

Eddie Dee Smith has always been at the forefront of Rubidoux's advancement. She was a founder of the Mount Calvary Baptist Church, the Mount Vernon Baptist Church, the Rubidoux Senior Center, head of the Jurupa Area Girl Scouts, member of the Avalon Park Committee, regent of the Jensen-Alvarado Ranch, president of the Jurupa Democrat Club, and 1993 Jurupa Chamber of Commerce citizen of the year.

On behalf of the many people whose lives this remarkable woman has touched, I would like to add my personal congratulations, and the thanks of the people of the 43d Congressional District.

CELEBRATING UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA PARTNERSHIP AND THE STATE VISIT OF PRESIDENT KIM YONG-SAM

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the long United States partnership with the Republic of Korea spanning nearly five decades will be celebrated this week in two major events. The first is the visit of South Korea's democratically elected President, Kim Yong-sam, and his address today to a joint session of Congress. The second will be the dedication of the long-awaited Korean War Memorial. It is a great pleasure to have President Kim here with us, and a source of immense satisfaction that those who fought our most forgotten war are finally being appropriately remembered and honored. Meanwhile, South Korea has emerged as a robust industrial power and a fully functioning democracy, and a steadfast United States friend.

CELEBRATING SOUTH KOREA'S DEMOCRACY

How South Korea moved with United States encouragement into the family of democratic nations, and the pivotal role played by President Kim, deserves reiteration.

In 1987, South Korea began a transition to democracy after 26 years of military-dominated governments. A new constitution was adopted, and free elections for President and a National Assembly subsequently were held.

President Kim Yong-sam had fought for a democratic South Korea since the 1960's. He had endured constant harassments and periods of confinement from the military-dominated regimes. Elected President in December 1992, Kim Yong-sam is the first South Korean leader since 1961 from a purely civilian background.

STRENGTH OF UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA SECURITY TIES

United States-Republic of Korea security relations were forged in blood during the Korean war and formally established in 1953. The dedication of the Korean war memorial during President Kim's visit to Washington symbolizes the long, intimate United States-Republic of Korea security relationship, including participation in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

The United States stations 37,000 troops in South Korea as the embodiment of its defense commitment to South Korea. These and other United States forces stationed in the western Pacific area are an essential element in maintaining stability in the Asia-Pacific region and

in ensuring that North Korea will never dare to attack the South.

THREAT POSED BY NORTH KOREA

At present, our security relationship faces its strongest test in dealing with the nuclear threat posed by North Korea. South Korea has supported the United States-North Korean agreed framework despite the mixed impact the agreed framework has on North Korea-South Korea relations and the security situation on the Korean peninsula. This commitment includes up to \$3 billion to finance the light-water reactor project.

Analysts contend that North Korea views the agreed framework as a window of opportunity to isolate South Korea diplomatically, divide South Korea and the United States, and draw the United States into a bilateral peace agreement. I am committed to seeing that this does not happen. This issue has been addressed in House Joint Resolution 83, the first legislation reported out by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific since I became chairman in January. The resolution has been reported out favorably by the full House International Relations Committee.

I am confident that this statement of congressional policy can materially assist the administration in removing any illusions that North Korea might entertain about American determination to demand full adherence to the essential provisions of the accord—if they properly use this expression of congressional views.

UNITED STATES-SOUTH KOREAN TRADE RELATIONS

South Korea has grown during the past decade as a market for United States exports. In recent years trade has become increasingly more balanced. Between 1985 and the end of 1994 United States exports tripled to \$18 billion, while our imports of South Korean goods doubled. The United States had a relatively small \$2 billion trade deficit with South Korea in 1994 on total trade of \$38 billion. Thus far during 1995 the United States enjoys a surplus.

South Korea has taken steps to remove many barriers to imports and otherwise to improve the environment for foreign trade and investment. During the past 5 years the Republic of Korea Government has significantly lowered import tariffs and has liberalized its import licensing regime to permit a greater range of products to enter the country unimpeded.

South Korea also has been one of the most important countries supporting the 18-member Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] organization.

Problems remain in United States-South Korean economic relations, for instance in discriminatory treatment of automobile imports, and in the use of standards, certification, and testing requirements to discriminate against foreign goods, especially agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I remain persuaded that these and other problems can be resolved and that both our political, security, and economic ties will continue to grow and flourish. It is a privilege to play a role in welcoming President Kim Yong-sam to Washington.

QUESTIONABLE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION GRANTS AWARDED IN OREGON

**HON. WES COOLEY**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exhaustive and very professional research done by my constituents Bob and Sharon Beck and the Oregon Cattlemen's Association regarding how environmental groups receiving Federal funding engage in political advocacy which threatens the survival of ranchers and other public land users.

Oregon ranchers are painfully aware that certain environmental groups have an agenda which includes putting them out of business. Unfortunately, Pacific Rivers Council and Waterwatch of Oregon, Inc.—two of the more radical and litigious of these groups—have received substantial Federal grants from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation [NFWF].

Although NFWF maintains it places restrictions against grantees using Federal funds for lobbying and litigation, at the very least these Federal funds free up other resources for these environmental groups to use for political advocacy.

As my colleagues are well aware, this problem has extended far beyond the NFWF to many other nonprofit groups that receive Federal funds. Representatives MCINTOSH, ISTOOK, and EHRlich have documented many horror stories in this regard and intend to offer an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to limit this abuse of taxpayers dollars. I strongly support their efforts and hope similar amendments are adopted to all appropriations bills.

Although I believe the NFWF should have its Federal funding terminated, the Interior appropriations bill—H.R. 1977—contained \$4 million for the NFWF for fiscal year 1996. However, I am encouraged that the committee report—House Report 104-173—accompanying this bill clearly states that fiscal year 1996 is the last year for Federal funding of NFWF. It is imperative to ranchers like Bob and Sharon Beck that this Federal funding be terminated as the committee report promises.

I would urge my colleagues to read the following articles from Beef Today, the Chicago Tribune, and the Washington Times on how Federal funds from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation are used for lobbying and litigation by environmental groups.

[From Beef Today, June-July 1995]

WEST SIDE STORY

(By Patricia Peak Klintberg)

In the high country above Oregon's Grande Ronde Valley, an occasional spray of daffodils or crocuses is all that remains of homesteads now long gone. It is in the valley below that one finds ranchers like Bob and Sharon Beck, offspring of the hardest pioneers.

Though they thrive in this emerald valley, criss-crossed with creeks brim-full in spring, the battle they fight today is just as dangerous, and infinitely more complex, than their ancestors' struggles against the elements.

"The agenda of some environmental groups in this state is to put us out of business," says a no-nonsense Sharon Beck.

The groups deny this charge. But the cumulative effects of the litigation they

bring—and even of their well-meaning projects—is to raise the cost of doing business for public-lands ranchers. This is a story about how environmental groups prosper by tapping into endless sources of funding—some of it straight from taxpayers.

Consider the Eugene-based Pacific Rivers Council (PRC). This is the group behind last July's injunction halting all ongoing activities that could affect salmon in Oregon's Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman national forests, where the Becks are permittees.

"We were out of town and read about it in the newspaper," recalls Sharon Beck. "We were stunned. Our cattle were in the forest." Ultimately, the Forest Service ordered cattle removed from some allotments. The experience burned the Becks and others as permanently as a brand. "We realized just how precarious our position is," says Beck.

Bob Doppelt, PRC's general counsel, defends the suit: "We were only trying to get the Forest Service to do a good job. They were allowing timber sales without consulting with the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]." PRC's suit charged that the Forest Service violated the Endangered Species Act by failing to consult with NMFS on its overall 1990 forest plan. Instead, the Forest Service checked with NMFS before approving individual projects—logging, road repairs or whatever. Last month, the Supreme Court agreed with PRC that the Endangered Species Act requires more than a project-by-project consultation.

The Forest Service, meantime, has completed the consultation in question—but under the Endangered Species Act, which requires the loser to pay the costs of lawsuits, it must reimburse the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund for the costs of its legal fight on behalf of PRC. To say the Forest Service must foot the bill, of course, is another way of saying that the taxpayer must. Though the amount for this case is not established, the group has received "about \$2 million" in attorneys' fees from the federal government in the past two years, says Buck Parker, a defense fund vice president.

The fight cost Oregon public-lands ranchers \$39,000 in legal fees. Since the Forest Service completed the consultation sought by PRC before the lawsuit was even decided, "All it did was cost the government and us a lot of money," says Beck.

Sharon and Bob Beck have a stake in what happens here. Their cow-calf operation lies in this nearly flat 150,000-acre valley, which is planted to grass and crops as diverse as coriander and sugar beets. The whole is surrounded by mountains. While water is abundant in spring, this is high country some 2,500' above sea level. Pastures can become parched in summer, so cattle are moved to the forest in May.

"To us the land is everything. It is our connection with our history and our connection with our future," Sharon Beck says.

Bob's great-grandfather led a wagon train to western Oregon. Sharon was born here, surrounded by reminders of her ancestors. The front door is Carolina poplar, the tree Sharon's grandmother nurtured with left-over wash water. With their two daughters grown and gone and son Rob farming 14 crops on hundreds of acres of arable land, Bob handles the cattle while Sharon delves ever deeper into the tangled web of local environmental group financing.

Teamed with Oregon Cattlemen's Association attorney Lindsay Slater, she discovered that PRC was receiving grant money from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). Indeed, 75% of PRC's funding in 1994 came not from individuals but foundations. What's unique about NFWF among foundations, though, is that a third of its funding—millions of dollars—comes from taxpayers (see sidebar).

Slater lays out the irony neatly: "Here was a foundation giving taxpayer dollars to a group that then turned around and sued the federal government."

Slater obtained a list of all NFWF grants made to groups in Oregon since 1988—\$9.3 million worth. While NFWF staff prepared to come to Oregon to meet with the cattlemen, Sharon Beck spotted two troublesome grants.

The first was a \$180,000 grant to PRC for a project dubbed "Salmon Safe." Though this grant had nothing to do with the earlier lawsuit, it was not lost on Beck and Slater that such funding keeps PRC flush, enabling it to pursue litigation.

Just as bad, the Salmon Safe project seemed unnecessary. The idea was to create a green label for ranches that participate in PRC projects to improve riparian habitat. But the Oregon Cattlemen's Association routinely conducts watershed workshops with university scientists who bring cattlemen the latest in riparian and range management. "NFWF just throws the money out there and never looks back," says Beck. At the meeting with NFWF staff in January, the cattlemen convinced them the project couldn't fly.

"The Pacific Rivers lawsuit took us by surprise," admits NFWF's Krishna Roy. "It is not something where we would necessarily have turned down the grant if we'd known they were suing someone else, but we have to keep it in mind in determining whether a project can be successful." The federal portion of the grant, \$60,000, has been frozen.

"We contacted PRC," Roy says, "and said, Look, we are not going to dispense any federal funds until we are satisfied that private landowners are willing to participate in this program and that it can work."

PRC isn't worried. Doppelt says, "Whether NFWF gives us money or not, it won't stop us." Cattlemen need "to get real. It's a sad thing to see them spin their wheels and look for scapegoats. The world has fundamentally changed and they don't like it."

The second grant that caught Sharon Beck's eye was to another local group suing ranchers: Water Watch of Oregon, Inc. In 1992, NFWF gave the group \$201,674, \$62,903 of it federal funds. The money "supported" an effort to remove the Savage Rapids Dam on the Rogue River. The turn-of-the-century dam supplies irrigation water and recreation and recharges wells. Sharon Beck initially thought the grant might be a positive example of NFWF's work—but then she talked to local people like Jack Waldon, who runs a small newspaper, The Little Company.

"This isn't about saving the salmon, it's about who controls the water," says Waldon. "Taking the dam out will affect people's water rights. If they were worried about the salmon, the town would stop using the Rogue River for sewage treated with chlorine."

Attorney later checked out Water Watch and confirmed that it has objected to every proposed water right in Oregon. Fighting these objections costs farmers and ranchers time and money.

NFWF's Whit Fosburgh argues the grant is justified: "The dam's a big fish killer and it's going to be a tremendous expense to bring it up to specifications," he says. But spring chinook salmon runs on the Rogue are 25% larger than they were a year ago, according to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Department.

"I went back 30 years, and I couldn't find a higher count at this time," says district biologist Mike Evenson.

As for the argument that fixing the dam would be hugely expensive—the federal government says it would cost millions—Emerson Roller, a contractor for 45 years who lives in the area, says the fish ladders on the dam could be repaired for \$100,000. "It needs

maintenance. If they use common sense they can probably fix it for less.

"Why not use NFWF's money to fix the ladders?" asked Waldon, who by now believes the effort to take down the dam is tinged with conspiracy.

"NFWF never came to Oregon before making the grant," says Sharon Beck. "They never talked to anyone in the community. They just gave them the money to take out the dam. There is no accountability."

Well, there wasn't—but now there is. As a result of Slater's deft work and some pressure from the district's Rep. Wes Cooley (R-Ore.) and Idaho's Rep. Helen Chenoweth (R), NFWF has been responsive indeed. It will now ask grant applicants if they are parties to litigation, and allow the Oregon Cattlemen's Association to review grant applications for projects in the state. Other states can make the same request.

Nevertheless, Chenoweth wants all federal funding for NFWF ended. Other members of Congress are reluctant to go that far, but with pressure to cut the deficit building, the President's request for NFWF federal funding of \$7.5 million may be in jeopardy. It certainly wouldn't break the environmental movement: In 1992, 379 foundations gave \$356 million to environmental and animal causes. Because of the federal funding it receives, NFWF is not included in this count. It is considered a "public" charity.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1995]

NON-PROFIT GROUPS' FUNDS UNDER FIRE

(By Patricia Peak Klintberg)

COVE, ORE.—What really galled Sharon Beck was when she learned that her tax dollars were hard at work. Against her.

She and her husband, Bob, raised cattle in the Grande Ronde Valley. While their cattle graze at the ranch in spring, they are moved to public forest land during the summer's dry months.

A year ago, a local environmental group went to court to protect endangered salmon, and that action almost forced the Becks' cattle off the forest land.

What the Becks didn't find out until later was that their own tax dollars partly funded the group.

Their experience is not unique. Thousands of non-profit groups that receive taxpayer funds lobby and participate in litigation. So common is the practice that freshman Rep. David McIntosh (R-Ind.) held a congressional hearing this week to investigate.

Some 600,000 non-profits or charities, ranging from hospitals to cultural centers, received \$159 billion in federal funds in 1992, according to Independent Sector, a coalition of 800 non-profits.

McIntosh says he is interested in all non-profits that use taxpayer dollars to lobby and litigate on the local or national level.

"Whether it's the Nature Conservancy on the left or local Chambers of Commerce on the right, if special interest are using taxpayer money to lobby for more money, it's just plain wrong," said McIntosh, chairman of the House regulatory affairs subcommittee.

Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) accused McIntosh of engaging in a "systematic effort to silence voices that disagree with the new Republican majority."

McIntosh replied: "We are not trying to silence them. We are just not going to give them taxpayer money to exercise their free-speech rights."

Among his targets is the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the group the Becks discovered was helping fund local environmental groups in Oregon.

Congress created the foundation in 1984 to finance public and private partnerships for

conservation projects. It is authorized to receive \$25 million a year in federal funds, although appropriations have never exceeded \$10 million in a year.

The federal money is given as a "challenge" grant, which means private contributions must match the federal portion of the grant.

The foundation is barred by law from lobbying. Yet in a letter last March, its deputy director, Barbara Cairns, asked board members to contact certain members of Congress to save the National Biological Service from budget cuts.

It also is barred from litigating. But according to Lindsay Slater, an attorney for the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, it has given grants to groups that do.

While environmental groups are a particular target of congressional budget cutters, they are not the only non-profits that lobby and litigate while receiving taxpayer dollars. The American Bar Association received \$9.5 million in federal funds in 1992. Local Chambers of Commerce received \$2 million over the past two years.

The lawsuit that threatened to disrupt the Becks' cattle operation was brought by the Eugene-based Pacific Rivers Council, which received a \$160,000 grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, \$60,000 of that from taxpayer money.

The suit charged that the Forest Service violated the law because it failed to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service on its overall forest management plan. Instead, the Forest Service had been checking with the agency before approving individual projects, such as logging or road repair.

In May, the Supreme Court upheld the decision of a lower court, agreeing that the Endangered Species Act requires more of the Forest Service than a project-by-project consultation.

In the end, the Becks' cattle were able to remain in the forest. But the Becks and other Oregon ranchers whose cattle graze on public land had to lay out \$39,000 in legal fees to fight the injunction.

The Becks are further angered that, as taxpayers they must also help foot the legal bills of the Pacific River Council: The council's legal team will be reimbursed by taxpayers because the Endangered Species Act requires losers—in this case, the Forest Service—to pay.

Said Slater: "Here was a foundation giving taxpayer dollars to a group that then turned around and sued the federal government."

The foundation grant to the Pacific Rivers Council was for a project that was unrelated to the lawsuit. But it helped keep the council "flush" so it could pursue litigation, Slater said.

"The PRC lawsuit took us by surprise," admitted Krishna Roy of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. It is not something where we would necessarily have turned down the grant if we'd known they were suing someone, but we have to keep it in mind in determining whether a project can be successful."

The foundation has since agreed to ask grant applicants if they are parties to litigation, and it will allow the Oregon Cattle-

men's Association to review grant applications for projects in the state.

But the Interior Department appropriations bill approved by a House panel Tuesday cuts the foundation's funds to \$4 million in fiscal 1996 and recommends eliminating it altogether in 1997.

House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young (R-Alaska) said he has supported the Fish and Wildlife Foundation in the past, "but they ought to be spending their money on wildlife projects, not funding our adversaries."

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 18, 1995]

WHY ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDING IS FOREVER

(By Alston Chase)

If you've wondered why it's so hard to reduce government spending, consider this: The whole country is on the dole. The poor have welfare. The middle class has college loans and National Public Radio. And the truly affluent enjoys handouts too. These are called "environmental," but you can think of them as pork.

This is worth keeping in mind as we watch Republicans try to reform preservation policy. GOP bean-counters promise to make welfare mothers and Sesame Streeters work for a living. Federal monies to both should be scrapped, they insist, because welfare doesn't work and public broadcasting does. One wastes public money, and the other can do without it.

But while many preservation programs are both wasteful and redundant, congressional cheese-parers have left them alone. And the reason isn't hard to find: The bureaucrats who run preservation agencies are smarter than their Hill adversaries. They know that merely speaking the magic words "private enterprise" reduces the most frugal GOP lawmaking to an oozing puddle of acquiescence.

Ever since the November Republican landslide, Beltway empire builders have been heavily playing this card. Quicker than you can say "Enola Gay," they have switched political sides, magically remaking their images from collectivist ecosystem groupies into staunch free-market libertarians. And conservatives are falling for it.

Such, for example, is the tactic of an upper-class entitlement called the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. This organization is authorized to spend up to \$25 million in federal funds a year, which it funnels to environmental advocacy groups and upscale hunting and fishing organizations. But its executive director, Amos Eno, a former National Audubon Society staffer, has convinced conservatives that this effort is a bastion of the free market. Last month, *Forbes* magazine praised the Foundation, urging that "other environmental groups would do well to adopt a down-to-earth, Eno-like approach."

To be sure, other conservation organizations, such as the Sierra Club, that are experiencing financial problems, would do better on the public dole, too. The Foundation reveals why public subsidies are forever. Established by Congress during the heyday of trickle-down economics in 1984, its purpose was to raise private monies for federal and

private preservation causes. Originally, it was expected to become self-supporting. Government, Congress then supposed, would only provide the seed money to get it started. To this end, it promised to match, one for one, each dollar the Foundation raised from private sources, up to \$1 million.

This federal commitment of course, was entirely unnecessary. America has plenty of philanthropies and doesn't need another. By 1993, according to the Environmental Data Institute, there were more than 1,800 environmental grantmakers, which since 1988 made more than 22,000 grants. Just the top 417 of these givers have combined assets totaling more than \$110 billion and collectively award more than \$340 million to recipients each year.

Nevertheless, the foundation's "private fund-raising" idea jerked the right chains of congresspeople infatuated with free enterprise. In 1987, the cap on federal matching funds was raised to \$5 million and, in 1994, lifted again to \$25 million annually for the next five years. In 1993, 31 percent of the Foundation's \$17.9 million in revenues came from taxpayers.

Meanwhile, the foundation befriended the power elite. It put, on its Board of Directors and Advisory Committee, people like Caroline Getty, James A. Baker IV, Marshall Field and Nancy N. Weyerhaeuser. It made grants to the favorite environmental and sporting causes of the rich, such as the National Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited and Trout Unlimited. It bestowed stipends on individuals, too. In 1992, according to the Environmental Data Institute, it awarded one Rick Weyerhaeuser \$80,000 to write a book on the environment.

And according to insiders, such disbursements escape adequate oversight. Taking place in the noman's land between public and private sectors, they are not subject to the same accountability other federal programs are. Complaining of a lack of sufficient "scrutiny" of grants awarded, in 1992, one board member noted, "staff review . . . seems to tend toward advocacy rather than critical review."

Despite these concerns, the Foundation, with friends in high places, remains insulated from budget cutters. A former Foundation staffer now works for the House Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. And when the subcommittee staff recently discusses possible cuts to the Foundation budget, word reportedly got back to Mr. Eno, who, according to sources, then visited the Hill to convince lawmakers of the Foundation's conservative bona fides.

Thus, while Republicans pick on "Masterpiece Theatre," they leave rarefied precincts of preservation alone. This is too bad. If public broadcasting should be weaned from the federal teat because it can survive without aid, so should silver-spooned enclaves like the Foundation. But this probably won't happen. Like all bad environmentalism, its support is bipartisan.