

realize what has been done under your administration in increasing the mileage of access roads. It is a remarkable record, trying to do what we can to check disease and fire loss, build up our water resources of our forests for the multiple-use programs that we all recognize is involved in the philosophy of the administration of Federal service, and the whole question of the improvement of our land. It is a sad thing for me to hear that we have to make a \$21.5 million cut in the items you have listed, each and every one of which is vital to building up of the Forest Service program that is necessary to serve the trusteeship obligation of our Government to the taxpayers of this country who own those forests.

As far as I am concerned, there is not a single item that you have listed that really from the standpoint of need and sound forest management can justify a cut. We ought to be increasing every one of those items. In fact, Mr. Cliff, on pages 12 to 13 of your statement this morning you talk about, in a very sound way, as to what has to be done, in the further expansion of our forest program in order to meet the needs. At the bottom of page 12 you say :

As I have already discussed to do all these things which justifiably could be done would require considerable time and would carry a price tag. We estimate that \$800 million to \$1 billion could be effectively spent in national forests of western Washington and western Oregon in the next 10 years. This would include roads, the cost of reforestation and getting thinnings and other forest work done.

That is the program he ought to follow, because that is the program that obviously increases the wealth of the Nation, and it is out of the wealth of the Nation that you get the national income.

May I say most respectfully that is why I think the administration is missing the economic boat in its proposals in regard to the balance-of-payment problem. It is walking away from the balance-of-payment problem in economic fact by this kind of cut.

Now, I am not blaming you. If the position of the administration is that each department, including the Department of Agriculture, has to make x millions of dollars of cuts, you and the Forest Service on the team have to make, you have your share of them too. I understand that. It happens to be those instructions that I am completely opposed to. I happen to think that the proposal of this administration to cut into this domestic program, which ought to be receiving more money, not less money to meet our domestic economic needs, is the wrong approach to meet the balance-of-payment problem.

You are going to have to cut in personnel. You know the problem that confronts us as Senators when we go to you, as we have so many years in the past, to try to see what we can do to speed up some of these sales, to get the appraisals and get the cruising done. Congress has never given you enough money to meet your personnel needs to carry out the program you ought to be carrying out. It is not your fault. There is where the responsibility of Congress comes in.

But here you have Congress' authorization, and in some instances Congress' appropriation, and you have got to make a cutback now on the ground that we have an economic problem here at home. We are talking about a \$20 billion domestic budget, which is far too little, and a proposal to reduce that \$20 billion domestic budget still further. I happen to believe that that is not the way to either meet the balance-of-payments problem or keep our domestic economy stable.