

the rescission package could be absolutely wiped out, in effect, by the actions we take on this amendment. So in terms of the implications of the American taxpayer, this single debate, as short as this amendment is—a page and a half—it can have very profound implications on this.

I am happy to possibly impose a quorum call here so we can have a minidiscussion, as my colleague has suggested, on the matter. But I must tell him in advance that I think postponing and delaying this for another 2, 3, 4, 5 hours—I am worried about what that itself does in terms of how markets are apt to react. I have such respect for my colleague from Oregon that I am more than willing to listen to his advice and thoughts on the matter.

Unless others want to talk on the amendment, I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum. I see people standing, so I do not want to do that at this juncture. But I will when the remarks are completed on this matter and we can have an opportunity to talk about it.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am going to keep my remarks, as I have indicated to the chairman, to a minimum. I am compelled to respond.

No. 1, the question in terms of relevance. I think it is absolutely, totally relevant. Here we are talking about—as the Senator from Massachusetts raised—the issue of cutting programs for women, children, and others. And I am saying, what about the American taxpayers? What about the hard-working middle class? We are sending money to programs of dubious value, reclaiming tesobonos for speculators, for people who made investments, which does not seem to me to be the right way to go.

As it relates to the question of \$5 billion, I deliberately kept it that high. Let me tell you, in the history of this fund, never once has it gone over \$550 million for any other country other than Mexico. Not Israel. Not Italy. Not Ireland. Let us bring in Greece and every ethnic community there is, including Russia. Not once. Mexico, one time, \$1 billion. Only Mexico. So we went to \$5 billion. Now if we want to make it Mexico specifically, I have no problem with doing that. The principle is whether or not this is a delegation of our constitutional authority. That is what we are down to.

I am more than willing to put the matter over. But in terms of relevance, I think it is very relevant. Here we are cutting 12, 14, 17 billion dollars' worth of programs, and some of them arguably are good programs. Yet, we are shipping off at the same time, watching it take place—by the way, in several weeks, maybe another \$5, \$6, \$7, \$8 billion will go down to Mexico. So I am saying, hey, fellows, let us look at this. Members of the Congress, let us look at this and see whether we want to continue the delegation of our authority in this matter.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We are dealing with economic dynamite here. And the very discussion has to be disquieting to a lot of people in the financial markets around the world. Senator BOXER made a very good point just a few minutes ago when she asked about the stability of the United States. People wonder, can we stay the course on things?

It is no accident that just a few days ago, we saw the worst trade figures we have had for a long, long time. And those trade figures were caused, to a great extent, by the peso crisis in Mexico.

Mexico has been a country where we have sold more goods than we have imported. The future of Mexico is tied in with the jobs.

Senator D'AMATO talks about working men and women in the United States. We want to protect those jobs and help Mexico protect those jobs.

I will add a couple of other points, Mr. President. It is easy in this kind of climate to find scapegoats, when people are having a tough time making a living. What has happened in our society is happening in every society: As the demand for unskilled labor is going down, the demand for skilled labor goes up.

As that happens and people lose their jobs, they look around: Whom can we blame? Part of it is translated, I regret to say, in terms of race in our society. There are people down on affirmative action, saying, "We are losing our jobs because of African-Americans," or because of others. Mexico becomes an easy scapegoat for a lot of people who do not understand the realities.

The drop in the dollar that we experienced here a few weeks ago, to the extent that Mexico was involved, is because of our debt and our deficit. Ordinarily, a \$20 billion loan guarantee would not mean anything for a country with a \$6 trillion economy. Mexico is not the primary problem.

I will underscore a point that Senator DODD made. This does not refer to Mexico. It says, "We can't make loan guarantees except as authorized by an act of Congress." Say on November 1 of this year, we recess until January. Say on November 10, there is a crisis in the British pound sterling. The United States is frozen. The most powerful economic Nation in the world, which will have so much at stake, could not do a thing. That just does not make sense.

Finally, I say to my colleagues, this is not the kind of an issue where we ought to be pandering to public opinion. There are issues in which all Members in politics pander to public opinion, but with this one we are dealing with something that really goes to the heart of the economic survival of this country and other countries.

I urge my colleagues to look back to something that happened some years ago—Senator BYRD was here; I do not

think Senator HATFIELD was—when General Marshall, in a Harvard commencement, announced the Marshall plan. Harry Truman was President of the United States. The first Gallup Poll that was taken after that showed 14 percent of the American public supported the Marshall plan. It was extremely unpopular.

We look back on it now and boast about how we saved Western Europe from communism with the Marshall plan. It is something we can be proud of. But it took the U.S. Senators, who had the courage to do what was not temporarily popular, to do that.

Particularly because Harry Truman at that point was dealing with a Republican Congress, it took Senator Arthur Vandenberg from Michigan to stand up and say this issue is more important than temporary public opinion or the Republican Party or winning a Presidential race.

Arthur Vandenberg did the right thing. The country moved ahead. It is one of the great acts of our country in the history of our country.

On an issue that is this volatile, we had better do the right thing and not ask ourselves what will the polls say back home. This is an amendment that ought to be resoundingly defeated.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe that both sides will indicate support.

I now ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the D'Amato amendment for the consideration of an amended amendment by Senator GORTON and Senator MURRAY, raising an amendment to that; that there be an hour equally divided; and then we return back to the status where we are now, with the D'Amato amendment the pending business.

This would incorporate an amendment by Senator BURNS to the Gorton amendment, which is about a 90-second action; there would then be the hour divided equally between Senator MURRAY to offer an amendment, and Senator GORTON; then return again to the status where we are now. And, in the meantime, maybe we can find some way to resolve the current status.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the unanimous consent will include language that says there will be no second-degrees to the Murray amendment?

Mr. HATFIELD. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator.

Mrs. MURRAY. Is it my understanding that the unanimous-consent language will agree that there will be no second-degrees?

Mr. HATFIELD. And there will be no second-degree amendments to the Murray amendment. In other words, in the regular form.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and I do not intend to object, but I just want to make it as clear as I possibly can that, while I am agreeing at this particular juncture to this approach to accommodate our colleague from Montana and a colleague from the State of Washington as well, I hope we could come to closure on the D'Amato amendment. Because I do want to make it clear that this is a matter which I take very, very, very seriously. I understand the desire of everyone to move on to the rescission package.

This was not my intention to have this amendment come up. It is up before us. But I do not intend for it to be disposed of within an abbreviated debate. I am not suggesting a filibuster here at all. But it is an important matter that deserves a lot of consideration.

So, while I am agreeing to this particular unanimous consent at this juncture, no one should interpret this agreement on this particular amendment to mean I will agree to future such requests. I say that with all due respect to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the chairman yield for a question?

Mr. HATFIELD. I will.

Mr. SARBANES. It is my understanding, then, that upon completion of the Murray amendment, which will take an hour—at least there is an hour of time for consideration of the Murray amendment—and then I take it there may be a vote? Or not?

Mr. HATFIELD. I think so.

Mr. SARBANES. At the end of that we would be back on the D'Amato amendment, in the exact posture in which we find ourselves?

Mr. HATFIELD. The circumstances of this moment will not be changed. They merely will be postponed for an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous consent is agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like just a moment to thank Senator DODD and Senator SARBANES and others for cooperating on this, and Senator D'AMATO on our side as the author of the amendment.

Once again, it will be a Burns amendment to the Gorton amendment, and then Senator MURRAY will offer an amendment as a probable substitute. So that means no second-degree amendments to the amendment of Senator MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 428 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To broaden areas in which salvage timber sales are not to be conducted)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] proposes an amendment numbered 428 to Amendment No. 420.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous-consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 69, strike lines 7 through 10 and insert the following:

“(A) expeditiously prepare, offer, and award salvage timber sale contracts on Federal lands, except in—

“(i) any area on Federal lands included in the National Wilderness Preservation System;

“(ii) any roadless area on Federal lands designated by Congress for wilderness study in Colorado or Montana;

“(iii) any roadless area on Federal lands recommended by the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management for wilderness designation in its most recent land management plan in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

“(iv) any area on Federal lands on which timber harvesting for any purpose is prohibited by statute; and”.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, this is a perfecting amendment to the Gorton amendment that merely accedes to the House language of the bill in the timber harvest. The House-passed bill contains language regarding lands which are exempt from the timber provision. However, the language as reported out of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is more limited than that passed by the House. So my amendment is the same language as that of the House, as it was passed through the House of Representatives.

It exempts land designated by Congress for wilderness study in Montana and Colorado, Federal lands recommended by the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management for wilderness designation in its most recent land management plan in effect; the Federal lands on which timber harvesting for any purpose is prohibited by statute.

In other words, what this does is prevents harvesting timber inside of now-designated wilderness areas, those study areas, and also those areas that have been proposed for wilderness by any forest plan that is now in effect under the forest plan. I believe this amendment addresses most of the concerns that have been raised by my colleagues. I hope the Senate will accept my amendment.

I thank Senator GORTON of Washington for allowing me to perfect his amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this amendment conforms the section of the proposal in the bill to what the House has passed. It clearly exempts wilderness areas and the like from the effect of the legislative language in the bill and I believe that, while the opponents to the whole section do not like it, they do like this addition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 428) to amendment No. 420 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 429 TO AMENDMENT 420

(Purpose: To require timber sales to go forward)

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 429 to amendment No. 420.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 68, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 79, line 5, and insert the following:

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) CONSULTING AGENCY.—The term “consulting agency” means the agency with which a managing agency is required to consult with respect to a proposed salvage timber sale if consultation is required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(2) MANAGING AGENCY.—The term “managing agency” means a Federal agency that offers a salvage timber sale.

(3) SALVAGE TIMBER SALE.—The term “salvage timber sale” means a timber sale—

(A) in which each unit is composed of forest stands in which more than 50 percent of the trees have suffered severe insect infestation or have been significantly burned by forest fire; and

(B) for which agency biologists and other agency forest scientists conclude that forest health may be improved by salvage operations.

(b) SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—

(1) DIRECTION TO COMPLETE SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall—

(A) expeditiously prepare, offer, and award salvage timber sale contracts on Forest Service lands and Bureau of Land Management lands that are located outside—

(i) any unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(ii) any roadless area that—

(I) is under consideration for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(II) is administratively designated as a roadless area in the managing agency's most recent land management plan in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act (not including land designated as a Federal wilderness area); or

(iii) any area in which such a sale would be inconsistent with agency standards and guidelines applicable to areas administratively withdrawn for late successional and riparian reserves; or

(iv) any area withdrawn by Act of Congress for any conservation purpose; and

(B) perform the appropriate revegetation and tree planting operations in the area in which the salvage occurred.

(2) SALE DOCUMENTATION.—

(A) PREPARATION OF DOCUMENTS.—In preparing a salvage timber sale under paragraph (1), Federal agencies that have a role in the planning, analysis, or evaluation of the sale shall fulfill their respective duties expeditiously and, to the extent practicable, simultaneously.

(B) PROCEDURES TO EXPEDITE SALVAGE TIMBER SALES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When it appears to a managing agency that consultation may be required under section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2))—

(I) the managing agency shall solicit comments from the consulting agency within 7 days of the date of the decision of the managing agency to proceed with the required environmental documents necessary to offer to sell the salvage timber sale; and

(II) within 30 days after receipt of the solicitation, the consulting agency shall respond to the managing agency's solicitation concerning whether consultation will be required and notify the managing agency of the determination.

(ii) CONSULTATION DOCUMENT.—In no event shall a consulting agency issue a final written consultation document with respect to a salvage sale later than 30 days after the managing agency issues the final environmental document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(iii) DELAY.—A consulting agency may not delay a salvage timber sale solely because the consulting agency believes it has inadequate information, unless—

(aa) the consulting agency has been actively involved in preparation of the required environmental documents and has requested in writing reasonably available additional information from the managing agency that the consulting agency considers necessary under part 402 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to complete a biological assessment; and

(bb) the managing agency has not complied with the request.

(3) STREAMLINING OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—Administrative review of a decision of a managing agency under this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (106 Stat. 1419), except that—

(A) an appeal shall be filed within 30 days after the date of issuance of a decision by the managing agency; and

(B) the managing agency shall issue a final decision within 30 days and may not extend the closing date for a final decision by any length of time.

(4) STREAMLINING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(A) TIME FOR CHALLENGE.—Any challenge to a timber sale under subsection (a) or (b) shall be brought as a civil action in United States district court within 30 days after the later of—

(i) the decision to proceed with a salvage timber sale is announced; or

(ii) the date on which any administrative appeal of a salvage timber sale is decided.

(B) EXPEDITION.—The court shall, to the extent practicable, expedite proceedings in a civil action under subparagraph (A), and for the purpose of doing so may shorten the times allowed for the filing of papers and

taking of other actions that would otherwise apply.

(C) ASSIGNMENT TO SPECIAL MASTER.—The court may assign to a special master all or part of the proceedings in a civil action under subparagraph (A).

(c) OPTION 9.—

(1) DIRECTION TO COMPLETE TIMBER SALES.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall expeditiously prepare, offer, and award timber sale contracts on Federal lands in the forests specified in Option 9, as selected by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on April 13, 1994.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—A rebuttable presumption exists that any timber sale on Federal lands encompassed by Option 9 that is consistent with Option 9 and applicable administrative planning guidelines meets the requirements of applicable environmental laws. This paragraph does not affect the applicable legal duties that Federal agencies are required to satisfy in connection with the planning and offering of a salvage timber sale under this subsection.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall make available 100 percent of the amount of funds that will be required to hire or contract with such number of biologists, hydrologists, geologists, and other scientists to permit completion of all watershed assessments and other analyses required for the preparation, advertisement, and award of timber sale contracts prior to the end of fiscal year 1995 in accordance with and in the amounts authorized by the Record of Decision in support of Option 9.

(B) SOURCE.—If there are no other unobligated funds appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, for fiscal year 1995 that can be available as required by subparagraph (A), the Secretary concerned shall make funds available from amounts that are available for the purpose of constructing forest roads only from the regions to which Option 9 applies.

(d) SECTION 318.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each timber sale awarded pursuant to section 318 of Public Law 101-121 (103 Stat. 745) the performance of which is, on or after July 30, 1995, precluded under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) due to requirements for the protection of the marbled murrelet, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide the purchaser replacement timber, at a site or sites selected at the discretion of the Secretary, that is equal in volume, kind, and value to that provided by the timber sale contract.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Harvest of replacement timber under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the original contract and shall not count against current allowable sale quantities.

(e) EXPIRATION.—Subsections (b) and (c) shall expire on September 30, 1996, but the terms and conditions of those subsections shall continue in effect with respect to timber sale contracts offered under this Act until the contracts have been completely performed.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an alternative to the timber management authorizing language in this bill. I offer my amendment because I believe the language included in the bill by my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, will

backfire. I believe it will hurt—not help—timber communities and workers in the Northwest.

The authorizing language contained in this bill is designed to accomplish three things: respond to a timber salvage problem resulting from last year's forest fires; speed up the rate of timber sales under the President's forest plan, option 9; and to release a few timber sales remaining from legislation passed by Congress 4 years ago.

These are goals with which I can agree. My problem is with the method. I believe the language proposed by my colleague will cause a blizzard of lawsuits, cause political turmoil within the Northwest, and take us right back to where we were 4 years ago.

Our region has been at the center of a war over trees that has taken place in the courtrooms and Congress for almost a decade. There is a history of waiving environmental laws to solve timber problems; that strategy has not worked.

It has made the situation worse. Until 1993, the Forest Service was paralyzed by lawsuits, the courts were managing the forests, and acrimony dominated public discourse in the region.

Now this bill contains language that will reopen those old wounds. I strongly believe that would not be in the best interest of the region.

Let me briefly explain my amendment, and why I think it makes more sense than the underlying bill. There are two distinct issues in question: salvage of dead and dying timber in the arid inland west, and management of the old growth fir forests along the Pacific coast.

There is a legitimate salvage issue right now throughout the West. Last year's fire season was one of the worst ever. There are hundreds of thousands of acres with burned trees sitting there. I believe these trees can and should be salvaged and put to good public use.

I believe there is a right way and a wrong way to conduct salvage operations on Federal lands. The wrong way is to short cut environmental checks and balances. The wrong way is to cut people out of the process. The wrong way is to invite a mountain of lawsuits.

The right way is to expedite compliance with the law. The right way is to make sure the agencies can make correct decisions quickly. The right way is to let people participate in the process—so they do not clog up the courts later.

I believe we can offer eastside timber communities hope, not only in the short term—by delivering salvage volume—but in the long term, too. By following the law, we can immediately harvest timber—and sustain it in the future—because we will not be tied up in lawsuits; we conserve our natural environment by not allowing poorly planned clearcuts to slide into salmon-bearing streams; and we protect human

lives by building roads that are rationally planned, not hastily built without planning.

The Chief of the Forest Service and many firefighters agree with me on this. I ask unanimous consent to have some letters and materials to that effect printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 21, 1995.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: I would like to answer to the editorial "From timber to tinder," published in the March 15 Washington Times. It argues that Congress should pass Representative Taylor's Bill that would eliminate all environmental and economic rules for Forest Service timber sales of 6 billion board feet, in the name of forest health and firefighter safety. Linking this initiative to the 1994 firefighters' deaths is an insult to those that died and a shameful appeal to emotionalism. I lost my husband of 21 years, and the father of our two young children, Jim Thrash, in the Colorado fire last year. He was a smokejumper with 16 seasons of experience.

He also loved the forests. Jim and I owned and operated an outfitting and guide business in the beautiful pristine mountains of west-central Idaho. We took many people a year into the backcountry to experience the "wilderness". He was also the President of the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Assoc., which represents an industry that takes thousands of Americans each year into the backcountry. Jim was very much at home in the forests. He worked for responsible forest management practices with a high emphasis on maintenance of clean, free-flowing streams and quality wildlife habitat. He knew, understood and advocated the use of fire in a more natural role in the ecosystem as well as prescriptive fires to aid in the restoration of natural conditions. He did not support further roading of Idaho's roadless lands or the use of clearcutting.

It is true that '94's fires were the result of the extended western drought, but were also the natural fire cycles of those ecosystems. There are those who are claiming that their loved ones' deaths resulted from careless forest managers who failed to log dead and dying timber elsewhere, resulting in a shortage of firefighting resources. In reality, the Colorado incident was not one of resource shortages, but one of mismanagement. Firefighting managers and supervisors used poor strategies (or had no strategies at all), and failed to recognize and respond to the existing conditions (drought and weather) and extenuating circumstances (resources shortages) when making the decisions to put employees on the firelines. Ultimately, this resulted in the deaths of 14 people.

HOLLY THRASH.

MARCH 27, 1995.

DEAR MADAMS OR SIR: I am writing to you regarding the various "Forest Health" initiatives floating around Congress these days. I am a wildland firefighter from McCall, Idaho who has worked for the Forest Service as a helicopteer, a hotshot, and 12 years as a smokejumper. As I am sure you understand, the opinions expressed herein are my own and do not represent any government agency. Since I was smokejumping on fires in Idaho and Montana last July, I was not on the South Canyon Fire. Yet I lost good friends there, and I feel a duty to them and to myself to speak out about the bills you have under your consideration.

Given my knowledge of fire and the health of our forests, I cannot support S. 391 (Fed-

eral Lands Forest Health Protection and Restoration) or any incantation of Mr. Taylor's amendment (The Emergency Two-Year Salvage Timber Sale Program), or Mr. Gorton's Bill. I believe a reasonable amount of salvage harvesting should be carried out, and I believe this can be carried out successfully within the confines of current law.

I believe all these bills are based on the premise that the salvaging cannot be done quickly enough to get the burned wood before it becomes useless. But the evidence shows that salvage has been occurring successfully in our forests. The Boise National Forest successfully carried out the historically biggest sale of any type in the Northwest as the Foothills Salvage in 1992. The Forest Service anticipates having all the salvage sales from the fires of 1994 on the auction blocks by late this summer—with environmentally sound analyses in place. I believe all of the bills mentioned above call for forgoing this type of analysis. This does nothing to help our forests. Given that it would be better to have salvage available for harvest by the summer following a burn, why not simply request that the Forest Service speed up the analyses? Even in the present situation, they only need to shave off three or four months to have salvage ready by the summer following a burn. This could be easily done if they were empowered (and given the necessary budget) to form a salvage analysis team as soon as it became apparent that there would be an opportunity for salvage. I believe this change alone would shorten the process by three months.

Some of the bills mentioned above propose increasing the national annual cut from four billion board feet to over five billion board feet. I believe the lower cutting levels are much more reasonable since they are based on an accurate level of a sustained yield. If the cut is allowed to continue at the higher level, at some point in the next decade or two, yield levels will begin to fall, and they will fall below the four billion level. This is the scientific advice given to you by the Forest Service. I urge you to ask yourself, what sustainable level of harvest can our forests support? Then who will you listen to for advice, industry or land managers?

I talked to a logger friend just yesterday. He said, "Why not let the individual states and industry set the cut level . . . Do you think they would cut themselves out of a job? This is our land, not Congress' or some easterner's and we know what is best for it." I told him that I had no doubt that industry would cut themselves out of a job because they are only concerned with short term profits.

A true commitment to community stability would help these mill towns read the writing on the wall. Find other specialties for their community that will increase jobs. The real growth industries in Idaho are information technology and recreation—tourism. People with jobs to offer come to Idaho because of the "quality of life." This includes low crime, a lack of urbanization and a healthy natural environment. We need to make sure that our forest and water environments are maintained and not sold for short term profit.

Let the land managers do the job they were trained to do. The Forest Service will have all the salvage sales on the auction blocks by this summer with environmentally sound analyses in place. Mr. Taylor's bill calls for forgoing this type of analysis, which does nothing to help our forests. And to link any forest health bill to our fallen firefighters mocks their deaths.

Yours truly,

PATRICK WITEN.

Mrs. MURRAY. Let me briefly discuss the salvage aspects of my amend-

ment. Whereas the underlying bill suspends all environmental laws to allow salvage operations, my amendment does not permit the agencies to operate above the law. Instead, it requires them to expedite compliance with those laws.

Second, the underlying bill allows salvage on any Federal lands outside of designated wilderness areas where there is insect- or fire-damaged timber. That allows agencies to build roads in pristine roadless areas and harvest trees along our wild and scenic river corridors. My amendment restricts salvage operations to areas outside of the wilderness, roadless areas, and other congressionally designated areas, like wild and scenic river corridors.

Third, like the underlying bill, my amendment would shorten the timelines allowed for appeals, but allow citizens' the right to challenge bad agency decisions. Where the underlying bill prohibits administrative appeals and does not allow temporary injunctions, my bill allows appeals, but dramatically shortens the timelines and procedural requirements.

This is a reasonable, responsible approach. It ensures salvage operations will go forward. It protects workers and towns from the tangle of yet more lawsuits and insures that appropriate environmental protections are in place.

We do need to work with timber communities; they have been waiting a long time. We also need to protect them from the uncertainties of prolonged litigation. My amendment will do that.

Until very recently, the old growth Douglas fir forests in the Pacific Northwest had been shut down because Judge William Dwyer had ruled the agencies were not following the law.

When President Clinton held his forest conference in Portland 2 years ago, he promised a scientifically credible, economically sustainable, legally defensible plan to resolve the crisis. Option 9 is the result of that pledge. Let's be clear about this: Everybody dislikes option 9. The timber communities felt it was inadequate. The environmental groups felt it allowed too much harvesting.

Whatever people felt about it, option 9 was the first serious attempt to resolve an issue that plagued my region for years. Therefore, I supported it.

Judge Dwyer has recently ruled that option 9 satisfies the requirements of Federal law. Today, timber communities are back in the Federal timber harvest business. Unfortunately, they are not back to the degree that they should be. I am very unhappy that the Forest Service has not produced promised volumes.

I wrote the President last week to request a schedule for timber sales under option 9. He responded with details on both option 9 and the salvage program. I ask unanimous consent these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. BILL CLINTON,
President, *The White House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I know you are as concerned as I about the seeming inability of the Forest Service to produce a reasonable supply of timber for Pacific Northwest timber communities under Option 9. You and the rest of your Administration worked hard to find a solution to the forest crises we were facing. Despite protestations from all sides, you supported a compromise plan to provide both scientifically sound management of our forests and a sustainable supply of timber to our communities.

Now, almost a year after the Record of Decision and 9 months after the lifting of the injunction, fewer than 300 million board feet of timber have been sold in the 17 National Forests managed under Option 9. I'm sure you agree that this is unacceptable.

Legislation has passed the House and will soon be considered by the Senate to suspend all federal environmental laws applicable to the Forest Service in order to enable the agency to sell the volume set forth in Option 9 (and to meet salvage and section 318 sale targets). As a rule, I do not support such "sufficiency" language because I strongly believe agencies should not be above the law. However, I am very frustrated by the Forest Service's inability to deliver on the Option 9 sale targets.

Mr. President, I must have assurances this week that the Forest service will meet its Option 9 target levels by the end of this year. I need to know specific plans, timelines, and changes that the Forest Service intends to take to get this timber out. And I need to know what, if anything, you need from Congress.

I believe Option 9 and existing law can produce a sustainable flow of timber. Unfortunately, my belief has been shaken by the facts.

Finally, I would appreciate knowing your plans for how the Forest Service will conduct its salvage operations and any problems you foresee in this area. Thank you for your continued interest in finding solutions to these thorny forest issues.

Sincerely,

PATTY MURRAY,
Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1995.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PATTY: Thank you for your letter regarding the status of the Northwest Forest Plan. I appreciate your concerns and want to make clear the progress that is being made.

As you know, from the time I took office, I made resolution of the long-standing Northwest forest dispute—which had produced years of conflict and litigation—a high priority for my Administration. The completion of my Northwest Forest Plan in April 1994 and the subsequent ruling by Judge Dwyer upholding the plan in December marks the first time since 1991 that forest management has been pushed out of the courts and back into the communities. That is clearly good news.

I understand that you are concerned about the sales of timber to date, but, as noted, we have only been out of the courts since December. In FY 1995 we will offer for sale approximately 600 million board feet (mmbf). This is consistent with my commitment under the Forest Plan, which was to offer 60 percent of the 1997 target (1.1 billion board feet) in FY 1995. Furthermore, I am assured by the U.S. Forest Service (FS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that we will meet our commitment under the Plan of 800 mmbf in FY 1996, and finally 1.1 billion board feet (bbf) in FY 1997. In addition, the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management will offer 1.664 bbf in salvage sales throughout the country.

The agencies are working hard to expedite the implementation of the Plan. The FS and BLM, for example, are now working with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) early in the process of timber sale preparation. By engaging early on and working simultaneously on project development, sale layout and contract preparations will be significantly expedited.

Let me also note that, in addition to getting timber sales moving, we are engaging state governments and local communities as never before to create new economic opportunities. In FY 94 the federal government invested \$126.6 million in the region combined with \$164.3 million in SBA loan guarantees. For example, the U.S. Forest Service allocated \$6.3 million for over 200 Jobs-in-the-

Woods contracts in the Gifford Pinchot, Okanogan, Olympic, Mount Baker-Snoqualmie, and Wenatchee National Forests. In FY 95, we will offer \$301 million to the region under the Forest Plan in grants and loan guarantees.

Additionally, with regard to salvage sales, we will be reducing the time it takes to prepare a salvage sale by about 30 percent.

Let me be clear that legislation to bypass existing environmental laws and mandate a minimum level of salvage sales may not increase the flow of timber. In fact, the Department of Justice has advised that such mandates could reduce timber, grazing, and mining activities because they could result in new litigation over every land management plan, including the Forest Plan.

I share your desire and commitment to a sustainable flow of timber in Washington. As you know, the gridlock created by the actions of previous administrations will take years to turn fully around. But again, our significant investment in this issue is now beginning to offer hope to communities in Oregon, Washington, and Northern California. I look forward to working with you toward productive solutions for the people of Washington and the entire Pacific Northwest. Enclosed you will find a schedule of timber sales and a summary of agency activity to facilitate the flow of timber in the region.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

TIMBER SCHEDULE ATTACHMENT

FOREST SERVICE AND BLM OR/WA/CA TIMBER SALE PROGRAM FOR FY 1994

Volume Sold	Owl range (mmbf)	Non owl range (mmbf)	Total
Forest Service	233	257	490
BLM	18.5	0	18.5
Total	251.5	257	508.5
Forest Service ¹	851.0	376	1,227
BLM ¹	154.0	0	154
Total ¹	1,005.0	376	1,381

¹ Volume harvested.

FOREST SERVICE OR/WA/CA TIMBER SALE PROGRAM FOR MAR. 1 TO MAY 1, 1995

FY 1995 sale period Mar. 1 to May 1	Owl range			Nonowl range			Region 5 and 6 total
	Green (mmbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	Green (mmbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	
Oregon (Region 6)	2.8	10.7	13.5	13.8	27.0	40.8	54.3
Washington (Region 6)2	0	.2	4.4	6.2	10.6	10.8
California (Region 5)	7.6	6.8	14.4	0	14.4
Categorical totals	10.6	17.5	28.1	18.2	33.2	51.4	79.5

FOREST SERVICE OR/WA/CA TIMBER SALE PROGRAM FOR FY 95

FY 1995 sale period	Owl range			Nonowl range			Region 5 and 6 total
	Green (mmbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	Green (mmbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	
Oregon (Region 6)	138.5	79.8	218.3	54.4	231.6	286	504.3
Washington (Region 6)	57.9	91.6	149.5	20.0	54.0	74	223.5
California (Region 5)	65.4	33.1	98.5	0	98.5
Categorical total	261.8	204.5	466.3	74.4	285.6	360	826.3

BLM OREGON/WASHINGTON TIMBER SALE PROGRAM FOR FY 95

FY 1995 sale period	Western Oregon			E. Oregon and Washington			OR/WA BLM total
	Green (mmbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	Green (MMbf)	Salvage (mmbf)	Total (mmbf)	
October–May 1	12.6	6	18.6	0	OR/4.8–WA/0.6	OR/4.8–WA/0.6	24
Oct.–September 30	104	16	120	0	OR/23.4–WA/0.6	OR/23.4–WA/0.6	144

Additional volume that will be made available in FY 1995

	(mmbf)
1. Marbled Murrelet volume From Unoccupied Units:	
Oregon	20.3
Washington	2.6
California	3.4
Total	26.3
2. Section 318 Rogue River Forest-Judge Marsh Case (Sales will be awarded within 60 days)	13.9
3. Going forward at purchasers' discretion from BLM	70.0
4. Willamette Horse Byers & Red 90 (Volume will be awarded this spring; delayed by Supreme Court Decision)	11.1
5. Siskiyou Forest	12.7
Total Miscellaneous Sales	134.0

SUMMARY OF ONGOING ACTIVITIES

(Prepared by E. Thomas Tuchman, Director, Office of Forestry and Economic Development, March 23, 1995)

INCREASING SHORT-TERM TIMBER SUPPLY

The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Northwest Forest Plan allowed all timber sales that were sold and awarded prior to the effective date of the ROD to go forward at the purchasers' discretion. Those that were sold but not awarded could go forward provided they met the requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). As of January 1, 1995, 96% of the total Section 318 volume offered had been released. The remaining volume is awaiting completion of surveys to comply with the ESA. Agencies are working vigorously to complete the required analyses and move these sales. A portion of the remaining Section 318 sales, 13.9 mmbf from the Rogue River Forest, will be awarded within 60 days. There will be an additional 20.3 mmbf offered by mid-summer pursuant to issuance of a biological opinion by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on unoccupied units for Marble Murrelets. Please note the attached chart which contains a timber sale schedule for FY 95 and includes salvage and green sales, in addition to some outstanding miscellaneous sales that will be offered by September 30, 1995.

IMMEDIATE ATTENTION TO ACTIONS IMPROVING FOREST CONDITIONS

We agree completely that we ought to move aggressively to improve the health of forests in the Northwest; therefore, several months ago we directed the agencies to move expeditiously forward with immediate actions, such as salvage sales. On March 8, the heads of four Federal agencies—Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the U.S. Forest Service (FS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), National Marine Fisheries (NMFS)—signed an agreement detailing new consultation time lines and streamlining processes for forest health projects. Pursuant to this agreement, compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the ESA, and other statutes will be significantly accelerated. In fact, by "reinventing" the consultation process, we will be able to cut the time required to prepare salvage sales by about 30%. These process improvements will accelerate the flow of timber in Oregon, specifically on the "east side."

Additionally, a meeting is scheduled between BLM, FWS, FS, and NMFS biologists and others involved in consultation to work on screens to expedite consultation for salvage sales in the region. Other streamlining actions will also be discussed.

With regard to your suggestion concerning proceeds from commercial thinning, the Forest Service currently has the authority to fund timber stand improvements and other restoration from timber receipts under the Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) Act. It is current practice for the Forest Service to utilize these funds through the K-V Act from thinnings and other timber sales to do timber stand improvements and to conduct riparian restoration where applicable. Another option is to consider the use of stewardship contracts. This is a mechanism we have piloted in other areas where timber sales pay for activities like watershed restoration, recreation improvements, and thinning and salvage sales. This is a tool we are exploring in your region. If you have any questions about it, please have someone contact us.

SIMPLIFY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

This Administration is committed to maximizing our flexibility in implementing the Forest Plan. For example, the U.S. Forest Service and BLM are expediting Plan implementation by, for example, working with the FWS and the NMFS to engage in the appropriate consultations early in the process of timber sale preparation. By engaging early on and working simultaneously on project development, we will expedite sale layout and contract preparation. Further, by involving FWS and NMFS biologists early in project development, we should alleviate problems that would otherwise arise in the final stages.

Also, we are on an accelerated track to complete half of all the necessary watershed analyses under the Forest Plan by the end of 1995. As you know, watershed analysis—utilized to help make informed management decisions—is a new requirement under the Forest Plan. As the watershed analyses are completed and timber sales are awarded over the next year, the timber pipeline will slowing be replenished after having been fully depleted during the three and-a-half year period (1991–June 1994) that timber sales were enjoined. This will allow for an even and steady flow of timber under the Forest Plan for Oregon and the region.

Overall, the agencies are pursuing better regional oversight through a prioritization of consultation actions and quality control of biological assessments submitted to NMFS. Priorities will be coordinated regionally, rather than for each Forest or BLM district. This will allow for smoother implementation under the Forest Plan, as well as facilitate forest salvage actions in the region.

EXPEDITE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT CONSULTATION PROCESS

We too are concerned about the time it has taken in the past to consult on management actions and are working to expedite the process. As a result, land managers are involving the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine & Fisheries Service at the beginning of a project rather than at the end. In addition, they are "batching" projects for consultation in larger groups, wherever possible, rather than consulting on a sale-by-sale basis.

Moreover, Secretary Babbitt has asked FWS to conduct an evaluation of the consultation process with the goal of further streamlining consultation for forest plan and salvage sale activities. Additionally, on March 6, Secretary Babbitt announced a ten point plan for easing ESA restrictions on harvests from private lands. These and other efforts are underway to facilitate responsibility the sale of timber in your region.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the administration needs to fulfill its commitment to the region. If Congress can help, so much the better. But we must be very careful not to go too far.

The Chief of the Forest Service told me last week he is well on his way to providing promised timber sales levels. But he lacks the human resources to do so. My amendment transfers money from road construction programs to need personnel to get these sales out. It does not simply waive the rules.

When Judge Dwyer approved option 9, he did so with conditions. He expects full funding for implementation, and he expects monitoring and assessment for compliance with the standards and guidelines.

Mr. President, I am concerned that if we do not heed his advice, Judge Dwyer will rule option 9 invalid and once again forbid all harvesting in the Northwest. Our communities simply cannot afford that blow.

My amendment provides needed financial resources. Additionally, it says that if the agencies follow the rules set forth in option 9, anyone challenging a timber sale will have to cross a very high legal hurdle to prove that a timber sale is environmentally harmful.

Let me say one final word about option 9. If people have a problem with option 9, they have a problem with the laws: National Environmental Policy Act, and National Forest Management Act. If we are going to revisit the merits of option 9, we should instead take a broad look at the laws governing it. We should not take short cuts in a rescissions bill without the benefit of hearings and public involvement.

SECTION 318

Finally, my amendment directs the Forest Service to find replacement volume for sales old under fiscal year 1990 appropriations bill, dubbed section 318, that are tied up because they may contain the threatened marbled murrelet. The companies who bought these sales years ago deserve what we promised them: timber. My amendment delivers that.

Mr. President, two of the provisions of this bill have only regional effects. The primary provision—salvage of damaged Federal lands—is national in scope and affects the health of forests

throughout this Nation. We must not give the agencies free rein to cut timber without regard to environmental considerations.

My amendment is a moderate, reasonable alternative. It expedites salvage. It expedites option 9. It ensures appropriate levels of environmental protection. And most importantly, it protects communities and workers from burdensome, frustrating litigation. Such litigation is sure to result from the underlying bill.

Mr. President, 10 days ago I went to Gray's Harbor in my home State of Washington, and I talked to people who have lived through the nightmare of Congress and the courts deciding their lives. They are just starting to get back on their feet. Hope is beginning to return. They do not want more empty promises. They do not need congressional interference that may backfire. They do need promises kept, and they do need Congress to act with common sense.

That is what my amendment does, and I urge my friends here in the Senate to support it.

Mr. President, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield time?

Mr. GORTON. Does the Senator from Alaska wish to speak in support of the amendment?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Senator from Alaska would like to speak in support of the Gorton salvage amendment.

Mr. GORTON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, before I do so, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Dave Robertson and Art Gaffrey, congressional fellows attached to Senator HATFIELD's staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Washington.

Mr. President, I rise to again commend the Gorton salvage amendment. I share, as Senator from the State of Alaska, a dilemma facing all of us; that is, a shortage of timber. We have seen our industry shrink by about three-quarters by a combination of the inability of the Forest Service to meet its proposed contractual agreements. As a consequence, the industry has shrunk. As I see the issue before us, we have an opportunity, because of an unfortunate act of God, to bring into the pipeline a supply of timber that otherwise would not be available. Clearly, without the help of the Gorton salvage amendment the Forest Service is absolutely incapable—make no mistake

about it—incapable of addressing this in an expeditious manner.

So those who suggest that we simply proceed under the status quo will find that the timber will be left where the bugs or the fire last left it when we are here next year and the year after. So, do not be misled by those who are of the extreme environmental bent to see this as an opportunity simply to stop the timber process. It is unfortunate that we could not make the decision on what to do with this timber based on sound forest practice management—what is best for the renewability of the resource.

The Gorton salvage amendment is an essential response to an emergency forest health situation in our Federal forests as evidenced by last year's fire season. Our committee, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, has held oversight in the area, has recognized the severity of the problem, and I strongly recommend we do a positive step of forest management practice and support the Gorton amendment as an appropriate emergency response to the problem.

I have listened to the critics of the amendment both on the floor and off the floor. I have come to conclude that they must be discussing some other provision than the one offered by the senior Senator from Washington.

First, they say the Gorton amendment mandates increased salvage timber sales. The Gorton amendment does not mandate timber sales. It provides the administration with the flexibility to salvage sales to the extent feasible. I trust the administration to properly utilize that flexibility. Opponents of the Gorton amendment apparently do not trust this administration. I cannot tell whether they do not want to rehabilitate burned forests or whether they need individual sign off from the Forest Service Chief, Jack Ward Thomas, the Secretary of Agriculture, or maybe even Vice President Gore to trust the administration.

Second, they say that the Gorton amendment suspends all environmental laws. The Gorton amendment expedites existing administrative procedures under the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other measures. If the agency successfully follows the expedited procedure, their performance is deemed adequate to comply with existing environmental and natural resource statutes. These expedited procedures are essential as we must appropriately respond to the forest health emergency, and it is an emergency that we face. If you have an emergency, Mr. President, you respond to it and you expedite a process. That is what the Gorton amendment is all about.

Third, they say the Gorton amendment eliminates judicial review. It simply does not. The amendment provides an expedited form of judicial review that has already been upheld by the Supreme Court in previous litigation.

Fourth, they would say the Forest Service cannot meet the salvage targets. The amendment does not have any targets. I wish it did. Today, the Forest Service is working on its capability statement on the House version of this amendment. There are strong indications that with the expedited procedure the House bill will match in pertinent part the Gorton amendment. The agencies can meet the House targets and still comply with substantive requirements of existing environmental and natural resources.

Fifth, they say the amendment will cost the Treasury. This is simply false. The Gorton amendment has received a positive score from CBO.

Sixth, they say the amendment may disrupt and actually reduce timber sales. Well, if that were true, I would expect them to strongly support the Gorton amendment. But it is not true. The Gorton amendment contains protective language to assure potential environmental litigants cannot disrupt other agencies' functions due to this amendment.

Finally, Mr. President, I have been genuinely perplexed by the misconceptions that accompany the attacks on this amendment, but today perhaps I know why this is the case. Yesterday, Senator GORTON and Congressman CHARLES TAYLOR along with Senator CRAIG, the author of S. 391, which is a measure directed at another aspect of this problem, offered to meet, as I understand, with groups of activists opposed to both the Gorton amendment and S. 391 together. It is my understanding they cleared time on their calendars at 9 a.m., but they found that the activists were evidently more interested in preparing for their 9:30 a.m. press conference than meeting with the authors of the three provisions which they proceeded to lambaste. That sort of interest group behavior I do not think can be tolerated if we are to continue to have informed debates in this body.

So, Mr. President, I rise in support of the Gorton amendment, and against other modifying amendments. I encourage my colleagues to proceed with what this is, an emergency.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as recently as half a dozen years ago, there was a booming, successful forest products industry in rural towns all up and down the north Pacific coast of the United States. In region 6, in Washington, Oregon, and northern California, approximately 5 billion board feet of timber was being harvested. Towns were prosperous and optimistic. Families were happy and united. Schools were full. The contribution that these people made to the economy of the United States is difficult to underestimate. It was easier and less expensive to build homes, to publish newspapers, to engage in all of the activities which

arise out of the forest products industry. And even during that time of maximum harvests every year in the Pacific Northwest more board feet of new timber was growing than was being harvested.

Beginning with the controversy over the spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest—in which incidentally, the recovery goal at the time of its listing has now long since been exceeded by the discovery of additional spotted owls—at the time of the beginning of that controversy, that harvest began to drop precipitately, to the point at which in the last few years the harvest on lands of the United States of America has been close to zero. Communities have been devastated. Families have broken up. Small businesses have failed. Homes purchased by the work of many years have become useless because they cannot be sold.

And we have constantly heard from those whose conscious policies drove the litigation leading to this end that the people in these towns should seek other employment in some other place or be the subject of various kinds of relief activities. So where they provided a net income to the United States from their income taxes, they now are a net drain on the people of the United States for welfare programs which have benefited primarily planners and contractors and advisors and not the people who lost their jobs.

Mr. President, these people, these communities, their contributions to America have been largely ignored by the mainstream media of this country. Their professions have been denigrated. They who live in this country and have a greater investment in seeing to it that it remains booming and prosperous have been accused of utter indifference and attacks on the environment.

Mr. President, that only has not been terribly unjust but it has been destructive of balance and destructive of the economy of our country.

Now, into this controversy some 3 years ago came the then candidate for President of the United States, Bill Clinton, promising in a well-attended meeting in Portland, OR, balance and relief, promising to listen to the people of the Pacific Northwest, to protect the environment but at the same time to restore a significant number of the lost jobs and some degree of hope and prosperity to those communities.

The first part of later President Clinton's promise was kept in 1993 when as President he returned to Portland, OR, and held a timber summit.

Long after the completion of that summit came what is now known as option 9, an option which the President stated met all of the environmental laws in the United States which he was unwilling to change in any respect but also promised something more than 1 billion board feet of harvest of timber to the people of the Northwest—1 billion as against 5, or 20 percent of the historic level.

I did not then and I do not now believe that that constitutes balance or that it was at all necessary to protect the environment. But it was a promise, Mr. President, of some form of relief.

Since then, the President has had that option validated by a U.S. district court judge who has taken charge of this area in Seattle. But do our people have 1.1 billion board feet of harvest? No, Mr. President, they do not. In spite of the time at which that promise was made, they are nowhere close to that because the Forest Service in its personnel cuts has cut mostly the people who work in the woods preparing these sales and because the Clinton administration knows that almost no single action taken pursuant to this option will escape an appeal within the Forest Service and a lawsuit being stretched out forever and ever.

That is one element, Mr. President.

The second is that last summer, regrettably, was a time of major forest fires in almost every corner of the United States—loss of life in Colorado, huge fires in Idaho and Utah, large fires in my own State of Washington. Those fires have left billions of board feet of timber that is now dead, absolutely dead, but for a relatively short period of time harvestable. If it is not harvested, Mr. President, it will become worthless very quickly by rotting away and at the same time will be tinder for future forest fires.

And yet the opponents to harvest say that's nature's way. Forest fires start; let them burn. Very few of them live in communities near where these fires have taken place, whose summers have been ruined by them, may I say, incidentally.

And so in this bill, as in the bill produced by the House, we attempt to enable the President of the United States to keep his own promises; nothing more than that, Mr. President.

It is true that the provisions in the House bill set a mandated harvest level roughly double what the administration deems to be appropriate. The proposal attacked by my colleague from the State of Washington, however, has no such requirement in it. It simply says that, after all of these years, all of these promises, all of this devastation, that we will liberate the administration to do what it wants to do.

And yet, this is attacked as if, somehow or another, this administration had no concern for the environment whatsoever; that Secretary Babbitt was simply out to cut down the forests of the Bureau of Land Management; that President Clinton's Forest Service wanted to do nothing else but that, and to ignore environmental laws from one end of this country to another. It is astounding, Mr. President, that the administration itself does not wish help in keeping its own commitments.

Now, both the amendment which is a part of this bill and the substitute amendment by the junior Senator from Washington cover three distinct, separate but related subjects.

One on salvage timber is nationwide in scope. The administration proposes in this fiscal year to sell something over 1.5 billion board feet of salvaged timber, dead or dying timber. In region 6, which is the Pacific Northwest, the figure is about one-fifth of that total. Four-fifths of it are from other regions of the country and they include every Forest Service region in the United States.

My proposal, the proposal in the bill, does not require the administration to double that offering. In fact, it has no number in it at all. But it says that the administration, having carefully considered every environmental law, is enabled to do what it tells us that it wants to do.

Does this suspend the environmental laws? No, Mr. President. This administration has certainly tried its best to abide by all of them and all of them remain on the books, those I agree with and those I disagree with.

And I cannot imagine that Members of this body will accuse the administration of wanting to ignore those statutes. It simply says that the administration's own decisions will not further be attacked in court by the often inconsistent provisions of six or seven or eight different statutes passed at different times with different goals.

The amendment that is sought to be substituted for that which is in the bill does not reduce litigation in the slightest, Mr. President. It calls for certain expedited procedures, but it still allows every timber sale to be appealed within the Forest Service or the BLM, and every one to go to court. And they all will go to court, Mr. President, because those who will attack them, those who want nothing to be done, will recognize that all they have to do is to delay it for another season and there will not be anything to sell, because it will be worthless. So that portion of the substitute amendment is simply an invitation to have no salvage at all.

The second and third elements in both amendments have to do with option 9 and with so-called section 318 sales. Section 318 was a part of the Appropriations Act in 1990, designed to provide some interim help for the forest in the two Northwest States. But many of the sales directed by this Congress pursuant to that law have been held up by subsequent environmental actions.

The proposal that the committee has made simply says that those sales would go ahead unless they involved places in which endangered species are actually found, in which case, substitute lands will take their place.

Our option 9 provision, I repeat, Mr. President, simply says that the President can keep the promises he made some time ago, almost 2 years ago, under option 9 and not be subject to constant harassing lawsuits. That is all that it says. It does not require him to get to the 1.1 billion board feet of harvest that he promised, and he will not.

It does say that he can do what he wishes to do.

Now, the substitute amendment, in each case, for all practical purposes, makes dealing with this issue at the level of Congress pointless. All of the lawsuits will still be able to be brought, but perhaps we will actually find ourselves in a damaging situation.

The Presiding Officer is from the State of New Hampshire. I presume that some small portion of this salvage timber is in his State. But if this substitute amendment passes, all of the personnel of the Forest Service from the rest of the United States will have to go to Washington and Oregon in order to meet the requirements of the substitute amendment, at the cost of every other region in the United States.

Now I would like to have that kind of service in my State, but I do not believe it to be fair. I do not think we can say that we are the only ones who under any circumstances should get anything out of one of these amendments.

The definition of what salvage timber is in the bill is the Forest Service's own definition. The definition in the substitute amendment is a different definition, one highly susceptible to further litigation.

The exceptions provided by the amendment of the Senator from Montana keeps this kind of salvage logging out of wilderness areas and certain other well-defined areas. The proposal by the junior Senator from Washington keeps them out of any area that is under consideration for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system.

Mr. President, under that proposal, one bill by one Member of the House of Representatives introduced to put the entire National Forest System included in a wilderness preservation system would stop any harvest anywhere. It would be under consideration by Congress. What it does, in effect, is to give any of the 535 Members of Congress a veto power over the entire proposal.

Mr. President, the issue in this case is clear. Do we care at all about people, not just in the Pacific Northwest but all across the United States, who live in timber communities? Do we care about our supply of lumber and of paper products? Or do we only care about the well-being of certain environmental organizations and their lawyers?

That is what we are debating with respect to this amendment. Do we want the President of the United States to be able to keep his commitments, his promises, however inadequate they are? Or do we have so little trust in him that we believe that he will ignore every environmental law and decide suddenly to cut down our national forests?

Mr. President, that is not going to happen. The lawsuits will, under this proposed substitute amendment, pro-

vide relief for people who need relief. Income for the Treasury of the United States will only come from rejecting the substitute amendment and accepting the bill in its present form.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me 5 minutes?

Mrs. MURRAY. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

Mr. President, this timber salvage language in H.R. 1158—so people understand the history, this represents the 12th time since 1984 this body would vote to exempt timber sales from environmental laws; 12 times since 1984.

Frankly, I find that disturbing. It means that the American people are going to be asked to believe that when it comes to cutting national forests, somehow environmental laws do not apply. These exemptions, which should have been, if at all, in emergency situation, instead are becoming routine and standard practice. It is not a short-term solution. I have to wonder how long this will go on. To me the exemption from environmental law is an extreme position. The majority of the American would not accept, nor should they. The distinguished Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, and I streamlined the process in 1992. We are speaking of public lands, and in public lands, every American has a right to express his or her public interest. H.R. 1158 takes away the opportunity to participate in public land management. I do not see how the U.S. Senate can accept a provision that strips people of this right and takes the right out of the people's hands and puts it solely into the hands of bureaucrats. This would not create any more open government. In fact, this seals the same government agents off from public interest.

I respect the concerns of my fellow colleagues from other timber States. Even though I am a tree farmer, that is not my sole source of livelihood. I have talked with people in that area. It makes sense to address the problem, but with a sensible, responsible, moderate solution that respects the true interests of the American people and, in the long term, the apolitical needs of the forest resource.

I believe Senator MURRAY has proposed a fair solution. In fact, she inherited this divisive timber issue when she was elected. She promised the people of Washington a responsible solution. I have discussed this with her since she has come here. I believe that since her election, she has helped put the timber industry on a reliable path that the timber industries can bank on.

In fact, with the work she has done, there has been an increase of 400 jobs, not a decrease in the lumber, paper, and allied wood products industry in the State of Washington since her election. She has an alternative that moves toward long-term sustainability, not a quick fix. Above everything else,

what Senator MURRAY has done is what timber-dependent communities want, especially the younger generations—long-term sustainability. People go into this for the long term, not with the idea that every 10 months, or year, or 14 months we are going to suddenly change the rules of the game.

So I urge my colleagues to support Senator MURRAY and abandon the extreme approaches that failed us in the past and removed any kind of public input from the process. Look at her long-term solution and adopt her amendment.

I am going to yield my time back to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington controls the time.

Mrs. MURRAY. I assume the Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, will yield time to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORTON. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by Senator MURRAY of Washington. This amendment severely weakens what this provision is intended to do—respond to our forest health emergency, restore our forests to health, and create jobs. This substitute amendment is only a clever way to do nothing.

The committee-passed provision is responsive to not only forest health, but to the people who support their families in the wood products industry. But this amendment is no more than status quo. And Montanans do not want status quo.

This substitute amendment does not streamline the process, limit the frivolous appeals, or allow for salvage sales to be expedited. Instead this amendment forces agencies to consult with other agencies, and does nothing to cut through the environmental red tape and still allows for endless delays.

It replaces the Forest Service definition of "salvage timber sale," which is included in the committee's bill, with a new definition. This definition doesn't take into account overcrowded forests which need to be thinned, and it forces the land managers to always consult with biologists.

This amendment also eliminates the legal sufficiency language which is needed in the preparation of sale documents. If we are truly serious about salvaging timber, we need to have sufficiency language included, and we need to retain streamlined timeframes to assure that the environmental procedure process is not abused.

Currently, delays in Federal land management arise primarily from two sources—multiple analysis requirements and administrative appeals and judicial review. Without this sufficiency language, we will continue to have lengthy delays which will substantially lead to the more dead and dying timber in our forests.

Congress needs to act on the salvage issue. We have the authority to establish the law, rather than leaving it to the judicial branch to declare what the law is. Yet, this amendment moves this authority toward the courts.

This amendment is worse than the status quo. It requires the agencies to jump through more holes than it already has to, and it makes some land currently available for harvest off limits. It wouldn't result in any more timber salvaging activities. And most importantly, it will stop the creation of jobs in Montana. I strongly oppose this amendment. The wood products industry comprises almost half of western Montana's economy, and this amendment is not responsive to those folks who make their living in this sector of our economy.

I just want to make one simple little evaluation here about this conversation. We have had the status quo long enough. I know what the status quo is. We do not salvage any, or we do not log any of our salvage lumber. It is finite. If it goes another year, it is not worth anything. That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about areas that have been burned and areas that are infested with disease. The lumber is finite.

Everybody can stand around and grin while people are not working and we are not taking care of the forests like they should be managed. They think they are doing a great thing for America, when they are not doing anything for America and are doing worse for the people who depend on public lands for their living. You are making your check; they are not. You think about that whenever you place this vote today.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana, Senator BAUCUS.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how best to deal with the salvage timber issue is a matter of judgment. We in the Pacific Northwest have seen a lot of dead timber, caused both by forest fires and by disease. And we are frustrated by the Forest Service's inability to get some of this timber cut. We know it can be done responsibly, with minimal impacts to the environment, yet it just isn't happening as quickly as it should.

The real question is: What is the best way to go about dealing with this problem?

We have many competing values that must be accounted for when we manage our national forest land. One value is timber. But there are many other values that must be considered: wildlife; maintaining the quality of our lakes and streams; and recreation.

I remember not too long ago reading a statement by H.L. Mencken, a former Baltimore Sun journalist. He said, "For every complicated problem, there is a simple solution—and it is usually wrong." And he is right. In many cases, where we face a complicated problem and somebody comes up with a simple

solution, it tends to be wrong, too simplistic. It often tends to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

I am very respectful of the underlying concept that we are considering here. Mr. Gorton's language attempts to address some of the frustration we have in the Pacific Northwest about the Forest Service's inability to harvest salvage timber in a timely manner.

I think if you look closely at the Gorton language in this bill, which is tailored after the so-called Taylor amendment in the House, you will see that it goes too far. It rides roughshod over the statutes that this country demands be in place to protect water, wildlife, and to maintain the very integrity of our national forests.

For example, the Gorton language says that "if any potential salvage sale is in the works by the Forest Service"—not up for bid but going through the hoops—"it is OK." We will ignore environmental statutes in the interest of saving a few weeks or months. We will ignore the public's right to make sure that their lands are being cared for in a responsible manner.

I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. On the other hand, the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, is also attempting to address this problem. She has a different approach—an approach that balances competing uses and respects the need to adhere to environmental laws. And the Murray amendment does not ignore the underlying public interest in speeding up the timber sale process. It carries a firm mandate to the Forest Service that salvage sales are a national priority. It eliminates many of the existing procedural hoops without sacrificing environmental protection. It shortens the administrative review process by almost half, without sacrificing the rights of the public to have their voices heard. Plain and simple, the Murray amendment directs the Forest Service to move much more expeditiously. To get on with it.

We love our forests. It is a cornerstone to the way we live in Montana. And logging is critical for Montana. Salvage sales are critical. But so are outfitters. Like the timber industry, our guides and outfitters stake their livelihoods on the national forests. Folks come from around the world to hunt and fish in Montana. The outfitting industry is economically critical to our State, and it should be given equal respect when management decisions are made in our national forests.

Unfortunately, the Gorton language is unbalanced. It goes way too far, and does not consider other stakeholders in the national forest. The Murray amendment is balanced. It recognizes that there are competing values at stake. It recognizes that we can speed up salvage sales and create timber jobs without jeopardizing those jobs that depend on our forests having clean rivers and lakes, and abundant wildlife.

I urge Members to support the Murray amendment. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield such time as may be consumed to the Senator from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

This is a very complex issue, and I understand both sides of it. I come down on the side of the junior Senator from Washington, because I think it is the correct side for the Nation.

I think to go with the language of Senator GORTON sets a very dangerous precedent. Nobody argues with harvesting infested, burnt, salvaged timber. I am for that. Every Member of this Senate is. The language of the Gorton amendment says that the Forest Service will harvest the maximum extent practical.

Then it goes ahead to say we are going to suspend all environmental laws including the Endangered Species Act. This is called sufficiency language saying, cut all you can possibly cut that is practicable, and do not worry about the environmental laws or any other law. And do that in 1995 and 1996.

It is a dangerous precedent. If we go with that, we do not know where we are headed. The pressures from the industry on the Forest Service will be intense. That is the reason the fishermen in the Northwest are very upset and concerned about this. They are concerned that excessive logging will hurt the habitat of the salmon which is disappearing at an alarming rate.

I know the Senator from Oregon wants to provide jobs in those mills, and I want to help him but not by suspending all environmental laws. I have a letter from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association, and they adamantly oppose sufficiency language. I would like to read an excerpt from their letter.

We oppose the current Congressional effort to approve "sufficiency language" or to mandate minimum timber harvest levels in the Northwest. However well meaning, these are nevertheless bad ideas. Sufficiency language would simply override all current protections for salmon and other aquatic species. Mandatory timber harvest levels would essentially do the same. . . . The result would only be additional degradation of already severely damaged salmon spawning habitat.

That ought to weigh heavily with somebody. It does with me. This is the biggest fishing organization in the West.

Mr. President, finally, there is language in this bill, as I read it, that allows the Forest Service to reemploy people who have received a \$25,000 buyout.

Mr. President, 3,000 Forest Service employees, approximately, have taken their \$25,000 under the Reinventing Government proposal and retired.

Now, here is an incomplete sentence, but if I could have the attention of the Senator from Oregon for a moment, here is what the provision in the bill says—the provisions of section 3D1 of

the Federal Work Force Restructuring Act of 1994: "Separation incentive payment authorized by such Act and accepts employment pursuant to this paragraph"—now that is an incomplete sentence. I do not have a clue as to what this means. My impression of it is that the Forest Service can take these people who have just taken their \$25,000 and retired and put them back to work in order to comply with this maximum extent practicable.

Does the Senator from Washington agree with that?

Mr. GORTON. No.

Mr. HATFIELD. No, I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. BUMPERS. What does this sentence mean?

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me just go back and put this in the context, if I could.

First of all, every timber sale preparation made by Jack Ward Thomas or Secretary Babbitt are required to prepare those timber sales with existing law in which the regulations on fish are there in place.

Those timber sales have to be prepared within that conformity. The so-called sufficiency language takes place after the fact in order to deliver the timber sale that has been prepared under those restrictions.

The Senator is absolutely wrong on this.

Mr. BUMPERS. Here is what the first sentence of the paragraph says:

Sale preparation. The Secretary concerned shall make use of all available authority, including the employment of private contractors and the use of expedited fire contracting procedures, to prepare and advertise salvage timber sales under this section.

Following that, page 71 of the bill, Senator, following that is the incomplete sentence. If that is not right, I still do not quite understand what it means, because it alludes to the \$25,000 buyout.

Mr. HATFIELD. If the Senator will yield for just a moment, let us go back and take the precedent of section 318. Because the same arguments, the same invalid arguments are being used today that were used then.

Let me quote. We went through that whole process underlying laws of NEPA, the National Forest Management Practice Act, and then we declared sufficiency. The Supreme Court ruled.

Mr. BUMPERS. Can the Senator continue this on his time?

Mr. GORTON. I can answer the specific question. The version has been corrected. The sentence is complete in the bill that is before us, and it simply says that someone who has been brought out of the Forest Service and paid, say \$25,000, can be hired back temporarily for this purpose without losing the \$25,000.

Mr. BUMPERS. But only temporarily?

Mr. GORTON. Yes.

Mr. BUMPERS. That is the Senator's understanding?

Mr. GORTON. Yes.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask I be permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes without the time being charged on the 1-hour allocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I will not object if I can add 2 more minutes to the time of Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. BUMPERS. Fine. We just took up some time here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I like to think I do not have two better friends than the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Washington. They have helped me over the years on many issues of concern to my State. However, I cannot support them on this issue.

I will remind my colleagues that the Senator from Idaho, who is on the floor right now, has introduced a forest health bill that was the subject of a hearing by the Energy and Natural Resource Committee. In fact the bill will probably be marked up in the next few weeks. We should let the authorizing committee do its job. I can assure you that I will do everything I can to make sure that a responsible bill emerges from that committee. I am not going to support something with sufficiency language in it.

If a responsible forest health bill emerges from the Committee, I hope it will automatically supersede the Gorton amendment. What is the Senator from Washington's understanding of this matter?

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to answer the question but I do not wish to use my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Arkansas yielding to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BUMPERS. I do not want to yield on my time.

Mr. President, I will close by saying one of the things I think the country is concerned about, about what is going on right now—they wanted change. They wanted regulatory reform. But they do not want to throw the baby out with the bath water.

I have seen that old expression: If you think education is expensive, try ignorance. If you think the environmental laws of this country are too tough—and sometimes they can be very frustrating, try living without them and see the kind of damage that will be inflicted on our environment. The Gorton amendment goes too far. I simply cannot support it and urge my colleagues to support the amendment by Senator MURRAY.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Washington controls the time.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 4 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I stand today in support of the Gorton amendment as now amended; certainly in opposition to the amendment of my colleague, the junior Senator from the State of Washington.

A good many things have been said this afternoon about what these amendments do and do not do. What I really think is important for all of us to understand is the state of the U.S. Forest Service and why we are engaged in a debate this afternoon in attempting to bring about emergency measures to deal with a very sick problem.

I use the word sick because the forests of the inland West are sick. They are the product of 8 years of drought and decades of mismanagement that have resulted in one of the largest fuel buildups, acre by acre, ever in the history of the U.S. Forest Service.

When fuel becomes dry and conditions are right, and Mother Nature comes along with thousands of lightning strikes, what happens is what happened in Idaho last summer and what happened in Colorado and Montana and eastern Washington and eastern Oregon and parts of northern California. Millions and millions of acres burn, wildlife is destroyed—in the instance of the infernos of last summer, 35 human beings lost their lives in an effort to stop these. This was not something that just happened. This was not just an ordinary circumstance. There are many who would like to argue this is Mother Nature at her finest.

Let me suggest it was Mother Nature at her worst. But it was also Mother Nature who had been assisted for decades by the mismanagement of a Forest Service, by allowing the buildup of a phenomenal fuel structure, of timber across these lands that had not been properly managed or thinned or allowed to be like they were before man came along with the tremendous ability to put out fire.

In my State of Idaho before my ancestors came along there were approximately 25 to 30 trees per acre. Today there are hundreds of trees per acre. And as a result of that, there are a million less acres of them and a couple of billion less board feet of them, because they went up in an inferno last summer. So what we are trying to tell Senators here this afternoon is that we have a very sick patient. That patient is called the U.S. public forests of this country, especially in the inland West.

For those who counsel comity, and for those who counsel slowness and process and procedure and time and let us work this out, let me suggest when you have somebody in the emergency room and the life support systems are attached and the heartbeat is very faint, you do not counsel long-term

strategy. You counsel short-term, immediate, emergency relief to resolve some of the problem while you then look at the long term down the road to see if you cannot make it better.

The Senator from Arkansas just a few moments ago spoke to the forest health bill I introduced a couple of weeks ago in the forestry subcommittee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. That is the long-term approach. That is what we ought to be doing, by allowing the Forest Service to manage critical situations, be it fires or bug kill or a natural environment that has created this tremendous problem that exists in the West.

But in the short term, with billions of board feet of timber at stake and watersheds and wildlife habitat and trying to avoid a cataclysmic situation of massive runoffs in the next couple of years that could result in the loss of fisheries, in the loss of water quality and stream quality, we need emergency measures now that protect the environment.

What is the offshoot? Well, the offshoot is some timber and some thousands of jobs and a few hundreds of millions of dollars that might come to the Treasury of this country. That is not the first goal. That is the latter goal. That is the fallout. That is the receipt from what we are trying to do here this afternoon.

Here is what we faced in Idaho and across the West last summer. This is not normal. This is one of the hottest fires ever recorded in the history of our environment. It destroyed the soil structure. It created an unnatural problem.

Today we are taking one small step back toward a process and procedure that allows Mother Nature, cooperating with human beings, to make a better environment and in the long term solve a problem that now perplexes the intermountain West and creates a cataclysmic environment that could go on for a long time.

Let us deal with the emergency problem now as this bill does. Let us deal with the long term, with quantitative and qualitative changes of the public law that allow the proper management of the U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. President, a strong 2-year salvage amendment is absolutely necessary to work hand-in-hand with your longer-term forest health bill, S. 391.

Salvage and restoration of the 4 million acres of 1994 fire-burned areas must be started immediately. Without this salvage language, it will not happen. Those in opposition will employ every effort to delay, confuse and derail the agencies' attempts to conduct responsible salvage activities.

Last year's fires burned 4 billion board-feet of timber. If done quickly, much of this timber can be salvaged at considerable return to the Federal Treasury. But, the value of standing, burned trees deteriorates rapidly.

Let me use this display to illustrate the rapid loss of value of trees burned in wildfire:

PONDEROSA PINE VALUE		
	6 months after fire	2½ years after fire
\$725/MBF lumber		\$0
\$70/ton chips		\$0

Six months have now passed since the 1994 fires in Idaho. It is estimated that 2 billion board feet of timber burned in those fires. Since there are mixed species involved, let us estimate that the value of that timber today is \$200 per thousand board feet on average. That means it is worth \$400 million to the taxpayers today, maybe \$200 million 1 year from now, and practically nothing a year beyond that. And let's not forget that 25 percent of this revenue will be returned to local counties. In my State of Idaho, Shoshone County officials have watched their budget drop sharply as a result of the lack of national forest timber sales. They are desperate for some solutions to this situation. They are among the many who have pointed out the absurd situation of no timber sales being offered while dead forests abound.

Let me make another point. The forest fires we are witnessing are not normal and they are not beneficial to the environment. They destroy fish and wildlife habitat and can result in hydrophobic soils. Hydrophobic soils will not percolate water and will cause rainwater to run off the surface in torrents.

We can no longer accept the cost of fighting these first. Cost to Federal agencies alone was \$1 billion last year. It makes sense to promote revenues to Federal, State, and county coffers through timely salvage rather than bear the increasing burden of wildfire suppression costs.

I am sorry to report that yesterday was a sad day for the community of smokejumpers around this Nation. Instead of meeting with me as I requested, a group of five smokejumpers rushed to meet with press to impugn the integrity of those of us who support some measure of salvage logging. Their statements about salvage logging are filled with inaccuracies. Until now, smokejumpers have enjoyed a good deal of reverence and support in the Congress. Now, the reputation of all smokejumpers has been called into question by the conduct of these five from within their ranks.

Under the tutelage of preservation discontents, these jumpers have become self-pronounced forest policy experts. Their tactic was, first, make a splash in the press, and then meet with their elected representatives to discuss the facts. It seems they are attempting to characterize me as using the deaths of 35 firefighters in 1994 fires as a means to promote salvage logging. I am incensed at this insinuation. Such personal attacks have no place in the debate over this issue. These

smokejumpers have disgraced themselves.

However, this incident illustrates perfectly why this salvage amendment is so necessary. As the process stands now, activists of every stripe find it easy to be obstructionists using appeals, threats, intimidations and false accusations in the media to slow down or stop the agencies' salvage efforts. It is past time for Congress to step in and clear a procedural path which the agencies can use to make responsible salvage decisions and carry them out. That is what this salvage provision will do, and that's why it must remain in this rescission legislation.

I compliment Senator GORTON and Senator HATFIELD for providing leadership on this issue. And the Senator from Montana for his amendment.

I ask unanimous consent letters to me on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTLATCH CORP.,

Lewiston, ID, March 28, 1995.

Senator LARRY CRAIG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: I am writing to ask for your continuing strong support for the Emergency Timber Salvage Amendment to the Omnibus Recissions Bill.

As you know, more than 600,000 acres of Idaho National Forests burned last summer. The fires resulted from years of drought combined with years of mismanagement allowing overstocked, diseased and dying timber stands to go untreated until finally fire reset the ecological clock.

Nationwide, the federal government spent over \$900 million fighting forest fires on 4 million acres with lives lost, private property destroyed and fragile wildlife and plant species put at risk.

This bill is a common-sense approach for quickly salvaging burned timber which will be converted to useful products for American families supporting rural economies in the process.

Opponents claim that all environmental laws are being by-passed. This is simply not true. The Amendment streamlines some of the time-consuming requirements of those laws in order to ensure timely action. But environmental assessments and biological reviews still must be done, and the Secretary of Agriculture still can veto any proposed sale.

You and I know this is an emergency and that salvage efforts must begin immediately to minimize values lost from rapidly deteriorating burned timber. The environmental safeguards are sufficient and the costs of delay are too great.

I hope you agree and will support the Salvage Amendment. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the Amendment or its impacts.

Sincerely,

KEVIN C. BOLING,
Director Public Affairs,
Northwest Region.

CROWN PACIFIC INLAND,
March 27, 1995.

Senator LARRY CRAIG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: I am writing to ask your support for the Emergency Timber Salvage Amendment to the Omnibus Recissions Bill.

Last summer, more than four million acres of forests burned, largely because of buildups of dead and dying timber. Over \$1 billion was spent to control those fires, and several lives were lost in the process.

The amendment would allow the Forest Service to recover some of the fire-damaged trees, and dying timber elsewhere, through emergency salvage sales. No new money is needed to do this; it's already contained in the agency's salvage trust fund.

As a bonus, the amendment would return millions of dollars to the Treasury, provide jobs for forest service workers, and give federal foresters the ability to convert dead, dying and burned forests into healthy young forests in order to stabilize soils, protect streams, reduce the risk of catastrophic fire, and develop habitat for wildlife.

Opponents claim that all environmental laws are being by-passed. This is simply not true. The amendment cases some of the time-consuming requirements of those laws in order to ensure timely action. But environmental assessments and biological reviews still must be done, and the Secretary of Agriculture still can veto any proposed sale.

Remember we are dealing with an emergency. Salvage work has to begin immediately to gain value from already-burned timber and to remove dead and dying timber before it is consumed in this year's firestorms. I believe environmental safeguards are sufficient, and the costs of delay are too great.

I hope you agree and will support the salvage amendment. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the amendment or its impacts.

Sincerely,

LARRY ISENBERG,
Manager Timber & Lands.

LEWISTON, ID.

Senator LARRY E. CRAIG,

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: I just received a notice that said that efforts were being made to weaken the language on fire killed timber salvage. As you already know, we here in Idaho have been plagued by punishing droughts for the last several years. Most likely this drought condition has been the major cause of the fires we had last year. We need to salvage and use all the timber we can. Punishing us further does not make any sense.

The salvage levels and accountability need to be the same as the recently approved House version (Taylor-Dicks Amendment).

Very truly yours,

SUE KNOLL.

BOISE CASCADE,
TIMBER AND WOOD PRODUCTS DIVISION,
Emmett, ID, March 27, 1995.

Hon. LARRY CRAIG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: This letter is to thank you for your continued support of the Emergency Timber Salvage Amendment to the Omnibus Rescissions Bill.

Salvage made available under this amendment will help maintain jobs in the local communities where we operate, while providing funds for reforestation and payments to counties.

Your efforts on this issue are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

DAVE VAN DE GRAAFF,
Region Timberlands Manager.

SCHWEITZER MOUNTAIN RESORT,
Sandpoint, ID.

Date: March 29, 1995.
Fax No: 202-226-2573.
Facsimile To: Sen. Larry Craig.

Company/Branch: U.S. SENATE.

Facsimile From: Barbara Huguenin.

Message: The Salvage levels and accountability need to be the same as the recently approved House version (Taylor-Dicks amendment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 2 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEAHY be added as an original cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent a letter submitted to the Members of Congress from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION
OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS,

March 13, 1995.

Re fishing industry groups oppose "sufficient language" and mandated timber harvests.

Members of Congress,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA) is the largest organization of commercial fishermen on the west coast, with member organizations from San Diego to Alaska. We represent working men and women of the Pacific fishing fleet who generate tens of thousands of jobs and are the economic mainstay of many coastal communities throughout the Pacific coast region. We are joined in this letter by the Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association (NSIA), which represents the many sportfishing businesses in the Northwest. There are more than 5,000 such businesses in this region, with several thousand more in Alaska. Between our two organizations we represent several billion dollars annually in economic productivity, and more than 100,000 jobs along the Pacific coast as well as far inland.

We oppose the current Congressional effort to approve "sufficiency language" or to mandate minimum timber harvest levels in the Northwest. However well meaning, these are nevertheless bad ideas. Sufficiency language would simply override all current protections for salmon and other aquatic species. Mandatory timber harvest levels would essentially do the same, since many levels could not be reached without severe damage to other resources. The result would only be additional degradation of already severely damaged salmon spawning habitat, more economic dislocation within fishing communities, and more lost jobs in our industry. Salmon throughout the region have already been severely depressed because of past timber harvests done without regard to their environmental consequences. This region cannot afford to go down that road once again.

We also are a natural resource dependent industry. We are sympathetic to the plight of timber communities, and are not opposed to harvesting timber through the existing Forest Plan or in ways that are legal under current law. However, it makes no economic sense to harvest timber on the backs of fishermen and at the expense of the jobs and coastal communities which salmon support. This would be a form of economic suicide for the region.

Federal management agencies already have an aggressive fire salvage program, and all the legal authority they need to imple-

ment it. However, they should not be forced by law to move faster than they can complete the necessary environmental assessments and watershed analyses so they can take the proper steps to protect fragile salmon and other aquatic resources. The solution is not "sufficiency language," nor is it mandated levels. The real solution would be to accelerate funding to the USFS and BLM to enable them to more quickly complete the necessary watershed analyses for their own planned salvage and harvest programs.

Sufficiency language and mandated harvest levels are simply bad ideas. If enacted, they would further deplete salmon and other aquatic resources which it is vitally important to protect. They would also further devastate fishing economies throughout the region. They would throw our industry further into economic chaos. They would make it just that much tougher, and just that much more expensive, to restore the Northwest's valuable salmon runs back to full productivity.

We urge you to oppose every attempt to impose "sufficiency language" to override current environmental protections as well as the setting of mandatory harvest or salvage levels on our nation's forests—whether by appropriations rider, amendment or separate legislation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ZEKE GRADER,

Executive Director,

Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

LIZ HAMILTON,

Executive Director,

Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association (NSIA).

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the remaining time to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I am very disturbed by the content of the amendment of the senior Senator of the State of Washington. The language of this amendment would allow the suspension of all environmental laws applicable to logging on certain forests managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM—all environmental laws.

This language would cover any timber offered through September 1996, in a salvage sale, a term that is so broadly defined as to apply virtually to any kind of timber sale.

The language of the bill says:

A salvage timber sale means a timber sale for which an important reason for entry includes removal of diseased, damaged trees or trees affected by fire and imminently susceptible to fire or insect attack.

Mr. President, as I read this amendment, that language means to limit salvage timber sales to areas where the trees are still made of wood; all wood would be susceptible to insect or fire. Therefore, all would be included in this amendment, and environmental laws for the logging of such timber would be not relevant.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we will support the amendment of the Senator from Washington. I think she has taken a politically difficult and dangerous course, and has done so on the stand of principle and in a way that does not savage the environmental law. I salute her for doing this.

Sometimes in haste, in an effort to respond to what is a crisis, we make big mistakes. This should not even be

on an appropriations bill. It should be in the authorizing committee. It is not. It is the wrong piece of legislation on the wrong bill at the wrong time, and it should be rejected because it sets an incredibly dangerous precedent.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in my State, and throughout most of our Federal forest nationwide, we are experiencing a forest health crisis of epic proportions. In 1994, 80 years of fire suppression and almost a decade of drought conditions culminated in one of the worst national fire seasons on record. Thirty-three fire fighters lost their lives and \$900 million was spent fighting these fires. Fourteen of the fire fighters who died were from Prineville, OR, a small town in my home State. Congress must act swiftly to address this situation or face a 1995 fire season as bad or worse than 1994.

Congress has known about the forest health and fire danger problem for a long time. In July 1992, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on forest health. At this hearing, Jack Ward Thomas, then a researcher and now Chief of the Forest Service, stated "we should proceed with salvage as soon as possible, and as carefully as possible." In fact, at that 1992 hearing, the Forest Service identified 850 million board feet of timber in eastern Oregon and Washington alone that needed to be salvaged in 1992 and 1993. Only half of that volume, however, has been actually salvaged.

The forest health crisis exists nationwide, but in my State it is particularly acute. Of the 5 million acres of Oregon's Blue Mountains, 50 to 75 percent contains predominantly dead or dying trees. According to the Forest Service, the land management practices of the past 80 or 100 years are the primary reasons for the poor health of Oregon's, and the Nation's, forests. Fire suppression, the single largest contributing factor, has prevented naturally occurring, low-intensity fires to clear out the understory of forest stands. This has allowed less-resilient, shade tolerant tree species such as white fir, and Douglas fir, to flourish. These trees have been prime targets for disease, insect infestation, and now wildfire.

It is time to begin the healing process in our forests that Jack Ward Thomas felt was so important 3 years ago. Congress can live up to its responsibility to provide direction to the land management agencies by passing the Gorton salvage amendment.

As many of my colleagues know, salvage logging is not without controversy. Although it is part of regular Forest Service practice, some seek now to block the salvage of diseased and bug infested timber as a land management option. To put their position in perspective, these same voices have publicly stated that their preferred goal is to eliminate the harvesting of any and all trees from Federal lands—even for the enhancement of forest health. This dogma is so stringent that the catastrophic loss of our natural re-

sources through disease, insect infestation and fire is preferable to having the health of these forests restored for future generations.

The radical doctrine of no use, which certain groups are now advocating, not only threatens the future health of our forests, it threatens the underlying base of political support for one of our Nation's most important environmental laws—the Endangered Species Act.

I was the original sponsor of the 1972 version of the bill which eventually went on to become the Endangered Species Act. I believe the act epitomizes the respect we, as a nation, hold for our environment and our natural surroundings. While I have made it clear that I believe some fine tuning of the act needs to occur during the upcoming reauthorization debate, I worry that when moderate positions, such as the one put forth in the Gorton amendment, become polarized, fodder is given to those whose goal is to abolish or gut the act. I will do my best to prevent this from happening, but the position of some groups on this salvage amendment simply perpetuates the attitude that all environmental laws, including the ESA, have gone too far and need to be significantly altered or scrapped.

These concerns are merely symptoms of a larger problem—the breakdown of our Nation's land management laws. The result of this breakdown is a problem of national significance with little ability in the law for land managers to take care of the problem in a timely manner.

Unfortunately, for those of us who have been around a while, this situation is all too familiar.

Almost 6 years ago, I stood here on the floor with my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate authorizing committees to announce a temporary solution to a crisis in the Pacific Northwest. This compromise was sponsored by myself and then-Senator Adams from Washington State, and was supported by every member of the Pacific Northwest delegation. It was truly an extraordinary measure, meant to address an extraordinary situation.

Recognizing the temporary nature of this solution, many Members of Congress believed that larger issues loomed and needed to be addressed. Namely, that the forest management and planning laws, originally enacted in 1976, were in serious need of revision. During the course of the debate on the Hatfield-Adams amendment I entered into a colloquy with then-chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator LEAHY, to proclaim the temporary nature of the amendment and announce our intentions to pursue a long-term solution through the review and revision of our Nation's forest management laws in the authorizing committees.

Six years later, however, our forest management laws are unchanged.

When the Northwest timber compromise was developed in 1989, I took the promises of my colleagues to address our Nation's long-term forest management laws very seriously, and I was determined to do my part to address this growing dilemma. In 1990, I introduced legislation, called the National Forest Plan Implementation Act, to assist with the implementation of forest plans developed as a result of the 10-year planning processes enacted by Congress in 1976. Two years later, another comprehensive bill was introduced by Senator Adams to address the long-term issue. Both of these measures were referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee where no hearings were held and they died in committee.

The next year, in 1991, I was a primary cosponsor of Senator PACKWOOD's Forest and Families Protection Act, which dealt with a number of the same issues as my 1990 bill and also addressed the issues of rural development and workers. This legislation was referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, of which I am a member, where we were able to hold several hearings and a markup on the bill. Unfortunately, the bill never made it to the floor for consideration.

My point is, Mr. President, many of us have undertaken significant efforts to live up to the commitments of 1989 to address the long-term management of our forest resources through the authorizing committees. Unfortunately for the entire Nation, the other Senate authorizing committees with jurisdiction over this issue have not felt compelled to do the same.

The Gorton amendment to the rescission bill begins to address this problem by doing three things to address the emergency situation that now exists in many forests. The first is national in scope and provides our Federal land management agencies with the flexibility to conduct environmentally sensitive forest health/salvage activities. These activities will be done using the agencies' own standards and guidelines for forest and wildlife management.

Second, the Gorton amendment releases 375 million board feet of timber sales in western Oregon that were previously sold to timber purchasers. Most of these sales, originally authorized by the Northwest timber compromise amendment of 1989, were determined by the record of decision for President Clinton's option 9 plan not to jeopardize the existence of any species. To ensure further protections, the Gorton amendment includes provisions prohibiting activities in timber sale units which contain any nesting threatened or endangered species.

Finally, the Gorton amendment gives the Clinton administration more tools with which to implement timber sales in the geographic area covered by its option 9 plan. As a vocal critic of option 9 and the process that was used to develop it, I have some concerns about this section of the Gorton amendment. Nevertheless, I applaud the sponsor's

efforts to give the administration all possible tools to meet its promises to get wood to the mills of the Pacific Northwest in the next 18 months.

While the first portion of the Gorton amendment is national in scope, these last two sections will assist the President in meeting his commitments to the workers, families, and environment of both western and eastern Oregon and Washington.

I came to the floor in 1989 to offer the Northwest timber compromise because we were witnessing what was then a crisis for the rural communities of my State. Since that time, 213 mills have closed in Oregon and Washington and over 21,800 workers have lost their forestry-related jobs. In addition, the forests in the eastern half of these two States are in the worst health in a hundred years.

These national forests and communities cannot wait through another fire season like 1994 for Congress to finally meet its commitments to rewrite the Nation's forest management laws. I have every confidence that the new Republican Congress will do its best to meet that challenge, but the Gorton amendment is necessary to help us bridge that gap. It is a much needed piece of legislation for our Nation's forests and timber dependent communities.

There are those whose agenda is to prevent people from managing our forests altogether. They would rather let our dead and dying forests burn by catastrophic fire, endangering human life and long-term forest health, than harvest them to promote stability in natural forest ecosystems and communities dependent on a supply of timber from Federal lands. The Gorton amendment says we can be reasonable in what we do in the forests and harvest trees for many uses—forest health, community stabilization, ecosystem restoration, and jobs for our workers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gorton amendment to the fiscal year 1995 rescissions bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). All time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. I move to table the Murray amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] are absent due to a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 121 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Abraham	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grassley	Packwood
Bond	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Reid
Burns	Hatfield	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Snowe
Craig	Kyl	Specter
D'Amato	Lott	Stevens
DeWine	Lugar	Thomas
Dole	Mack	Thompson
Domenici	McCain	Thurmond
Frist	McConnell	Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Heflin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kerrey	Roth
Cohen	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	
Feingold	Levin	

NOT VOTING—6

Conrad	Faircloth	Grams
Dorgan	Graham	Kassebaum

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

HONORING JEREMY BULLOCK

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to welcome some special friends to Washington today. They are Penny Copps of Butte, and Penny's son, Steve Bullock, late of Montana and now living here in Washington, DC.

Just about a year ago, the entire Bullock family weathered about the worst blow any family can take.

Eleven-year-old Jeremy Bullock—the grandson of Penny and her husband Jack; Steve's nephew; the son of Bill and Robin; Joshua's twin; the elder brother of Sam, Max and now Kaitlyn—was shot and killed, on the playground at the Margaret Leary Elementary School, by an emotionally troubled fourth grader.

The family and the whole Butte community, has been through a terrible

test. The loss can never be repaired. But they are working together to use this tragedy to make our State of Montana, and all of America more sensitive to and aware of the violence that has hurt so many of our youth. They have a spent a year teaching, learning, and doing their best to make sure no other family suffers such a loss.

It is now my great privilege to read to you a statement written by the Bullock family in memory of their son, Jeremy.

There is nothing more infectious than a child's laugh.

Nothing more disarming than the innocence of a child's question.

What fills the void when our children's voices can no longer be heard?

On April 12, 1994, Jeremy and Joshua, eleven-year-old-identical twins, woke, dressed, had breakfast and left for school that day, the same as any other day. It was library day, so Jeremy's backpack was heavy with books he had read and was returning.

Weeks later, a police officer worked up the courage to give Jeremy's family that backpack. He had tried to scrub the blood from the canvas, trying to ease the pain in the only way he knew how. For on April 12, 1994, eleven-year-old Jeremy was shot and killed at his school by a child whose only explanation was "No one loves me."

Jeremy Michael Seidlitz Bullock lived in a home in Montana where violence was not condoned. He was not allowed to watch violence on television or play games glamorizing violence. Instead, he was active in sports. Jeremy loved to sing. He listed his hobby as getting good grades. School was his second home, a place where children laughed and learned.

Jeremy wanted to become a teacher or an environmental engineer. Jeremy and his brother Josh would spend hours on hikes, coming home with their pockets overflowing with garbage they picked up along the way. Jeremy believed that leaving places he visited better than the way he found them was a good way to live.

Jeremy loved and was deeply loved. Yet, he was not safe because collectively we allowed Jeremy's voice to be silenced.

Every day in America the voices of 10 of our children are silenced by violent acts. Over three million of our children ages 3 to 17 are exposed to parental violence every year. Our children will witness over 200,000 acts of violence on television by the time they turn 18. A new handgun is manufactured every 20 seconds in America. And many of them wind up in the wrong hands.

We passively listen and accept the statistics, but do we listen for the voices lost?

On behalf of Jeremy's family and children everywhere, we will designate April 12 as a day of remembrance of