Federal forest lands since the early part of this century. We have refused to accede to the no-use philosophy that is currently being popularized by elements of the national environmental community and, to some extent, agents of this administration.

We have chosen the former over the latter because any sentient being can see the results of the no-use philosophy on the land. Fires are burning out of control through forests that are inherently unhealthy because of stand conditions that have been allowed to deteriorate as a consequence of both simple administrative inaction, and a more basic and grievous confusion over the role of man in nature. The bill we will propose does not deal with the forest health issue alone. Rather, it will also deal with the health of the Forest Service and the other land managing agencies. It is our conclusion that the clear results of the implementation of no-use philosophies on the agencies have been as dramatic as the results of the application of similar philosophies on the land.

Consider this—in over 15 hearings with 200 witnesses—no one supported the status quo. Let me repeat, no one from any walk, profession, interest group, or point of view provided any testimony that suggested Congress need not act to fix the current situation. In sum, the health of the Forest Service—or, more broadly, our Federal Government—as an enlightened advocate of professional resource management has reached a critical point. In an era of tightening Government budgets this might be the case even if this administration was not subjecting the agencies to unprecedented political interference. But, in fact, the amount of political interference that the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are facing is extraordinary.

Thus, as we summarize our general philosophy, we flatly reject the preservationist philosophy that the best

thing we can do for our Federal forests is to walk away and leave them alone. Rather, we choose to: First, reaffirm and reinvigorate multiple-use management; second, restore the health of our forests and the morale of our professional forest managers; third, fashion forest policy on hope instead of fear; fourth, develop solutions instead of conflict; fifth, encourage education instead of litigation; sixth, rely upon science instead of stoking emotions; and seventh, employ human resources in environmental stewardship, instead of destroying them in the interest of environmental purism.

OUR APPROACH TO THIS PROCESS HAS
NECESSARILY BEEN TIME CONSUMING

When we initiated this oversight process two Marches ago, I remarked upon the novelty of Congress wading into an area where it has been absent from the field for so many years. I also noted that, if our oversight uncovered the need for significant changes, these changes would take time. Indeed, legislative changes of this nature always take more than one Congress to achieve. When you write the environmental history of this Congress I hope you will remember that we expected it to take awhile, but we will get the job done.

I relish the opportunity to quote Senator Hubert Humphrey's remarks 20 years ago this week as he brought the conference report accompanying the 1976 National Forest Management Act to the Senate floor. He stated that:

It is with a tremendous amount of pride and satisfaction that I offer this measure for the consideration of the Senate. It is a product of 3 years of work by four committees of this Congress, as well as more than a dozen public interest groups and business interests.

These issues could not be viewed as the work of a single Congress or the result of an individual election, even then. They certainly cannot now. For those critical of Congress' efficiency, it is worth noting that the number of congressional committees has decreased, even as the panoply of interest groups has expanded exponentially.

Generally speaking, significant change comes only through crisis or consensus. I would submit that, today, we have a consensus that the status quo is unacceptable. But there is not yet a shared sense of crisis, nor any specific agreement on an appropriate solution. Therefore, our proposal will represent a starting point to see if we can: First, build upon the only established consensus—that is, the status quo is unacceptable; and second, move toward some agreement on what kinds of appropriate solutions should be provided.

By necessity, many parties will be involved in the deliberations that we will begin in a few weeks, and carry forward through the next Congress and perhaps beyond. But at the same time, many parties have already been involved in providing us useful insights that are reflected in the proposal we will circulate in the near future. Let me men-

tion a few groups that have been involved and deserve recognition for the contributions made to date.

First, I want to recognize the thousands of people involved in the Seventh American Forest Congress. Their coming together was a truly unique experience. I directed my staff to attend, and they benefitted greatly from the insights provided. We delayed introduction of this measure to benefit from their deliberations. I hope to continue this extraordinary dialog with this other Congress.

Representatives of the environmental community have also been instrumental in providing both the backdrop for the discussions that have occurred in this Congress, as well as a number of specific suggestions for changes. While we do not agree with all they advocate, they nevertheless deserve the credit for elevating the public's interest in the state of our Federal forests.

Third, I want to recognize the forest scientists that have begun to look at land management and ecosystem analysis at broader geographic scales. Many of the initiatives that have been pioneered by this group of devoted Forest Service and other Federal agency scientists over the last 4 years are going to be recognized and provided with a statutory basis.

Fourth, I want to thank State and local officials who have provided considerable testimony about the current state of federalism, insofar as Federal resource management is concerned. They have suggested a number of improvements based upon their increasingly impressive capabilities to perform a number of the management functions that are currently entrusted solely to the diminishing number of Federal agency employees spread across the country.

Fifth, I want to thank representatives of local, dependent communities and industries. I want to commend their patience in seeing us through these deliberations, while in many cases—and for justifiable reasons—they felt their concerns are of a more immediate nature.

Finally and most importantly, I want to thank the Forest Service and other Federal agency employees who contributed so much to our oversight process both formally and informally. By elevating environmental considerations within the agency, Forest Service employees have made many of the changes that we will propose both reasonable and possible. There is less need now to use other Federal employees to police the work and commitment of Forest Service scientists, biologists, and land management professionals than there may once have been. For this, and for other efficiencies in better land stewardship that we will propose, Forest Service employees deserve considerable credit. I am also appreciative of the amount of time and effort that went into the development of agency testimony and support materials that provided the information necessary for

our oversight and ongoing drafting processes. I deeply appreciate, the professionalism and commitment of these employees.

I do not expect any of the above mentioned groups to be wholly or very satisfied—or, in a few cases, even remotely satisfied—with the proposal that we will unveil shortly. Nevertheless, all of their views were heard and in many ways reflected, even if not exactly the way they thought they would be.

Now having reviewed the process that we used to develop the legislation, let me explain how we will proceed. Prior to meeting with the Secretary last week, I was prepared to introduce this measure immediately and start the process of discussing these ideas. The Secretary's responses to my questions have convinced me that this would result in little more than the most cynical exercise in political posturing at the present time.

Therefore, I plan to wait and circulate this proposal immediately after the election. If the current administration returns, the invitation to come forward with their own proposal still stands. If not, I expect that their successors may well be more aggressive and communicative in their desire to proceed and address these issues. After I finish a little work I have back in Idaho, I will sponsor a series of workshops and/or hearings during the recess to secure specific comments and suggestions for change. I will also direct our staff to meet with interested groups to secure additional comments. I hope that we will then have an improved bill to introduce at the beginning of the next Congress in order to begin a more focused dialogue on legislation that I will strive to advance in a bi-partisan fashion.

To this end, I look at the forthcoming proposal as a working draft—even though I have been at it for 2 years. I urge people to review it carefully. I hope that, with a minimum amount of rhetorical overkill, they will tell us what they think the good parts and the bad parts are. I will not be seeking immediate support, and I will try to avoid immediate condemnation. This proposal is going to change—perhaps dramatically—as we listen and rework it to reintroduce in the next Congress.●

DR. JOE CARROLL CHAMBERS

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to recognize today a man who has given selflessly to his community and profession, Dr. Joe Carroll Chambers. He will be retiring on October 11, 1996 and we are very sad to see him go. Dr. Chambers is a graduate of the University of Tennessee College of Medicine, interned at the Baptist Hospital in Nashville, and completed a masters in public health at the University of North Carolina. He is the recipient of many awards, including the James Hayne Award by the SC Public Health Association for meritorious