

historical and statutory notes that the 107th Congress reaffirmed the exact language that has appeared in the Pledge for decades.

SEC. 3. REAFFIRMING THAT GOD REMAINS IN OUR MOTTO.

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—Section 302 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 302. National motto

“‘In God we trust’ is the national motto.”.

(b) CODIFICATION.—In codifying this subsection, the Office of the Law Revision Council shall make no change in section 302, title 36, United States Code, but shall show in the historical and statutory notes that the 107th Congress reaffirmed the exact language that has appeared in the Motto for decades.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3009

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 3009.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the message.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Madam President.

Mr. DASCHLE. I withdraw the request, Madam President.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes as in morning business.

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

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I rise today to talk about forest management, although I am certainly sad it has taken the current catastrophic wildfires out West to get some attention on this issue.

On May 18, before most of the fires had started and were underway, I held a field hearing for the Energy Committee in Golden, CO, to review coordination of firefighting efforts. The four intergovernmental witnesses all expressed serious concern that Colorado's unnaturally dense forests pose serious risk of unnaturally hot burning and unmanageable fires, increasing the danger to both people and property. Unfortunately, that worry became a very real, unimaginable reality for much of the West.

In our State alone just this year, we have had over 350,000 acres burn. As of yesterday, the Hayman fire east of I-25

between Denver and Colorado Springs had burned in excess of 137,000 acres, much of it in the all-important South Platte watershed of the City of Denver.

While the fire is now 70 percent contained, over 1,200 residents are at risk and many lost their homes. In fact, 618 homes and structures burned, and it has cost over \$26 million so far in fighting this fire. The Forest Service tells us much of this fire is in an area of diseased and stressed timber, some of which they have been attempting to clean up, but opponents are delaying this needed management through courtroom appeals and litigation.

It is important to note that large parts of the area that has burned are in the areas that were designated as roadless during the Clinton administration, under the Clinton management plan.

We have the Million Fire near the little town of South Fork, CO, near Wolf Creek Pass. That fire is not big by the standards of this summer, but it has already consumed over 8,500 acres, and it is right on the outskirts of the town of South Fork. We have lost 13 homes and buildings in that fire. The resource managers tell us it is burning in an area of spruce and ponderosa pine already killed by insects.

History shows many of proposed salvage sales on the Rio Grande National Forest have also been opposed by opponents of cleaning the forests, and they have had difficulty getting proactive thinning and sanitation harvesting through the NEPA process. The agency tells us that nearly 100 additional homes and commercial buildings are currently threatened and that the town's watershed is also in the line of fire.

Finally, just near where I live in Durango, CO, what is called the Missionary Ridge fire, which I am sure you have seen on CNN and a number of other networks, is 15 miles from the town of Durango, CO—in fact, I can see it from my front porch—and it is burning that way. Ten subdivisions are endangered, over 1,150 residences are being evacuated, and we have lost 71 homes and outbuildings. The municipal watersheds of the towns of Durango and Bayfield are threatened, as well as numerous businesses, radio towers, and homes.

The interesting part of that fire is it is burning mostly in RARE II roadless areas. Last week, when I was home, the fire was only about 2 miles from the city limits of the town of Durango with zero containment and certainly has had a devastating impact on the morale of the community, on the structures, and on tourism, which is the backbone and mainstay of our economy.

All of those fires I have mentioned have really been eclipsed and overshadowed by the huge fire in Arizona in the Coconino National Forest, not far from the White River National Forest.

I am reminded of 1996, when there was an effort by the Forest Service to

do some fuels reduction in the Coconino Forest. They were prevented from doing so by an environmental lawsuit under the Endangered Species Act which contended that the fuels reduction would disturb the goshawk, a small hawk. Later that same year, there was a fire that did start in that forest, and it destroyed everything in its path, including the goshawk nests. Now we have almost the same catastrophic fire in the White River National Forest.

Time and again, we hear from Colorado firefighters who are frustrated they can't seem to get ahead of the fires. I submit we cannot seem to get ahead of some of the lawsuits that block our responsible management of the forests, and we won't be able to get any place under control until we do. This year so far, we have had over 300 fires nationwide, and the fire season is just starting.

The science is certain: Thinning forests at natural levels significantly reduces the threat of wildfires. Yet the constant threat of environmental lawsuits has resulted in what has been described by the Forest Service as “analysis paralysis.” The Forest Service is now forced to study and assess proposed actions, not for the right reasons, but because of any potential action in the courts, in anticipation of a flurry of lawsuits and appeals by some extreme groups. Dale Bosworth, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before our committee that they are now using over 40 percent of their agency work and a good deal of their resources, about \$250 million a year, that could have gone to save lives and property. Instead, they are using it to prepare for court actions against opponents of cleaning the forest.

Environmental groups are proud of that obstruction-through-litigation strategy because every dollar we spend in litigating is one less dollar we spend on managing the forest. They do acknowledge, however, that forests are unnaturally dense.

In Colorado, normally we have 50 trees per acre. But now we see stands of 200, 500, and 800 trees per acre, representing unmanageable fuel loads. Many of these trees are dying from insect infestation, which increases the fire risk. Yet environmentalists still oppose any thinning or removal of dead timber except if it is near homes or around homes. They argue that thinning other parts of the forest grants unnecessary footholds for the “big, bad” timber industry that will ravage the landscape. It is interesting that what they completely ignore is that industry thinning on national forests is done under very close scrutiny of the National Environmental Policy Act.

What about lawsuits in the name of animals? On the one hand, environmentalists sue land managers to keep them from thinning because the action might disturb all manner of species. On the other hand, they ignore the complete devastation that catastrophic

fires such as the ones we are experiencing do to the same species.

I spoke to one firefighter last week. He told me that the 150-foot flames in the Mission Ridge fire were traveling so fast and were so intense that birds in flight were actually being burned out of the air. Certainly, most small animals that are land animals have no chance at all. That includes the spotted owl, the red squirrel, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and hundreds of animals on the endangered species list.

In arguing against thinning, environmentalists also ignore the very real long-term damage that large and intense fires have on soil and watersheds. Over 70 percent of our Nation's water comes from waterbodies in our forests. Yet, these environmental groups would prohibit thinning around watersheds, such as the South Platte project. I would have thought that they would support such efforts, especially after the Buffalo Creek fire of 1996, which cost the city of Denver millions of dollars to restore water quality.

Environmentalists oppose improving the safety of our watersheds because they fear losing the Clinton-era "roadless rule," which provides that no new roads can be built where none exist. Their prized "roadless rule" effectively acts as a wilderness designation requiring an act of Congress.

It is ironic that the "roadless rule" that environmentalists hold so dear was recently ruled illegal by a Federal judge in Idaho because the public comment period was grossly inadequate, stating, "Justice hurried on a proposal of this magnitude is Justice denied."

I am a big supporter of grass roots initiatives—local communities should be involved in land management decisions. Opportunities for public comment and participation are important aspects of environmental law. However, these opportunities are being poisoned by radical groups too interested in legitimizing their own worth to contributors than in collaboratively working for the betterment of our Nation's resources.

Some of these organizations have effectively paralyzed responsible forest management practices, thus contributing to poor forest health. In fact, 73 million acres of national forest are at risk from severe wildland fires. In the West, more than half of the rangeland riparian area on the National Forest System do not meet standards for healthy watersheds, and one in six acres in the Rocky Mountain and Plains states is making no progress toward improvement. All this in the name of environmentalism.

Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth recently acknowledged that the Hayman Fire near Denver would not have been nearly as severe had forest thinning projects gone forward.

I am unwilling to allow our forest's health and environmental quality to continue deteriorating simply because a minority of environmental organiza-

tions have thrown science and good sense out of the window in the name of their own political agenda while completely avoiding the tragedy of the 14 deaths of firefighters from the Storm King Fire of 1994 or the recent loss of five firefighters in a bus wreck while on their way to fight fire in Colorado.

I have seen the negative effect that some environmental organizations have had in the West for a long time. But enough is enough—something has to change. It is unfortunate that it has taken tragic fires like the ones raging out West to get the Nation and the media to acknowledge the same.

I hope, as we move from this Congress to the next, we will look for more positive ways to achieve responsible forest management.

With that, I yield the floor and 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, be recognized for 3 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

AMTRAK

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, the attention of a lot of people in the Northwest and in the Midwest and in California has been drawn to the potential shutdown not just of the Amtrak passenger rail service, but commuter rail service in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Delaware, Chicago, Los Angeles, and a lot of places in between.

Amtrak has sought to negotiate a loan from a consortium of private lenders. Literally in the middle of the negotiation, the administration put on the table its restructuring plan for Amtrak. That plan was, in my view, a "dismantling" plan for Amtrak. That was the end of the negotiations with the private lenders, for the most part.

Now Amtrak faces a difficult decision as to when to begin curtailing and shutting down its operations. When they do that, it will have a cascading effect on the operations of many commuter railroads in America as well.

The Secretary of the Department of Transportation, Norman Mineta, was before one of our committees today testifying. Knowing him as an old colleague and somebody who I respect, I think he is in a tough spot. I have not been inside his heart to see what he would want to do in his heart. Given that independence, I think he would

favor going ahead with the loan guarantee, or support the Congress in going through and including a \$200 million emergency supplemental for Amtrak. The administration, which created this crisis before us, is now still in a very good position to end the crisis, the threat. They can do that by saying, yes, we will provide the full loan guarantee, or we will support the appropriation from the Congress.

Our thanks to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and Senator STEVENS, the ranking Republican, for their willingness to support \$200 million in the emergency supplemental to help us get through this difficult time, and later this fall we will resolve more fully the passenger rail service in this country.

I have said for a long time—and I will say it again today—the problem with passenger rail service in this country is we have never provided adequate capital support for passenger rail service. We need to do that, to find an earmark source of revenue. I hope in the months to come we will debate that and come to a consensus on that point.

I thank the Chair.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 3009; that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, agree to the request for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on behalf of the Senate: three on behalf of the majority and two on behalf of the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have had a number of discussions with respect to how many conferees the Senate would want to have involved in this very important conference that will deal with trade issues on which we spent a great deal of time in the Senate, including the Andean trade authority, as well as the overall large trade assistance bill and the Trade Promotion Act—three very important pieces included in this one bill.

As we look at this, I think this is going to be one of the most important conferences we are going to deal with this year.

The House has a small number of conferees to the underlying bill, but they have a number of conferees to different sections to the bill. I suspect there is a total number of House conferees involved that would probably run in the 18 range.

We have members of the Finance Committee who worked very hard on this important legislation, and I had