

What we see on television, when we see the pictures of these enormous forest fires, is the canopies of the big trees literally superheating and then exploding into flame, and this is what spreads the fire for miles and miles.

If the dead and dying fuel on the forest floor is removed, the down fuel as well as those small-diameter trees that are literally choking the forests to death right now, it is not only opened up for the trees and other flora and fauna that we want to grow properly but it also removes a significant fire danger. That is what the scientific community understands needs to be done.

The problem is that there are radical environmentalists who do not want to see this done. Ironically, our goal is the same: To protect those beautiful big trees and to create a healthy environment for all of the other flora and fauna. But they are so afraid that a timber industry will be either preserved or regenerated, and that that timber industry will soon set its sights on cutting the big trees as well, that they are really willing to cut off their nose to spite their face; that is to say, to risk the health of the entire forest in order that a timber industry is not encouraged to take hold.

In my State of Arizona, there is not any more timber industry, so we are not interested in bringing an industry back. It is gone. There are a couple of small mills that can take small-diameter timber and make 2 by 4's and fiberboard. The White Mountain Apache Indian Tribe has two small mills that can handle larger diameter timber which they cut on their reservation.

But this is not about creating a timber industry in Arizona. It is not about logging. We are not going to have logging as we used to know it. It is about companies being permitted to do the Government's work of cleaning out the forests and making a little bit of profit. They are not going to do it for free. We do not have enough money in the budget to pay the cost of doing that. They have to be willing to do it for the small amount of money they can make on the products they are now permitted to sell.

That is what this debate has been all about, and I am very discouraged that the radical environmental movement has such a stranglehold on some politicians that even though they will privately tell us they understand the scientists are right, that we do need to go in and manage our forests, they are not willing to confront these people in an open forum. It has been an interesting one-sided debate we have had in the Senate. No one has defended the other position. The reason is because it is indefensible. It boils down to a political issue. That is too bad for the forests.

I understand what happens when we are not able to reach agreement. We are not going to be able to get 60 votes to carry the day. As a result, we have to find another way to do this. Therefore, depending upon what the assist-

ant majority leader and others decide to do at the end of the day, that issue may well be behind us as of tonight as something we will deal with in the Senate. That is too bad. We should have been able to deal with that.

I add a postscript before I turn to the next subject. Some on my side of the aisle have criticized the majority leader because he was able to secure in an appropriations bill special relief for his home State of South Dakota and the Black Hills by doing exactly what we are talking about, thinning those forests. He did that by, in effect, waiving all environmental considerations. In other words, the legislation provided the sufficiency for environmental achievement and nothing further was required to clean up these forests.

There was criticism. I suppose one could criticize the use of the process in the way that he did but frankly, I cannot criticize what he was attempting to achieve and what will be achieved as a result of his actions. The Black Hills are some of my favorite forests in this country. I used to vacation there as a young boy. I love the Black Hills. I am glad the majority leader saw fit to save the Black Hills. I wish we could apply something close to that same management technique for the rest of the country's forests. I find it ironic people would permit it to be done in this one area, which I support, but nowhere else.

I hope we can find a way to address this in the future, put the politics behind us, and get back to a scientific resolution of the issue.

IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the second subject I address is a resolution the White House has sent Congress for consideration of Presidential authority to deal with the problem of Iraq. There have been questions raised this weekend about the language of the resolution and the need, in some people's minds, to define it and provide greater definition.

My own view is the President and his administration did a very good job at crafting a resolution which will give the President the authority he needs to do the things we understand have to be done. I am a little worried about trying to be too cute in drafting language that will constrain the President in a variety of ways, not because we do not want to know what the President has in mind, but because we do not want to come back to the Congress every time the President needs some additional component of authority in fighting this war on terror.

The immediate need is to grant the authority to follow up on the resolutions that were violated by Saddam Hussein, and that if the United Nations is not going to take action, and it is not, then for the United States to be able to do that. We will pass that resolution by a fairly wide margin both in the House of Representatives and in

the Senate. I am hoping Members of this body will not view it necessary to draft the language in such a way that it puts the interests of the United States behind the authority of the United Nations.

The U.S. Government and those who represent the people of America will act on behalf of the security interests of the American people. That ought to be our first objective, not to try to resurrect the good reputation of the United Nations, not to put the U.S. position in a subservient role to the Security Council of the United Nations, and not to subject our decisionmaking or the President's authority to act to approval first of a body in the United Nations.

I therefore urge my colleagues not to succumb to the temptation of inserting language which would submit first to the United Nations and then the U.S. Congress.

It was my understanding—perhaps I should have asked unanimous consent before I began to speak—that I would be allotted 20 minutes, 10 minutes beyond the usual time.

Mr. REID. We have a limited amount of time. We have Democrats that need to speak.

I am sorry, but I have to object.

Mr. KYL. Might I then have 30 seconds to explain that I had been told that I would have 20 minutes, and I have calibrated my remarks to reflect that? I regret I will not be able to finish these remarks.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator. We on this side have speakers who wish to speak. If the entire allotted time is not used—I think it will be; we have our time allotted—perhaps the Senator wants to wait around to see if Democrats show up when they are supposed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair observes that the minority controls 8 minute 16 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask that the Senator from New Mexico be allocated the 8 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I will not get a chance today to accomplish what I intend to accomplish. I assure those who are listening they will not have to wait long to get the rest of it because as we get time this week, we will start talking a little bit.

The majority side, led by the majority leader and the chairman of the Budget Committee, last week took to the floor one or two times with lengthy discussions about the American economy, with comments by each of them about who was to blame for the economic shortcomings that exist today.

I start with the economic downturn. Many Members and a few Americans remember the name Joseph Stiglitz. He was chairman of President Clinton's

Council of Economic Advisers. He is quoted in the *Atlantic Monthly*, October 2002, page 77. He was known as an erudite and academically brilliant economist. He summarized when asked: When did the downturn start?

He said:

The economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office, and the corporate scandals that are rocking America began much earlier.

In this article he is explaining the American economy, which had been so buoyant for almost 10 years. We spoke of it from both sides of the aisle, with great admiration and fantastic respect for who did what, who did not do what, and why did this American economy grow.

He is suggesting the beginnings of the downward trends, in response to a question:

The economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office . . .

Not when he sent us a budget; not when he sent us a tax bill; not when he recommended we have tax cuts to perk this economy up; not when he recommended we spend more money to continue perking it up. Before those events occurred, the American economy was slipping into recession.

It is all right by this Senator that we come to the floor and state what we think. It is all right with me if we state them in political tones. It is all right with me if we state them with overtones that are patently political. It is someone's responsibility, when they think that is the case, to at least try to respond.

I will not be able, in the next 5 or 6 minutes, to respond to what probably was more than an hour last week by two or three on the other side, led by their leader, the majority leader, and the chairman of the Budget Committee, and what they had to say when they blamed the President of the United States for almost everything that is going wrong with the economy, in spite of many of them knowing that this is the fact, that this is the salient fact—that it all began long before that. We may be even fortunate that the economy, in its downward pressures, did not get worse. Perhaps it did not get worse because we did some things right under the leadership of the President and with Congress. Although it was difficult, hard work, we did follow most of his suggestions to try to get out from the slippage.

In less than a week we will enter the new fiscal year, the year of 2003. Let me repeat, in less than 1 week we will be entering the new Federal fiscal year, fiscal year 2003. As this new fiscal year approaches without us having enacted even one appropriations bill for next year, I have been struck by some of the statements being made on the floor—principally on that side of the aisle, and principally by leaders of the majority party.

Recently, the majority leader and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee have taken to the floor to

criticize the President's handling of the economy. I would like to be as honest as I can about this, so let's try to be honest as to what this is all about. This is politics, in my humble opinion, at its worst. Unwilling or afraid to face up to their own responsibilities, unable to defend their own record for failing to enact a budget in the Senate for the first time in the history of the Budget Act, they are now trying to confuse the public and somehow blame the President or the House of Representatives—which happens to be Republican by a few votes—for their failure. So now the time has come to play the blame game and to run away from whatever you have done and pin it on somebody else. That is this time of year.

This is important, and I would like the record to be clear. Back in May, the majority leader blamed the lack of a budget on an evenly divided membership in the Senate. Earlier this month, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. McAuliffe, appearing on a Sunday morning show—I think it was "Face The Nation"—said: Don't blame us: . . . we need 60 votes for a budget.

Finally, last week the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, referring to an amendment that was voted in the Senate on June 20, clearly implying that it was a Senate budget, literally said here on the floor:

. . . we got 59 votes for that proposal on a bipartisan basis. We needed a supermajority, which is 60.

Let me be as clear as I possibly can. We have not voted on a budget resolution in the Senate this year. We have not voted on a budget this year in the Senate. This will be the first time in the Budget Act's nearly 27-year history that the Senate has not adopted a budget blueprint. Say what you want about what it is or what it is not, we have always seen fit to adopt one. As tough as it was, as many hard votes as it took in the hours allotted under law, we always got one. We got one out of the committee when we were practically tied, for all intents and purposes. But no budget resolution has been brought to the floor of the Senate to be debated and voted on this year.

The chairman of the Budget Committee knows this. The majority leader knows this. To even hint that we have considered a budget is an absolute insult to those of us who worked to make this process a functional part of fiscal decisionmaking here in the Senate.

If my time is up, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WYDEN). The Senator from Nevada, the assistant majority leader.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico, has a chart. He talks about when the downturn started. The fact is, it is here. To try to divert attention from the problems of this country by trying to talk about when this problem start-

ed really doesn't do the trick. Presidents are blamed or given credit for what happens during their 4 years of office. That is the way it is, and that is the way it should be. The fact is, during this administration the economy has gone downhill every month the President has been in office.

To talk about when a problem started, we had problems during the 8 years that Clinton was President, but he was able to respond to make sure the country went on an upward path after that. The fact is, President Bush, no matter what he received when he was President, has done nothing to alleviate the problem. He has made it worse.

I would say to my friend from New Mexico, if he read the rest of Stiglitz's article, I find Stiglitz blames much, if not all, of the problems of this economy directly on the President, President Bush's economic policies. We just had Stiglitz appear before the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and he spent all afternoon telling us what was wrong with the Bush economic policies. Joseph Stiglitz has won a Nobel Prize in economics. He is one of the most renowned economists in the world. He places the blame at the foot of the President of the United States, President Bush, for the economy we now have.

There may have been some corporate problems that started many years ago. But, remember, this White House wanted to bring corporate America to the White House—and they did. There is no better example of that than the fact that when the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission was having his confirmation hearings, he said he wanted to bring a kinder more gentle SEC to America. That is what we have had at this White House. They simply have been kinder and gentler. They brought corporate America to the White House. The American people do not want that.

My friend also mentions in passing the United States of Representatives, which is controlled by the Republicans by just a few votes. Those of us who have served in the House of Representatives know the party that controls the House of Representatives controls the agenda over there. That is the way it works. It has always worked that way. One reason we have gotten nothing done in the Congress is because the Republican majority in the House of Representatives decided a long time ago they were not going to have anything happen this year. That is why we have every conference report stuck in a dark hole in the House of Representatives. They won't let us do anything on bankruptcy. They won't let us do anything on terrorism insurance. They won't let us do anything on election reform. They won't let us do anything on the Patients' Bill of Rights. They won't let us do anything on our generic drug bill, and on and on.

Whether it is 1 or 100 vote, it doesn't matter in the House of Representatives. It works like the parliamentary