

other U.S. officials as a result of the investigation, and when any such conclusions or findings were reported.

On Sunday, you stated that "there is now a lot of revisionism that says, there was disagreement on this data point, or disagreement on that data point." I disagree strongly with this characterization. I am not raising questions about the validity of an isolated "data point," and the issue is not whether the war in Iraq was justified or not.

What I want to know is the answer to a simple question: Why did the President use forged evidence in the State of the Union address? This is a question that bears directly on the credibility of the United States, and it should be answered in a prompt and forthright manner, with full disclosure of all the relevant facts.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Ranking Minority Member.

MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, both houses of Congress are continuing the difficult task of drafting comprehensive Medicare reform legislation this week.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep moving forward in the spirit of compromise on this extremely important issue.

Mr. Speaker, as time passes, the expectations of our constituencies continue to grow. We cannot return to our respective districts on the Fourth of July without some news of progress in the halls of Congress on a prescription drug plan for our seniors through Medicare.

Our colleagues in the other body have set the goal of reaching an agreement by the next recess, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this body to work on a bipartisan basis in order to reach a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue and we can not allow it to fail because of partisan differences.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Lincoln Echo Newspaper for 10 years of service to Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Last week, the Lincoln Echo celebrated its 10-year anniversary. It began with the mission of unifying Fort Smith's African-American community. When the paper was sold in 2001, its mission statement changed to reflect the changes in Fort Smith. Their new aim became to unify Fort Smith's diverse communities.

Their work has been noticed not only in Fort Smith but around the country, reaching over 25,000 readers in 29 different States. This paper has preached the importance of unity in our neighborhoods and continuously relays a positive message to all of its readers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Napoleon Black, Allen Black, Jr., Cecil Greene, Jr., and everyone involved in the Echo's success. I look forward to many more years of success for the Lincoln Echo.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the capital markets do not much care for indecision. When a company or industry is in regulatory flux, the industry is basically forced to be at a standstill. That is what is happening today with the telecommunications industry.

The Federal Communications Commission voted on February 20, 2003 to make changes to the way it regulates telecommunications carriers. Many of the changes were very significant, but the FCC is dragging its feet. These decisions will drive the short and long term future of the telecom industry. The industry, however, is stymied because the FCC, while having voted on the issue, has yet to issue the rules. This is quite unusual as texts of orders are issued usually within weeks or even days of the date that the item is voted on.

Here we are, almost 4 months later, and we still have no rules issued. It takes less time for a pig from time of conception to time of birth than it has taken the FCC to give birth to the written words embodying the agreements voted on in February.

The FCC needs to stop this nonsensical delay and issue its orders so the industry can get back to the business of building infrastructure and serving the telecommunications users of this Nation.

SAVE OUR FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration is about to open up our national forests to a new phase of road building. Now, in preparation for commenting on this, I had my staff check because the last time I had checked with the Forest Service, they had an 8 billion, not million, \$8 billion backlog on maintenance on Federal forest roads. Hundreds of thousands of miles of road, crisscrossing the United States, the West, and yet they have an \$8 billion backlog.

Now, the Forest Service said yesterday said, no, no, no, the Congressman is wrong. It is not 8 billion. We just recalculated it. And I thought, well, this will be good news. It is \$10.5 billion. The Forest Service has a \$10.5 billion backlog on Forest Service roads. Of the 382,000 miles of roads, only 21 percent meet their maintenance standards; 50 percent are declared unsafe for driving; and 50,000 miles of roads are missing

from the data. They are unclassified. They might be there. They might not. They might be passable; they might not. They have not had a chance to go out and look lately. Yet they are proposing under the Bush administration to begin a new phase of road building. Well, how is that?

Well, we heard a couple of weeks ago they will uphold the Clinton Roadless Rule. And I had some folks in Oregon say to me, We cannot believe that the Bush administration will uphold the Clinton roadless rule. And I said, Well, there were an incredible number of comments on that rule, over 2.2 million, over 600 public meetings. It was hard fought, well constructed, well thought out, and it was very popular among most folks in the western United States. And yet, I said, it does seem unusual.

Well, it turns out, no, they are not really going to uphold the roadless rule. They will immediately put in place exceptions for the Chugach and the Tongass Forests in Alaska, 300,000 acres. Except 300,000 acres of timber harvest with roads in the Tongass Forest will affect well over a million acres of land with fragmentation and eroding and other problems, perhaps even more. And, of course, there is the expense that comes with that. And then in the Lower 48 they will have a national policy, sort of, except they will develop an exception process where Governors can ask for exceptions on Federal lands for the roadless rule.

What kind of national policy is this?

At the same time they are staring in the face of an over \$10 billion backlog, which they have no intention of dealing with because, of course, there is no money to deal with thinning or fire protection or even fighting forest fires, and particularly low on the totem pole is road construction. Every year the road maintenance unanimous money is stolen and used to fight fires, and they do not put the money back, and they never get around to it; and the backlog has grown by \$2 billion since this President has been in office.

The roads are unsafe. They are crumbling. They are causing all sorts of problems with erosion into pristine streams. They need culvert work. They will erode worse without the culvert work. And yet this administration wants to go on another road-building binge to fragment up the little bit of remaining roadless area in the United States. Just like Gale Norton recently said that all of the wilderness areas under study by the BLM would no longer be studied for wilderness value. The Forest Service, under the direction of this administration, wants to make certain they put in enough roads before this President leaves office, to fragment that up so those areas can never again be considered for roadless or wildness designation.

This is wrong-headed policy at the wrong time. This administration should do what it said it was going to do, uphold the roadless rule in all of

the States, and then it should begin to deal with the very real needs of the Forest Service, to deal with its maintenance backlog. Some of these roads need dramatic amounts of work in the short term. I have some in my district that have been promised for several years that roads, washed out in flood 5 years ago would be rebuilt; and yet the money, as I say, each summer has been taken away and spent on fighting forest fires because there is not enough money in the budget to fight forest fires because, of course, the administration has no money because they have given it away in tax cuts to all the rich people. So this is a pretty strange way to run a country and make a policy on Federal lands that are so precious to the heritage and to the environmental future of our Nation.

ROADLESS AREA CONSERVATION ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, as I fly across America, which I do every Monday and Friday from Seattle to Dulles Airport, every time I fly I realize what a beautiful country we have, truly the most beautiful one both for our democracy and in our beautiful lands. And those lands now are still at risk because the current administration, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) so well laid out, threatens to violate the roadless area rule and violate the very clear desires of Americans to protect the last remaining pristine areas in our national forests.

Now, we have an opportunity to stop this administration from gutting the roadless area rule. And I hope that my colleagues will join the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and myself in co-sponsoring the Roadless Area Conservation Act of 2003.

This bill will simply incorporate the existing rule that protects the last remaining one-third of our national forests that truly are the crown jewels of our national forest system. And it will protect by preventing future road building, road building that has already covered 360,000 miles of roads in our national forests already, most of which are built for timber harvest, much of which is no longer usable. At least 60,000 of those miles of road are no longer usable by anyone, even though they were used and built with taxpayer money. That is enough road to go around the world 16 times already in our national forests.

Now, in response to that, Americans came out in droves over the last 3 years at over 600 public meetings held by the Federal Government to ask Americans what they wanted to do with their national forests. At those over-600 meetings of 2 million Americans, both in person and by e-mail let-

ter, responded with the very clear and dramatic message, preserve these last remaining virgin pristine areas. Over 96 percent of Americans who addressed this issue had a single message for the President of the United States: keep the clear-cutting and the bulldozers out of these remaining forests. And we got some good news rhetorically from the administration because rhetorically the administration said that they are going to keep the roadless area rule. But, it is one of those big "buts" that you hear so much of in life; they were going to slash and burn by exempting Alaska. And they were going to slash and burn by exempting other States, as long as in some process, it remains uncertain, the Governor of that State wanted to exempt that particular State.

In fact, some of the biggest tracts, in fact, the biggest tracts, the most biologically intact tracts of land in the world for temperate forests are in the Tongass and Chugach National Forests which are right now protected by the roadless area rule, which if the President has his way will no longer be protected. These are the most biologically productive rain forests in the world that the administration wants to now open up to clear-cutting and road building, to strip away the protection that over 2 million Americans spoke so loudly to keep, and that is just wrong. It is wrong because Americans do not want it, and it is wrong because it violates the whole spirit of the roadless area rule.

You cannot say you are going to uphold the roadless area rule and then strip out the largest forests in the United States from its protection. It is kind of like the President saying, We will have the No Child Left Behind Act, but we will exempt the children in Alaska because they are some kind of lesser Americans, and then we will also exempt the States where Governors say we do not want to have this protection of No Child Left Behind.

We believe that all American forests, including Alaska, including all 50 States, are entitled to the roadless area rule.

Now, in my State of Washington, we are kind of proud of our forests too. We have three very beautiful roadless area rules that we want to see statutorily protected, protected by a law passed by Congress so that no President of either party in the future can cave in to special interests to allow clear-cutting in these forests. These are in the Colville National Forest, they are in the Dark Divide area in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, and my personal favorite, the Olympic National Forest close to where I live in Kitsap County, Washington.

In that forest there are two trees at the end of a trail in this roadless area, two beautiful Douglas firs. They are about maybe 8 feet in diameter. Incredible trees. We call them Theodore and Franklin after the Roosevelts who were so responsible for protecting these

areas that are now subject to the roadless area rule.

Our message from Washington State is, Theodore and Franklin deserve protection, and their cousins in Alaska deserve protection, and every tree in these protected roadless areas deserve protection. I hope my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this bill and send a message to the administration, we want the roadless area, not just pieces.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon today.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. David Halpern, Rabbi, Flatbush Park Jewish Center, Brooklyn, New York, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Sovereign of the world, we stand in the House of freely elected representatives of all the American people. These men and women, dedicated and strong, have accepted the awesome burden of promulgating the laws by which our free society lives and shall live. They wear this mantle of leadership in profoundly perilous times.

The threat to human security wears many faces: Tyranny, terror, religious oppression, racial tension, disease, hunger and despair. We seek the solution to these problems. We search diligently for the road to peace, for the path to harmonious living, for the means to achieve human dignity for us all created in Thine image.

May we always remember that to safeguard our own freedom, we must speak out against oppression, and, where warranted, even take up arms against it. To enjoy the blessings of our own wealth, we must also provide for the underprivileged and the needy. To be truly strong requires more than strength of arms, it requires strength of spirit.

Almost six decades have passed since the age of the Nazi death camps, the places where 6 million Jewish men, women and children had their lives cruelly and brutally ended, their only sin that they were born Jewish. The world has watched helplessly as in the last decade hundreds of thousands of different nationalities and ethnic groups have been slaughtered. We pray that the destruction of man by his fellow because of religious beliefs or racial origins will be known no more;