

that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.●

JEWISH HERITAGE WEEK

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to Jewish Heritage Week, which was recognized from April 14 through 21, 2002.

Every spring since 1976, during the season in which Jewish people commemorate Passover, Yom Hashoah (Holocaust Memorial Day) and Yom Ha'atzmaut (Israel Independence Day), a week is set aside to promote and encourage all Americans to learn about the history of Jewish Americans and to participate in activities that highlight the accomplishments of these citizens. It is in light of that charge I come to the Senate floor to highlight this important week.

For centuries, Jews from across the globe have come to America seeking the ability to worship in freedom and to pursue their individual and hopes and dreams in peace. Throughout the many years, nearly every facet of American culture has been cultivated and enriched by the talents of Jewish people, including business, education, research, fine arts, and government. In fact many of their names and accomplishments are found in the textbooks of students across this country. Their contributions to our character and culture help make America a better place.

We also commend our friends in Israel as they celebrated the 54th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of Israel. This milestone is a tribute to the strength and resilience of the Jewish spirit in the face of great adversity. At this time, it is imperative that freedom loving people from around the world stand with the people of Israel in affirming Israel's right of existence and its right to defend itself against those who would use terror to achieve their goals.

I know my Senate colleagues will join with me and the millions of Americans to mark this special week to pay tribute to the countless people of Jewish faith and descent who have contributed so much to the definition of our nation and the world.●

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION ROADLESS POLICY: STILL AND ALWAYS A BAD IDEA

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the issue of roadless areas in our national forests and to discuss the manner in which the last administration developed their roadless area conservation rule. Recently, the OMB released a draft report on the costs and benefits of Federal regulations. In this report, the Clinton roadless rule is estimated at costing \$164 million and saving only \$219,000. I find these numbers outrageous and add this to the extensive list of reasons why this rule would hinder our rural

economies. With this, I would like to again express my objections to the Clinton roadless rule and explain why I feel it is still a bad idea.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands of the Energy and Natural Resource Committee I held a series of five hearings between November 1999 and March 2001 to examine the development and potential consequences of the Clinton administration's roadless area conservation rule-making. Our hearing record details numerous questions about the process and data used to develop the roadless area conservation rule. While I will not recite the entire history of this controversy, I do want to highlight some of the key dates and events to help my colleagues better understand this issue.

To begin, the issue of roadless has been around for more than 30 years. In 1972, the Forest Service began Roadless Area Review and Evaluation One, RARE I, to examine how much land should be set aside and recommended for potential Wilderness.

A more comprehensive RARE II inventory was undertaken in 1982. That review examined a little more than 62 million acres. A variety of wilderness bills passed by Congress allocated 24 percent of the RARE II lands to Wilderness. The forest plans completed by the Forest Service between 1983 and 1998 recommended—10 percent of the 62 million acres for wilderness; 17 percent of the land for future wilderness study; 38 percent of the land for other multiple-uses that excludes timber harvesting; and 14 percent of the 62 million acres to be considered as potentially available for timber harvesting.

It is important to know that from the time RARE I was completed, through 1998, that less than 1.1 million acres of the original 62 million RARE II acres were utilized for timber harvesting. Thus, less than 2 percent of the entire 62 million acres had been entered, or would be entered in the next 5 years, for timber harvesting.

In 1998, after an Interior Appropriations vote on funding for Forest Service road construction, I invited then chief of the Forest Service Mike Dombeck to my office to discuss the roadless issue. I offered the chief my help in working to legislatively resolve this thorny issue. I was politely informed by Chief Dombeck that they would rather resolve the issue administratively.

In May of 1999, then Vice President Al Gore, during a speech to the League of Conservation Voters stated that not only would he eliminate all road building, but he would prohibit all timber harvesting in roadless areas. In effect he announced the selection of the final alternative for the Clinton roadless area conservation rule before the draft rulemaking had even begun.

On October 13, 1999, President Clinton, speaking at Reddish Knob, VA, directed the Forest Service to develop regulations to end road construction and to protect inventoried and un-

inventoried roadless areas across the National Forest System.

On October 19, 1999, the Forest Service published a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement to propose protection of certain roadless areas.

In June of 2000, Chief Dombeck, in a letter to his employees on the roadless issue, stated that "Collaboration does not alleviate our responsibility to make decisions that we believe are in the best long-term interests of the land or the people who depend on and enjoy it." Mr. Dombeck made it very clear to me that Mr. Gore's desires would be carried out.

In the 2000 State of the Union Address, nearly 11 months before the final roadless area conservation plan was published, President Clinton said that together, the Vice President and he had "in the last three months alone helped preserve 40 million acres of roadless in the national forests."

On November 13, 2000, the final EIS for the roadless area conservation plan was published. And on January 12, 2001 the final roadless area conservation rule was published in the Federal Register. This meant that over the Christmas holiday the agency read, absorbed and responded to more than 1.2 million public comments in a little less than 2 months.

The Public Lands and Forest Subcommittee hearings that were held, made it clear to me that the decision on what to do about the roadless issue was sealed on October 13, 1999 when the President spoke at Reddish Knob and the rest of this effort was little more than window dressing.

It was also no surprise to me when U.S. Federal District Court Judge Edward Lodge stayed the implementation of this rule in May of 2001. While Judge Lodge's stay has been appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the fact remains that no administration, not the Bush administration, not the Clinton administration, nor any future administration can ignore Judge Lodge's ruling.

I know that many in the environmental community, proponents of the Roadless Rule, would like to convince us that the Bush administration is somehow skirting the law by refusing to fully implement the roadless area conservation rule. But, the simple fact is that Judge Lodge ENJOINED all aspects of the roadless area conservation rule.

Some have decried the fact that the Bush administration chose not to contest Judge Lodge's decision in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. They claim this action by the Bush administration is an attempt to rollback a much-needed environmental rule. I think we would be wrong to draw this conclusion. The fact is that every administration faced with defending agency decisions in court examines each case on its merit and then decides which course of action is best for the government.