



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2000

No. 65

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

WE MUST USE OUR NATURAL RESOURCES IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY BALANCED WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the forest fires in Los Alamos and Nevada have highlighted what may have become a much bigger problem. One of the subcommittees on which I serve is the Subcommittee on Forest and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources.

We heard testimony a few months ago that almost 40 million acres of Federal land out West was in imminent danger of catastrophic forest fires. This is because environmental extremists fanatically, sometimes even violently, oppose cutting any trees in our national forests.

Forestry experts tell us that we have to cut some trees to have healthy forests, yet some of these extremists oppose even the removal of dead and dying trees, thus causing huge fuel buildups on the floors of these forests, leading to forest fires.

The Los Alamos fire was a so-called controlled burn set by Federal bureaucrats that simply got out of control. Of course, we all know that no Federal bureaucrat has ever made a mistake, or at least one that they have been held accountable for.

The leading environmental extremist, Secretary Babbitt, said on television last week that our forests are now 100 times more dangerous than they were 100 years ago, but it is because of the very policies that he has been advocating. If we do not start cutting more trees in the national forests soon, then in the very near future we are going to see forest fires that make the Los Alamos disaster look like peanuts in comparison.

Yet some of these environmental extremists want the forests to be thinned only by forest fires because that is the "natural way," and the way it occurred before man started populating the Earth, and, according to the extremists, messed things up.

Last year in the subcommittee we were told that the Congress in the mid 1980s passed what was then proclaimed as a great pro-environment law that we would not allow cutting of more than 80 percent of the new growth in the national forests. Since then, we have repeatedly reduced that percentage, stopping it altogether in some places. From the pro-environment law of 80 percent 15 or 16 years ago, we now allow harvesting of less than one-seventh of the new growth in our national forests.

National forests have about 23 billion board feet of new growth each year. Today we cut less than 3 billion board feet, or only about 12 or 13 percent of the new growth. There are about 6 billion board feet of dead or dying trees in the national forests, yet these extremists will not even permit the removal of these dead trees.

Now we are cutting less than half of the dead and dying trees, and unbelievably, some people want it stopped alto-

gether. Environmental extremists have had such an impact that many schoolchildren have almost been brainwashed about these things. They never hear the other side. If I went to any school in Knoxville and told them I was against cutting any trees in the national forests, they would probably think that was a really good thing. They never stop to think that we have to cut trees if we want to build houses or furniture, or have books, newspapers, toilet paper, and many, many other products.

Also, if we keep limiting and restricting where and how trees are cut, it will drive the prices for homes and many other items much higher than they already are. Even now, lumber dealers tell me they are having to import all kinds of Canadian lumber because we have cut out or halted so much U.S. lumber production.

When extremists get our lumber production in our national forests reduced so drastically, it helps big businesses and other countries, but it destroys jobs and drives up prices in this country. The people it hurts the most are the lower-income and working people in this country.

I know most of these environmental extremists come from very wealthy families, and I know they are more or less insulated from the harm that they do. But I think it is really sad that they destroy so many jobs and drive up prices for so many people who really cannot afford it.

I am not talking about cutting any trees in our 356 national parks, I am talking about cutting trees in our national forests so they can grow and be healthy and keep lumber prices down.

Our national forests cover 191 million acres. I know when people look at a map of the United States on one page in the book, the country looks small. Yet, 191 million acres is equal to about 325 Great Smoky Mountain National Parks. Most people who go to the Great

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3527

Smokies think it is huge. Yet I am talking about forests that cover more than 300 times the Great Smokies, and this does not count any of the land in our national parks or the land the Bureau of Land Management controls.

The Federal government owns over 30 percent of the land in this Nation today. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies own another 20 percent. Half of the land is in some type of public ownership.

What is most disturbing, though, is how government at all levels has been taking over private land at such a rapid rate in the last 30 years, and perhaps even more dangerous, putting so many rules, regulations, restrictions, and red tape on the shrinking amount of land that still remains in private lands today.

Yet, there are some of these environmental extremists who are not satisfied with half of the land and want even more.

There is something known as the Wildlands Project, which I first read about in the Washington Post, which advocates taking half the private land in the U.S. and placing it in public ownership.

This may sound OK until some bureaucrat comes and takes your home or your property.

Also, we could not emphasize enough that private property is one of the main keys to our freedom and our prosperity. It is one of the main things that has set us apart from countries like Russia and Cuba and other socialist or communist nations.

These national forests are not national monuments. They are natural resources, renewable resources.

Whenever some of these extremists are confronted by loggers who have lost jobs or communities that have been devastated, they always say just promote tourism.

Well tourism is an industry filled with minimum or low wage jobs. Even more importantly, it is just not possible to turn our whole country into tourist attractions or base our whole economy on tourism.

I know these environmental groups have to scare people and continually raise the bar so that their contributions will keep coming in.

I know, too, that many big companies, and particularly big multi-national corporations are helped by extreme environmental rules because they drive so many small and medium-sized businesses out of business or force them to merge. So many contributors for these groups come from these big companies, often headquartered in other countries.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we want to continue having a strong economy, with good jobs and half-way reasonable prices, and especially if we want to have a free country, we must use our natural resources in an environmentally balanced way.

We cannot stop cutting trees, digging for coal, and drilling for oil and continue to have the good life that we fortunately enjoy today.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES AND SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized

during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is for the Federal government to be a better partner in making our communities more livable, to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

One of the indicator species of a livable community is the pedestrian. Earlier this week, people in Montgomery County were shocked, I am sure, to read that in their community pedestrian deaths were as high as homicides. In 1998 and 1999, 25 people were killed in pedestrian accidents, the same as those that were killed in homicides.

Really, this is not news. The statistics are that Americans are 160 percent more likely to be killed by a car than to be shot and killed by a stranger. It is the equivalent of an airline crash every 2 weeks in this country, and for every person who is killed, there are another 20 who are injured; 6,000 dead in all, and 110,000 injured.

The seniors of our community are at the highest risk, almost twice as likely to be killed or injured. Walking for them is more important, not just as a form of exercise, but it is an important part of their transportation system, because many of them no longer drive.

Mr. Speaker, it is important because everyone at some point in their journey is a pedestrian. But there are lessons to be learned from our experience. We are finding that some of the sprawling unplanned communities that are primarily auto-oriented are the most dangerous places for people to walk, places like Fort Lauderdale and Miami; Atlanta, that we have talked a lot about on the floor of this House is sort of a poster child for unplanned growth and sprawled; and Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Dallas, Texas.

Ironically, many of the older, more pedestrian-oriented are the safest. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, by one account, is the safest place to walk in America.

It does not have to be this way. There are opportunities for us to plan for people, not just for cars; to put uses closer together, not mandate that they be separated from where people work, where they live, and where they shop.

The Federal government itself can be a partner by not taking an historic Post Office in downtown small town America and locating it by a strip mall out at the edge of town without even paved sidewalks.

There is a whole philosophy that has developed, an engineering approach that is called "traffic calming" that we had great success with in our community in Portland, Oregon, to be able to make a difference for the way that people live.

The Federal government in the ISTEA-T-21 legislation has set aside significant funds for traffic safety, but sadly, many of the States are not using those resources in ways that will make pedestrians safe. Fourteen percent of all motor vehicle-related deaths are pe-

destrians, yet only 1 percent of the highway safety money from the Federal government is used for pedestrian safety.

It is important for us to use the tools that we have available, that we are sensitive to putting people into the planning process to make our communities more livable and make our families safer, healthier, and economically secure.

KOSOVO AND BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago the United States and many of our NATO allies were engaged in an air campaign against Yugoslav forces. Next month will mark the 1-year anniversary of the agreement providing for the withdrawal of Yugoslavian troops from Kosovo and the deployment of international peacekeeping forces.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we not forget the American troops who continue to languish in Kosovo, or those in Bosnia, and other fellow citizens scattered throughout the world on various deployments. We should also consider the cost of these deployments both in dollars and in reduction of our military capability.

President Clinton's decision to attack Yugoslavia and to maintain peacekeeping forces in Kosovo were based upon the mistaken notion that military forces can turn ethnic and religious hatred into peaceful coexistence.

As a participant in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation known as KFOR, the United States has 5,000 troops in Kosovo, 450 in Macedonia, and 10 in Greece. While working to achieve this harmony, U.S. troops have been fired upon and assaulted in many instances.

Census figures collected by the U.N. High Commission for Refugees and the Yugoslavian government indicate that 93 percent of the population of Kosovo is ethnic Albanians now and 5 percent Serbs. In essence, American troops are in Kosovo to protect the Serbs from an angry majority. This makes the President's plan to build a peaceful, multi-ethnic state all the more daunting.

This situation begs the question, when will our troops leave Kosovo? If the Clinton administration has its way, the answer is, no time soon. All we need to do is to look at Bosnia to explain this conclusion.

Remember Bosnia? In 1996, the United States sent 16,500 troops to Bosnia and some 6,000 support troops to neighboring nations. The President stated that the deployment would last about 1 year. Mr. Speaker, the troops are still there, and the administration has requested \$1.4 billion for the next fiscal year to continue this 1-year mission to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that much the same is expected for Kosovo. Two