

More Reforestation Funds Needed

In its efforts to cut the federal budget deficit while increasing spending for a variety of social programs, the Carter administration is seeking to make a cut in at least one program it should not.

This cut is in the Forest Service's budget for 1980. The Forest Service is slated to lose 15 percent of its overall budget and 30 percent of its funds earmarked for reforestation.

This, we feel, is an ill-advised move and we support our Congressional delegation led by Senators Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood and Representative Les AuCoin in fighting this cut-back.

It seems foolhearted for the

Carter administration to propose cutting back on one of the countries' much needed renewable resources — wood.

We have some of the richest forest lands in the nation in Oregon, but they can do little for our country if they lie idle and are not replanted as rapidly as possible. With the modern reforestation methods and faster growing trees, these idle lands can be turned into forests for our future generations, but only if they are replanted.

As we have stated many times before, we support a balanced budget, but more consideration for the future must be given areas where trees are being

NEWS-TIMES JAN 31 1979

Local Cutbacks Necessary

To the Editor:

While I think that it is commendable that you speak out in favor of reforestation ("More Reforestation Funds Needed" News-Times Jan. 31), I think that you have over-looked one point and were unaware of another.

The first is that the national reforestation budget has been increased dramatically (20-30 percent) for years and has been symptomatic of our larger problems of increased taxes, inflation and top-heavy government. If we are to combat these problems we are going to have to tighten our belts at home. We can't allow ourselves the luxury of criticizing Carter's "soft" anti-inflation proposals, becoming indignant over increased

HEW

expenditures and demanding a balanced budget on one hand while protesting local cut-backs on the other. For every increase in government funding in Oregon there's going to be a new dam in Tennessee or more food stamps in Chicago.

The second is that the government has the ability with its present set-up to actually increase reforestation practices while reducing its budget markedly.

When I hear accounts of Co-op tree-planters earning \$300 for a day's work, and listen to private contractors gloat about \$600 man-days on government contracts, I have to believe, as a taxpayer, that waste is involved. When I perform government contracts myself and witness the great amount of unnecessary administrative and regulative costs incurred with little, no or negative results as the outcome, I know that waste is involved.

If Hatfield, Packwood and AuCoin would take a little time and see what happens to this funding; what actually goes for labor, stock, machinery and supplies and what goes into administration and the private contractor's pocket (not to mention the Youth Conservation Corps and CETA programs), and compare these findings with similar expenditures by private forests such as G-P's, Publisher's and Weyerhaeuser's, I think that they might become a little less vocal about Carter's proposed cuts and a little more aware as to how some waste might be trimmed from the tax-payer's dollar.

As an additional note, a common error is to assume that reforestation means planting or replanting (as you state in your editorial) forest land. Actually, most forest land has been reforested naturally by seed from surrounding trees, and in order to replant an area, it must be planted first.

Sincerely,
Bob Zybach
Eddyville