

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 administrators, 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 trouped 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

to a management plan that, to this Senator, seems to say that our forests are not managed, but mismanaged.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

AMENDMENT NO. 3954 TO S. 2514

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, on Friday, amendment No. 3954 to S. 2514 was approved by the Senate and I would like to make a few remarks regarding this important provision.

I am proud to have sponsored this amendment with my good friend from Florida, Senator NELSON. We both have a strong interest in space, for personal and constituent reasons, and believe this amendment, while only a Sense of the Senate, is important to show that the Senate is on record supporting assured access to space.

United States national security and economic vitality depend on our ability to launch a variety of satellites into earth orbit. Access to and utilization of space provides an advantage to the United States that must be maintained. Unfortunately, significant contractions in the commercial space launch marketplace have eroded the overall viability of the United States space launch industrial base and could jeopardize the ability of the Department of Defense to provide assured access to space in the future.

The Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle, EELV, program is the Air Force's solution for assured access. EELV is designed to be more responsive and affordable than current launch vehicles. With EELV, the Air Force has adopted a commercial launch services approach. The DOD also shared with the contractors the investment to develop next generation launch vehicles—the Atlas V and Delta IV. In 1997, at a time when worldwide projections envisioned 70 launches per year, the Air Force decided to retain both EELV contractors rather than down selecting to a single provider. The commercial satellite marketplace, it appeared, would provide adequate sustainment for the U.S. space launch industrial base, thereby justifying the large contractor investments in EELV, and providing the DOD a more robust assured access capability for a relatively modest government investment. Since 1997, however, such launch projections have deteriorated by 65 percent. The 2002 projection envisions approximately 25 launches per year.

As the EELV program transitions from development to recurring operations, the Air Force is evaluating a range of options for sustaining the

launch infrastructure and industrial base necessary to assure access to space. The key to this effort is the maintenance of two financially stable launch service providers that will keep U.S. launch providers competitive in the global market and provide backup for any technical or operational problems that may be encountered. Such a program will not fundamentally alter the projected cost savings associated with the EELV program, a 25-50 percent reduction over today's systems. The Air Force is currently negotiating with the two EELV contractors to develop an appropriate cost and risk sharing strategy for assured success.

The amendment calls on the Air Force to evaluate all the options for sustaining the space launch industry base, develop an integrated, long-range, and adequately funded plan for assuring U.S. access to space, and for the Air Force to submit a report to Congress at the earliest possible time.

Again, I want to thank Senator NELSON for working with me on this simple but important sense of the Senate. I look forward to working with him on this and other space issues in the future.

---

MILITARY CHIEF NURSES

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, today I wish to address a timely and important amendment to increase the grade for the Chief Nurses of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to that of two stars. The existing law limits the position of Chief Nurse of the three branches of the military to that of Brigadier General in the Army and Air Force, and Rear Admiral, lower half, in the Navy.

Chief Nurses have a tremendous responsibility, their scope of duties include peacetime and wartime health care delivery, plus establishing standards and policy for all nursing personnel within their respective branches. They are responsible for thousands of Army, Navy, and Air Force officer and enlisted nursing personnel in the active, reserve, and guard components of the military. The military medical mission could not be carried out without nursing personnel. They are crucial to the mission in war and peace time, at home and abroad.

Organizations are best served when the leadership is composed of a mix of specialties, of equal rank, who bring their unique perspectives to the table when policies are established and decisions are made. This increased rank would guarantee that the nursing perspective is represented on critical issues that affect the military medical mission, patient care, and nursing practice. I believe it is time to ensure that the military health care system fully recognize and utilize the leadership ability of these outstanding patient care professionals.

E-MAIL SECURITY

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to address the Senate on an increasingly important topic: the security of the Internet, and specifically, the security of the e-mail we send across the Internet.

During my service on the Judiciary Committee I have held and attended a number of hearings on Internet oversight, and on the development of related legislation. Despite a thinning in the ranks of Internet focused companies, the Internet of course continues to become a more and more important part of our economic and personal lives.

In the wake of the September 11th and anthrax attacks, much of our attention has been focused on national security issues. The interruptions in traditional communications systems like the phone and traditional mail systems underscore the wisdom of the founders of the Internet, which began as a Defense Department project to develop a communications system that would be flexible and decentralized enough to withstand attacks that might cripple other systems. Internet technology is continually changing, and we need to be aware of its capabilities as well as any signs of vulnerability that can be exploited by those bent on using Internet access to attack the integrity of communications or vital data. In particular, since the anthrax attacks the nation has come to rely even more heavily on e-mail. There is no doubt that trust and confidence in e-mail, especially between businesses and consumers, is critical to the vital role such mail has played during recent months in keeping the channels of commerce and communication open despite blows to telephone service and traditional mail.

Yet, the Internet is vulnerable in its own ways. The Internet itself can be used by terrorists as well as by those of good intentions. While e-mail cannot be used by criminals and terrorists to spread harmful biological or chemical agents, there are risks in the way most e-mail is generated and transmitted. We have all been familiar with the various viruses that have been sent via e-mail and affected many computer systems. Among some of the risks are loss of privacy through unauthorized access to e-mail in transit and through invasions of e-mail host databases. Another technique is "spoofing," in which messages are sent purporting to be from a trusted sender in order to deceive the recipient, especially individual consumers and other citizens. We are increasingly threatened by viruses and other malicious code that can be carried on e-mails and unwittingly activated by the recipient.

We need to review industry's ongoing efforts to answer these challenges, and assess what individual consumers and policy makers can do. Some of these threats are familiar, others are just emerging. For example, by sending