

Israel's security—a threat that Iran's support for terrorism against Israel only magnifies. But this is part of a more complex picture. Iran is a theocracy which is edging toward democracy. At a certain point, the continuing growth of civil society in Iran may require its rehabilitation.

North Korea, on the other hand, is beyond reform. Diplomacy has little value. Indeed, North Korea has already been appeased too much. It is in the grip of a psychotic Stalinist regime whose rule is sustained by terror and bankrolled by those who buy its missiles. It is one of the few states that could launch an unprovoked nuclear strike. The regime must go, and I fear that it may not go peacefully.

Between Iran on the one hand and North Korea on the other, the list of rogue states will be the subject of continuing revision and debate. And in each case there will be a mix of policies appropriate to achieve our goal of removing the threat which these states pose.

That is also true of Iraq. I have detected a certain amount of wobbling about the need to remove Saddam Hussein—though not from President Bush. It is not surprising, given the hostility of many allies to this venture, that some in Washington may be having second thoughts. It is, of course, right that those who have the duty to weigh up the risks of particular courses of action should give their advice—though they would be better to direct their counsel to the president not the press. But in any case, as somebody once said, this is no time to go wobbly.

Saddam must go. His continued survival after comprehensively losing the Gulf War had done untold damage to the West's standing in a region where the only forgivable sin is weakness. His flouting of the terms on which hostilities ceased has made a laughingstock of the international community. His appalling mistreatment of his own countrymen continues unabated. It is clear to anyone willing to face reality that the only reason Saddam took the risk of refusing to submit his activities to U.N. inspectors was that he is exerting every muscle to build WMD. We do not know exactly what stage that has reached. But to allow this process to continue because the risks of action to arrest it seem too great would be foolish in the extreme.

COERCIVE MEASURES

I do not claim to know the precise balance of coercive measures required now to remove Saddam: only those with access to the best intelligence can assess that. A major deployment of ground forces as well as sustained air strikes will probably be required. And it will be essential that internal groups opposed to Saddam be mobilized and assisted. No one pretends that an equivalent of the Afghan Northern Alliance is available. But I suspect that once the aura of terror surrounding the Iraqi regime is dispelled we may be astonished by the number of opponents who come forward to help finish the job.

Finally, a warning: We should not try now to predetermine the final outcome for a post-Saddam Iraq. One of the errors in 1991 was an exaggerated fear of the possible breakup of Iraq if the measures required to topple Saddam were taken. The Kirds and Shiites have since endured years of murderous repression as a result. In great strategic questions it is possible to be too clever. We need to concentrate on what we can achieve with the instruments at hand, and then press ahead boldly with the task before us. That will be quite taxing enough.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, that terminates my remarks on the bill. May I inquire of the Chair, is it correct that at the conclusion of my remarks the Chair was prepared to put the Senate into a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senate is in morning business.

FOREST FIRES IN ARIZONA

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I rise to speak on the crisis pending before the whole State of Arizona.

Arizona has never had a tragedy like this Rodeo fire. It has now consumed an area 10 times the size of the District of Columbia. It has burned at least 200 homes, probably more. We can't go back into areas that have been burned because it is still too hot. It has destroyed a lot more buildings than that, and animals, both domestic and a lot of the animals that populate our beautiful forests.

People who are not familiar with Arizona might not understand how there can be a forest fire in Arizona. But the world's largest ponderosa pine forest stretches from the Grand Canyon into New Mexico, across a rather wide swath of Arizona at an elevation of about 7,000 feet. It is beautiful country, with pine trees, aspen, fir, spruce, lakes, rivers—not the kind of environment you would ordinarily associate with Arizona. It is a place to which many Arizonans repair during the summer when it is very warm “down in the valley,” as we call it. It contains some of the most interesting and unique habitat in the United States—habitat, both flora and fauna, which is not preserved by wildfire but is absolutely and utterly destroyed.

You might be interested to know that an area not far from this—75,000 acres—burned a couple years ago, and it was the largest black bear habitat in the whole United States. When you think of Arizona, think of habitat for an enormous variety of animals, including fish and birds, that has now been destroyed by this fire. We have the Apache golden trout, which, at great pains and at great cost, the Apache Indian tribe and the U.S. Government have tried for years to bring back to the area of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation and surrounding areas. It has been dealt a huge setback because of the fire that has gone through the area which this trout ordinarily populates. The erosion that will come from the devastation caused by this fire will clog the streams, and it is unlikely, I have heard today, that the Apache trout will be able to make a comeback in this area.

I am sure there are many other species—the gosant, just to mention one—that will be devastated as a result of this fire.

Yet it is interesting that some of the radical environmentalists in our country are the very ones who are responsible for preventing the kind of management of our forests that might have prevented this devastation. Their view is that man should not touch the forest. As one of them was reported as saying today: If the price for that is a 500,000-acre fire with an entire town like Show Low, AZ, devastated, then so be it; that is the way it should be. That is a misreading of history and science.

A century ago, before we overgrazed the area, and before we employed a pol-

icy of fighting all of the fires, fire regularly burned through our beautiful ponderosa pine forests. We had, about every 7 years, a small fire that would burn the “fuel” on the ground and a few of the smaller trees, but it could not hurt the great big, beautiful trees—maybe 50, or 60, or 70, or 80 per acre. Now we have 3,000 trees per acre, or more, because we have suppressed the fires and the grazing has resulted not in more grass growing but all of these seedlings growing.

If you look at a lot of these forests in Arizona today, instead of the big sequoia trees, which is what the mature ponderosas look like, you see what is called a “dog-haired thicket,” which is a forest so thick with stunted, little—frankly, ugly—trees and brush that they say a dog cannot even run through without losing half of his hair. It is hard to walk through these forests; they are so thick with this “fuel,” as the Forest Service people call it.

What happens when there is a lightning strike or a man-caused fire, as in this case? Instead of burning around the ground, licking at the base of these big trees—and they shrug it off—it roars throughout the underbrush and climbs up the ladder of the smaller trees, up through the higher trees, and finally the superheated structure at top of the trees explodes into flame, and the flames swirl, creating air currents, and even affecting the weather. The fire then races across the top of the forest, devastating everything in its path. The heat is so intense, the soil is sterilized and the waxes from the needles that ordinarily don't bother the forest floor melt and literally create a coating on the floor. The rains that may someday come—although we have not had any for a long time—will wash the unprotected soil into the streams, creating huge erosion problems, and it will be a hundred years before this forest once again looks like it did a week ago.

That is just the impact on the forest itself. The other fauna—various varieties of animals, birds, fish, and insects—are destroyed. That is not to mention the human tragedy. The elderly people who moved to these communities, because they are retirement and recreation communities, don't want to leave their homes. A family I heard about saw the pictures and saw that their outbuildings had been burned, and they had no idea whether their own home was still standing. The town of Show Low, with 30,000-plus people, was evacuated. Every one of the citizens was forced to leave town. The fire is within the town limits, and it has been there for basically a day now, as the firemen from our State and from other places in the country are battling to keep it from totally destroying that town.

Almost as bad, immediately to the south of town there is basically a clear path of forest, tinderbox dry, all the way to New Mexico that would literally devastate the entire Apache-

Sitgreaves Forest, which I consider to be some of the most beautiful country in the world. Our own summer cabin is in those mountains. I know the area. I have hiked it. I love it.

It is a tragedy of unspeakable proportion that we have allowed a condition to endure that created this much devastation. To give you an idea of the magnitude, a person not from Arizona was asked to describe it, or try to characterize it, provide an objective description. He thought for a long time and finally said:

I have seen one thing worse, Mount St. Helens.

Now, could this have been prevented? The answer is, probably so—at least to the order of magnitude of this devastation. We have known for a long time that it is possible to manage our forests by going into these densely populated forests, mechanically thinning them—that is to say, removing all the little trees I spoke of in the brush, the downed trees, and so on, mechanically moving most of it; and then during October and November, when it is cool and wet, you burn what is left during a prescribed burn, which is very safe, so that the following spring grasses crop up. And what we have found by research done out of the Northern Arizona University—primarily by Wally Covington and his group—is that the number of species of butterflies and birds and animals of all kinds, by orders of magnitude, return to the area and the protein content of the grass is great. The antelope, deer, and elk want to get there to graze. Also, the pitch content of the trees is improved so the bark beetles cannot get in and cause the trees to die. It looks so much better. Instead of this tangled mass of little trees and brush, which I talked about before, you have beautiful, big trees that, as I say, look like the sequoias in California, and which are much healthier as a result of the fact that they are not competing with so many little trees for the nutrients in the water and the soil.

It can be done by thinning and taking out that dead brush and then, in appropriate cases, doing a prescribed burn as well. After that, nature can take its course. When you have a lightning strike 5, 6, 7 years later, what happens? It burns along the ground. It will burn the grass and some of the stumps that are left, but it will not crown to the top of these trees, creating the devastating fires we have seen.

Why haven't we been able to do that? I am sorry to say it is a combination of a lot of factors, but most of it goes back to one central problem: There are radical environmentalists who don't agree with this. Most mainstream environmentalists understand that this so-called ecological restoration is exactly what our forests need, and they are willing to support it. Yes, there are quibbles about, do you cut 16-inch or 24-inch diameter trees, but the concept is agreed to.

Some of the radicals are so afraid that there will be any commercial tim-

ber operation left standing in this country—and there is none in Arizona to speak of anymore—but they are so afraid somebody might make a little bit of money cutting timber commercially that they will do anything to prevent anybody from getting into the forest to cut trees; thus, our roadless policy, and thus, 5,000 appeals to Forest Service actions seeking to go into our forests and provide this kind of management. Between 40 and 50 percent of the Forest Service budget is devoted to dealing with these legal challenges.

Think about that for a moment. Talk about a litigious society. Between 40 and 50 percent of the Forest Service budget is devoted to these administrative and legal challenges to moving forward with this management. Part of the fault is Congress. We have written laws that are so open-ended and unclear that it is very easy for radical environmentalists to find something wrong and challenge one of these proposed management programs.

Bureaucrats make mistakes. It is always easy to stop a project. It is very difficult to move these projects forward, as a result of which a lot of Forest Service people have essentially given up. I have asked them and they say: Why should we propose any more? We will get stopped, and we don't have enough personnel to fight this in court or in the administrative process.

There is plenty of blame to go around. We tried to get more funding in the Congress, and, frankly, my colleagues have not been all that supportive. We tried to get support from this administration and the past administration. Again, we could have had a whole lot more help than we have received.

To its credit, this administration only had one budget, and I am hopeful that as a result of this—the Secretary of the Interior I know is strongly committed to this kind of management, as is the head of the Forest Service. I am hopeful that as unfortunate as the Rodeo fire is—and, by the way, the Chediski fire—might stimulate both the administration and my colleagues in the Congress to support more meaningful management practices.

I spoke with friends on the other side of the aisle who are anxious to help in this regard because all the Western States have the same environment. The ponderosa forest is a little different than other forests. They have their own nuances but generally the concept is pretty much the same.

We need to do three things. We need to, first, provide whatever supplemental funding is necessary to deal with the crisis that is here today. The Forest Service long ago spent all the money we gave it to fight fires. We are just entering the fire season. We have to replenish those accounts and get more money into the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Second, we have to in next year's budget provide adequate funding for the implementation of a forest plan

that provides this management on a large-scale basis. The General Accounting Office said 3 years ago that we have to treat 35 million acres in a 15- to 20-year period or these forests will be lost forever through disease and burning. Now it is down to about 30 million because about 4 million of those have burned. But we still have a job and less time within which to do it. We need to devote the resources that are necessary, and that will mean spending some money.

Third, we will have to change some of the laws to provide for more expedited procedures to get these plans approved and to make it more difficult for frivolous objections to prevail or to slow up the process. If these plans are done in accordance with commonly accepted good management practices, then the burden should be on those opposing the sale to prove why the sale should not go forward.

When I use the term "sale," I want to be very specific. We do not have enough money in this country to treat these forests without commercial enterprise. I have gotten a little bit of money each year to support Northern Arizona University and the research people in Denver who hire AmeriCorps volunteers and grad students at the university to go out during the summer and do some of the work by hand. They can treat a few hundred acres doing that, but they cannot do a large area treatment that the GAO said is necessary. That is why we are going to need commercial enterprises to clear the forest of the debris, the fuel about which we are talking.

Somebody might make a little bit of money doing that, but it is not going to be by taking out the big trees that all of us want to preserve. It will be by having enough wood for fiber board, plywood, and a few poles for cabinet construction, for example. There may be a little bit of lumber but not very much.

Those are the actions we are going to have to undertake in the next few days to begin to deal with this situation. The one way we can begin to repair what has occurred and to keep faith with the people who have lost their homes and their livelihood, their livestock, and, frankly, the people of this great Nation who have now lost a tremendous resource of almost half a million acres in Arizona, one way we can help to make this right is to see it does not happen again. We can do that by implementing sound management that begins to restore our forests to the way God created them and the way they can be preserved if we will but treat them as we would treat anything that belongs to us in our own yard or in our own garden.

We would never hope to have a successful garden without ever weeding it, and there has been a parallel made of our forests to our gardens. To keep it healthy, one has to weed it every now and then. That is not unnatural. In fact, it is a very natural way of dealing with our forests.

Madam President, I join all who have expressed sympathies and best wishes for the people who have suffered as a result of this fire. I appreciate all the comments that have been made to me, expressions of concern and support. I am absolutely delighted President Bush is going to be flying to Arizona tomorrow to this little town of Show Low whose Fourth of July parade I do not think I have missed now in about 15 years. It is a beautiful little town. I know the people of Show Low and of northeast Arizona will appreciate the President's visit, and I know it will be on behalf of all of us that he visits there and expresses our sympathies and concerns and hope for the future as a result of our ability to join together and engage in sound management practice.

I support what he is doing. I regret I cannot join him. I know he would ask us to do the work here in response to this important Defense authorization bill.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a Wall Street Journal editorial of Friday, June 21.

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

[From The Wall Street Journal, June 21, 2002]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK
THE FIRE THIS TIME

In December 1995, a storm hit the Six Rivers National Forest in northern California, tossing dead trees across 35,000 acres and creating dangerous fire conditions. For three years local U.S. Forest Service officials labored to clean it up, but they were blocked by environmental groups and federal policy. In 1999 the time bomb blew: A fire roared over the untreated land and 90,000 more acres.

Bear this anecdote in mind as you watch the 135,000-acre Hayman fire now roasting close to Denver. And bear it in mind the rest of this summer, in what could be the biggest marshmallow-toasting season in half a century. Because despite the Sierra Club spin, catastrophic fires like the Hayman are not inevitable, or good. They stem from bad forest management—which found a happy home in the Clinton Administration.

In a briefing to Congress last week, U.S. Forest chief Dale Bosworth finally sorted the forest from the tree-huggers. He said that if proper forest-management had been implemented 10 years ago, and if the agency weren't in the grip of "analysis paralysis" from environmental regulation and lawsuits, the Hayman fire wouldn't be raging like an inferno.

Mr. Bosworth also presented Congress with a sobering report on our national forests. Of the 192 million acres the Forest Service administers, 73 million are at risk from severe fire. Tens of millions of acres are dying from insects and diseases. Thousands of miles of roads, critical to fighting fires, are unusable. Those facts back up a General Accounting Office report, which estimates that one in three forest acres is dead or dying. So much for the green mantra of "healthy ecosystems."

How did one of America's great resources come to such a pass? Look no further than the greens who tramped into power with the last Administration. Senior officials adopted an untested philosophy known as "ecosystem management," a bourgeois bohemian

plan to return forests to their "natural" state. The Clintonites cut back timber harvesting by 80% and used laws and lawsuits to put swathes of land off-limits to commercial use.

We now see the results. Millions of acres are choked with dead wood, infected trees and underbrush. Many areas have more than 400 tons of dry fuel per acre—10 times manageable level. This is tinder that turns small fires into infernos, outrunning fire control and killing every fuzzy endangered animal in sight. In 2000 alone fires destroyed 8.4 million acres, the worst fire year since the 1950s. Some 800 structures were destroyed—many as a fire swept across Los Alamos, New Mexico—and control and recovery costs neared \$3 billion. The Forest Service's entire budget is \$4.9 billion.

That number, too, is important. Before the Clinton Administration limited timber sales, U.S. forests helped pay for their own upkeep. Selective logging cleaned up grounds and paid for staff, forestry stations, cleanup and roads. Today, with green groups blocking timber sales at every turn, the GAO says taxpayers will have to spend \$12 billion to cart off dead wood.

It's no accident that two of the main Clinton culprits—former director of Fish & Wildlife Jamie Rappaport Clark and former Forest Service boss Michael Dombeck—have both landed at the National Wildlife Federation, which broadcasts across its Internet homepage, "Fires Are Good."

Fixing all of this won't be easy. After 30 years of environmental regulation, the Forest Service now spends 40% of its time in "planning and assessment." Even the smallest project takes years. Mr. Bosworth has identified the problems, but fixing them will require White House leadership and Congressional cooperation.

One solution would be to follow the lead of private timber companies, whose forests don't tend to suffer such catastrophic fires. Their trees are an investment; they can't afford to let them burn. Americans should feel the same way about theirs.

MANAGEMENT OF OUR FORESTS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I know a number of Senators who are in the Chamber who could probably speak to this subject better than I. Certainly the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Colorado know plenty about the subject matter. But I thought I might give my own assessment, very cursory in nature but, nonetheless, somewhat relevant.

We here in Washington, DC, are only getting to view the State of Arizona, as it burns, on our television sets. We have seen, in the last few days, large forests in Colorado burn. They are not under control yet. We can only imagine the additional fires that are likely to come in the State of New Mexico. New Mexico has already had a number this year. We also had a series last year and the year before.

Senators remember when we came to the floor about Los Alamos, NM. There, the forest burned right around the city of Los Alamos. We lost almost 400 houses. We have not lost that many this year, but the way the fire season looks, there will be plenty of damage.

I just want to say to the Senate and to those listening, it is this Senator's opinion that we have not made an

American decision about the maintenance of our forests.

I believe we have made decisions in a haphazard way because of litigation and certain people in our country who think they know best about forest management. These same people have prevailed in the courts over our professional managers. It leaves us wondering tonight how many more hundreds of thousands of acres will burn? And we don't know. But what many of us think is that our forests are not being managed and maintained. They do not have the maximum opportunity to stand, but rather are likely to burn down.

Our forests are so clogged with underbrush that you cannot even walk in some of them—but they sure will burn. I submit that we have taken for granted too long that forest management is going all right. Now, the courts are determining lawsuits, which, in turn, determine forest management policies. It seems to this Senator that it is all finally catching up.

When drought and heat are combined with forests clogged with fuel, the incendiary nature is so severe. We sit here every year wondering what we can do in our committees. We continue to call the land managers and they tell us they are making headway. It is hard to see sometimes, but pretty soon we must get this done.

I believe this year—even though we cannot finish it—we ought to start with the appropriate committee and get prepared to undertake a major senatorial investigation of the forests of the United States, including those that are part of the Agriculture Department and those that are BLM. We should make some determinations sooner rather than later, as to whether we have been maintaining the forests in a manner that is most apt to cause them to be burned down, and that either is or is not good for our country.

Some think what I just described is good. I don't think it is. But I think we owe it to our people to get the experts of our country and make a big, major American decision: Are we to maintain our forests so they are filled with underbrush that will burn down, or are we to maintain it another way? Which way are we maintaining it? Is it in an orderly manner, or is it being determined by court cases pushed and pursued by endangered species laws and others that have caused our forests to be so mismanaged that they are just ready to burn and burn? This isn't the last one today. We are not even in the middle of the summer. Imagine. We see forests out there loaded with underbrush, with the hot, boiling sun, no rain or clouds in the sky, but no trees on the ground either.

Just in passing, it is amazing because, even when the trees are all burned we cannot cut them down. We have to leave them there to rot because there are some who win in the courts of law and say that is a better way to manage. So there they stand as relics