The Sierra Club and others are urging a ban on logging in US National Forests.

**Why?**
- USFS wood contributes ~4% domestic consumption.
- Of what is cut, ecological value far exceeds lumber value.

**I am against this.**

**Why?**
- A decrease in logging on USNF will be offset by increased imports, especially from tropical and subtropical forests.

**7 facts explain my position.**

1. Since 1990, domestic softwood production has declined by 4%, largely due to closures on Western forests.

2. US softwood exports have also declined due to declining production and a strong US dollar (which weakens US wood value on world markets).
3. Despite this decline in production, US softwood consumption has increased 11% since 1990, reaching a record high of 360,000,000 m³ (50.9 billion bf) in 1997-1998.

4. This increase in consumption (demand) has NOT been met by recycling and more intensive cuttings on US plantations.

5. Instead, it has met by a 40% increase in imported softwoods.

6. The result of the trend is clear: when we cut fewer of our own trees, more logs arrive on ships.
7. While most imported softwood still comes from Canada, imports from tropical/subtropical countries such as Brazil, Chile, and New Zealand have skyrocketed, increasing by 175% from 1996-2000.

In 1949, Aldo Leopold suggested that "there are two spiritual dangers in not owning a farm. One is the danger of supposing that breakfast comes from the grocery, and the other that heat comes from the furnace."

Similarly, I believe there is a danger in not carefully managing federal forests in part for timber extraction: Our children may suppose that wood comes from ships.

The inverse relationship between domestic logging rates and log imports can only be broken if domestic logging restrictions are coupled with effective incentives to reduce wood consumption, recycle, and/or seek alternative building and paper-making materials.

I, for one, believe these incentives are at least as important as the call for reduced logging.