

Thompson Voinovich Wyden
 Thurmond Warner
 Torricelli Wellstone

NAYS—2

Byrd Feingold
 NOT VOTING—1
 Helms

The bill (S. 2514), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The provisions of the order will be executed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

The bill (S. 2515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

The bill (S. 2516) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military construction, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

The bill (S. 2517) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 379, H.R. 4546, the House companion measure; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 2514, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read a third time, passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with the above occurring without further intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 4546), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER) appointed Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BUNNING conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the adjournment resolution, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 125) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 125

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 27, 2002, or Friday, June 28, 2002, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, July 8, 2002, or until such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 27, 2002, Friday, June 28, 2002, or Saturday, June 29, 2002, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 8, 2002, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business until the hour of 3:20 p.m., when I understand the next vote will occur.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

TO REAFFIRM THE REFERENCE TO ONE NATION UNDER GOD IN THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2690.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The bill (S. 2690) to reaffirm the reference to "One Nation Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. At 3:20 this afternoon we will vote on a piece of legislation I introduced to reaffirm Congress' commitment to the Pledge of Allegiance and our national motto "In God we trust." I hope my colleagues will join me in this reaffirmation. Many already have.

I ask unanimous consent the list of 32 Senators as original cosponsors be printed in the RECORD.

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

ORIGINAL COSPONSORS OF S. 2690

Mr. Sessions, Mr. Lott, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Burns, Ms. Collins, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Helms, Mr. Inhoff.

Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. DeWine, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Voinovich.

Mr. Phil Gramm, Mr. George Allen, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Bob Smith, Mr. Bunning, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Hagel, Mr. Lugar.

Mr. Bond, Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Craig, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Brownback, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Zell Miller.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yesterday's decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress* was, in a word, outrageous. It is inexplicable that this man so seriously objected to his daughter having to listen and watch others recite the pledge at their school. Keep in mind, in this country no one can be forced to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. It is simply a matter of respect.

It is appalling that this court took the time and judicial resources to resuscitate this case which the district court had already dismissed for failing to state a claim. This complaint was a mess. The plaintiff, Dr. Newdow, who represented himself, asked a Federal court to order the President to change a law. The court took great pains to find a claim in Mr. Newdow's complaint and then to rule in his favor.

He did this at a time when Federal judicial resources are very strained. The Nation is trying to function in the speedy manner required by the sixth amendment, with 89 judicial vacancies, a staggering number, representing 10 percent of the Federal judiciary.

According to the Judicial Conference, in the past three decades, a U.S. Courts of Appeals judges' average caseload increased by nearly 200 percent. In light of these strained resources, it is appalling to me that the court took time to resuscitate this very flawed case.

The Pledge of Allegiance plays a very important part in the citizenship experience of every American. It is part of the patriotic thread that weaves us all together in times of crisis and times of celebration.

If the ninth circuit's interpretation of the establishment clause stands, many national ceremonies and celebrations will be negatively impacted. Singing of songs with references to God on government property will be prohibited. For example, songs such as "Star Spangled Banner," "God Bless America," and "America the Beautiful," which Americans sing every Fourth of July on the steps of this building. But such references are not just important in ties of celebration. On September 11 we stood on the steps of the Capitol and sang "God Bless America." Countless Americans uttered the phrase "God Bless America" and prayed together in public spaces. This ruling could prohibit that.

Judge Ferdinand Fernandez wisely dissented from this decision. His words have been quoted before. He said it beautifully. Such phrases as "In God we trust" or "under God" have no tendency to establish a religion in this country or to suppress anyone's exercise or nonexercise of religion. He went on, in eloquent terms, and defends his dissent.

I believe this ruling will be soundly rejected. I was so pleased that yesterday the majority leader and the minority leader moved the Senate very quickly in expressing its disapproval immediately following the ruling yesterday. The Ninth Circuit is not unfamiliar with going out on a limb, and the Supreme Court is not unfamiliar with striking it down. This circuit is the most overturned circuit in the country.

There is certainly nothing wrong with pushing the envelope and using an original interpretation on novel issues of law, but this court repeatedly makes rulings which countervail standing precedent. Instead of administering justice, it seems some judges in the ninth circuit are far more interested in making social policy statements. It is not what the Constitution asks them to do and it is not what the American people pay them for.

The first amendment prohibits Congress from passing any law establishing a religion. Coming as they did from a land with an established religion where those of other faiths were not well tolerated, they set the highest value on freedom of religion. But they were not advocating freedom from religion.

By passing this legislation today the Senate will make clear that we understand the Founders' intention. We will reiterate our support for the Pledge of Allegiance as codified and our national motto, "In God we trust."

Finally, I commend the Judiciary Committee today in voting out the nomination of Lavenski Smith to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. Lavenski Smith, who is from the State

of Arkansas will make an outstanding jurist on the Federal bench. He is supremely well qualified as a former member of the Arkansas Supreme Court. He understands the proper role of the judiciary.

I applaud the committee's unanimous vote today. I believe if we did not have the vacancies on the Federal bench to the extent that we now have them, the decision from the Ninth Circuit would not have occurred. In Judge Smith's confirmation hearings last month, he expressed his unshakable respect for an adherence to precedent. He said even when it goes against his personal beliefs, he would follow precedence. Clearly, we need people like Lavenski Smith on the bench.

I am pleased that the Judiciary Committee has taken this step. I am also pleased that the Senate will, today, make clear to the Federal judiciary, our reaffirmation of our Pledge of Allegiance and our national motto "In God we trust."

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ZELL MILLER be added as an original cosponsor on the bill on which we are about to vote.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to speak in support of the legislation proposed by Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas. I am a cosponsor and helped draft this legislation. I would say this: This is not an itty-bitty issue. This is a big issue. The Congress and States and cities have been expressing a desire to have, and be allowed to have, an expression of faith in the public life of America. The courts have been on a trend for decades now to constrict that.

The opinion out of the Ninth Circuit is not as aberrational as some would think. The Supreme Court, in my view, has been inconsistent and unclear. It has cracked down on some very small instances of public expression of faith. Our courts have made decisions such as constraining a valedictorian's address at a high school. Certainly our prayer in schools has been rigorously constricted or eliminated in any kind of

normal classroom setting, as has the prayer at football games.

I will just say we hope the courts will reconsider some of their interpretations of the establishment clause and the free exercise clause of the first amendment and help heal the hurt in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 3:20 has arrived.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I wish to announce this will be a final rollcall vote of the day and the week. Our next rollcall vote will occur Tuesday morning following the July Fourth recess. Senators should be on notice that we will have a vote that morning and votes throughout the day and the week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 166 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Durbin	McCain
Allen	Edwards	McCormack
Baucus	Ensign	Mikulski
Bayh	Enzi	Miller
Bennett	Feingold	Murkowski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Gramm	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Rockefeller
Byrd	Harkin	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hollings	Schumer
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Sessions
Carper	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Jeffords	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
Dayton	Levin	Voivovich
DeWine	Lieberman	Warner
Dodd	Lincoln	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Helms

The bill (S. 2690) was passed, as follows:

S. 2690

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On November 11, 1620, prior to embarking for the shores of America, the Pilgrims signed the Mayflower Compact that declared: "Having undertaken, for the Glory of God and the advancement of the Christian Faith and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia."

(2) On July 4, 1776, America's Founding Fathers, after appealing to the "Laws of Nature, and of Nature's God" to justify their separation from Great Britain, then declared: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness".

(3) In 1781, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and later the Nation's third President, in his work titled "Notes on the State of Virginia" wrote: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the Gift of God. That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever."

(4) On May 14, 1787, George Washington, as President of the Constitutional Convention, rose to admonish and exhort the delegates and declared: "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God!"

(5) On July 21, 1789, on the same day that it approved the Establishment Clause concerning religion, the First Congress of the United States also passed the Northwest Ordinance, providing for a territorial government for lands northwest of the Ohio River, which declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

(6) On September 25, 1789, the First Congress unanimously approved a resolution calling on President George Washington to proclaim a National Day of Thanksgiving for the people of the United States by declaring, "a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the many signal favors of Almighty God, especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a constitution of government for their safety and happiness."

(7) On November 19, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address on the site of the battle and declared: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

(8) On April 28, 1952, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952), in which school children were allowed to be excused from public schools for religious observances

and education, Justice William O. Douglas, in writing for the Court stated: "The First Amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concern or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the State and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. Churches could not be required to pay even property taxes. Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who helped parishioners into their places of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamations making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; 'so help me God' in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting the First Amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session: 'God save the United States and this Honorable Court.'"

(9) On June 15, 1954, Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed into law a statute amending the Pledge of Allegiance to read: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

(10) On July 20, 1956, Congress proclaimed that the national motto of the United States is "In God We Trust", and that motto is inscribed above the main door of the Senate, behind the Chair of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and on the currency of the United States.

(11) On June 17, 1963, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), in which compulsory school prayer was held unconstitutional, Justices Goldberg and Harlan, concurring in the decision, stated: "But untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality can lead to invocation or approval of results which partake not simply of that noninterference and noninvolvement with the religious which the Constitution commands, but of a brooding and pervasive devotion to the secular and a passive, or even active, hostility to the religious. Such results are not only not compelled by the Constitution, but, it seems to me, are prohibited by it. Neither government nor this Court can or should ignore the significance of the fact that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God and that many of our legal, political, and personal values derive historically from religious teachings. Government must inevitably take cognizance of the existence of religion and, indeed, under certain circumstances the First Amendment may require that it do so."

(12) On March 5, 1984, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668 (1984), in which a city government's display of a nativity scene was held to be constitutional, Chief Justice Burger, writing for the Court, stated: "There is an unbroken history of official acknowledgment by all three branches of government of the role of religion in American life from at least 1789. . . [E]xamples of reference to our religious heritage are found in the statutorily prescribed national motto 'In God We Trust' (36 U.S.C. 186), which Congress and the President mandated for our currency, see (31 U.S.C. 5112(d)(1) (1982 ed.)), and in the language 'One Nation under God', as part of the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag.

That pledge is recited by many thousands of public school children—and adults—every year... Art galleries supported by public revenues display religious paintings of the 15th and 16th centuries, predominantly inspired by one religious faith. The National Gallery in Washington, maintained with Government support, for example, has long exhibited masterpieces with religious messages, notably the Last Supper, and paintings depicting the Birth of Christ, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection, among many others with explicit Christian themes and messages. The very chamber in which oral arguments on this case were heard is decorated with a notable and permanent—not seasonal—symbol of religion: Moses with the Ten Commandments. Congress has long provided chapels in the Capitol for religious worship and meditation."

(13) On June 4, 1985, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38 (1985), in which a mandatory moment of silence to be used for meditation or voluntary prayer was held unconstitutional, Justice O'Connor, concurring in the judgment and addressing the contention that the Court's holding would render the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional because Congress amended it in 1954 to add the words "under God," stated "In my view, the words 'under God' in the Pledge, as codified at (36 U.S.C. 172), serve as an acknowledgment of religion with 'the legitimate secular purposes of solemnizing public occasions, [and] expressing confidence in the future.'"

(14) On November 20, 1992, the United States Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, in *Sherman v. Community Consolidated School District 21*, 980 F.2d 437 (7th Cir. 1992), held that a school district's policy for voluntary recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance including the words "under God" was constitutional.

(15) The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals erroneously held, in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress*, (9th Cir. June 26, 2002) that the Pledge of Allegiance's use of the express religious reference "under God" violates the First Amendment to the Constitution, and that, therefore, a school district's policy and practice of teacher-led voluntary recitations of the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional.

(16) The erroneous rationale of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in *Newdow* would lead to the absurd result that the Constitution's use of the express religious reference "Year of our Lord" in Article VII violates the First Amendment to the Constitution, and that, therefore, a school district's policy and practice of teacher-led voluntary recitations of the Constitution itself would be unconstitutional.

SEC. 2. ONE NATION UNDER GOD.

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—Section 4 of title 4, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4. Pledge of allegiance to the flag; manner of delivery

"The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag: 'I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.', should be rendered by standing at attention facing the flag with the right hand over the heart. When not in uniform men should remove their headdress with their right hand and hold it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Persons in uniform should remain silent, face the flag, and render the military salute."

(b) CODIFICATION.—In codifying this subsection, the Office of the Law Revision Council shall make no change in section 4, title 4, 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 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