

component life spans. Dr. Kathy Chuang of NASA Glenn joined representatives from the Maverick Corporation to accomplish this feat of engineering.

Last, but certainly not least, versatile new lubricant products pioneered by NASA Glenn are now being used to improve commercial steam valves and furnace conveyors. Dr. Christopher Dellacorte and Brian Edmonds, both NASA Glenn researchers, made these lubricants possible.

I extend my most sincere congratulations to everyone involved with each of NASA Glenn's award-winning projects and also thank NASA Glenn's AeroSpace Frontiers newsletter for bringing these wonderful accomplishments to my attention.

CAN-SPAM ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to add my congratulations to the authors of the CAN-SPAM Act. This is an important topic, and I am pleased that the Senate passed this bill.

The Internet is a medium that in under a decade has completely changed the way we live in this country. And it still has enormous untapped potential to enrich our lives and improve and expand communications and commerce for all of our citizens. E-mail has been called the "killer application" of the Internet, and it is truly ubiquitous in our daily lives in a way that no one could have predicted only a few short years ago. But over the past few years, the spam problem has come to threaten the utility of e-mail in very serious way. By passing this bill, the Senate has begun to address some of the worst abuses false and misleading headers and subject lines, fraudulent and pornographic solicitations, the harvesting of addresses and the hijacking of addresses to send unsolicited e-mail.

I am pleased also that the bill will allow legitimate commercial e-mail to continue to be sent as long as the sender provides a way for the recipients to indicate that they do not want to receive such e-mail in the future. Not all unsolicited commercial e-mail is bad. E-mail is an inexpensive way for businesses to advertise their products and we should not try to stamp out all such communications.

At the same time, some people don't want to receive such e-mails at all and they should be able to make that fact known and have their wishes respected. In addition to requiring that unsolicited commercial e-mail give consumers the ability to opt out of future such communications, I am pleased that portions of Senator SCHUMER's bill, which I have cosponsored, will be incorporated into this bill because I believe a Do-Not-Email List, modeled on the very popular Do-Not-Call List recently activated by the FTC, is something that should be created. Senator SCHUMER's proposal is a sensible and measured approach that I think will help get a Do-Not-Email List off the ground promptly.

It is time to stop spam from bogging down the great promise of the Internet

and e-mail. I am pleased to have voted for this important bill, and I appreciate all the efforts of the Senators who have brought us to this point.

FRANCE, THE EU, AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, yesterday in my opening statement at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations on anti-Semitism in Europe, I criticized the European Union for not having included in its Brussels summit's so-called "Presidency Conclusions" a denunciation of the Malaysian Prime Minister's vile anti-Semitic remarks.

I also recognized that French President Chirac wrote a personal letter to the Malaysian Prime Minister, but I said that I doubted that many Muslims would have access to his criticisms.

This morning, however, I was informed by my friend the French Ambassador that President Chirac's letter had, in fact, been made public.

I am happy to learn this, and I applaud President Chirac for his personal condemnation of the Malaysian Prime Minister's disgusting speech.

This does not, however, change my opinion that the European Union should have included a condemnation in the catalog of external issues delineated in its "Presidency Conclusions."

Most importantly, as yesterday's hearing pointed out, it is imperative that both the European Union and the United States resolutely and publicly oppose the cancer of anti-Semitism wherever in the world it raises its ugly head.

HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, 73 million acres of national forests are at unnaturally high risk of catastrophic wildfires because of unhealthy forest conditions. Efforts by the Forest Service to restore forest health and prevent catastrophic wildfires have been frustrated by requirements for detailed documentation, administrative appeals of proposed forest treatment projects, lawsuits and injunctions.

The U.S. Forest Service recognizes that it must be able to move more quickly to achieve results on the ground. One of its reports, "The Process Predicament—How Statutory, Regulatory, and Administrative Factors Affect National Forest Management," dated, June, 2002, cited a study conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration where it was estimated that planning and assessment consume 40 percent of total direct work at the national forest level, representing an expenditure of more than \$250 million per year.

We cannot continue to shuffle paper while our forests burn. Federal land management must address dangerous fuel loads and declining forest health before we can ever hope to stem the wildfires that have plagued Arizona

and other parts of our country. H.R. 1904 allows the Federal land management agencies to take action in protecting forest health.

It would streamline the administrative process by allowing the Federal land management agencies, in their preparation of environmental assessments or environmental impact statements, to describe a proposed action, an alternative of no action, and one additional action alternative if the additional alternative is proposed during scoping or the collaborative process and meets the purpose and need of the project.

The legislation would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue interim final regulations which will serve as the sole means by which administrative review may be sought for authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects. It further directs that authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects be subject to judicial review only in U.S. District Court where the Federal land to be treated is located. It would encourage the court to expedite proceedings with the goal of rendering a decision as soon as practicable. It would further direct the court—in its consideration of injunctive relief—to balance the short and long-term effects to the ecosystem of undertaking the project versus the short and long-term effects to the ecosystem of not undertaking the project.

H.R. 1904 would authorize hazardous fuel reduction projects to protect wildland-urban interface areas, municipal watersheds or water supply systems, and areas where windthrow, blowdown, ice storm damage, or the existence of insects or disease poses a significant threat to ecosystems or forests or rangeland resources on Federal land or adjacent non-Federal land, or contain threatened and endangered species habitat.

It outlines a path to unlock the gridlock that has precluded our Federal land managers from moving forward to protect our forest health.

Unfortunately, it appears that even at this date, after the bill has been reported favorably from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and following lengthy bipartisan discussions, some Members of this Senate remain unwilling to move this vital legislation forward. If we fail to act, our communities and our forests will continue to be at risk from insect damage and fire that threatens our citizens and their homes and property.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 1904, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. I commend the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, THAD COCHRAN, and his staff who have worked tirelessly since this legislation was reported out of Committee to reach a compromise with members on both sides of the aisle who have concerns about this legislation.

In the South forest fires pale in comparison to forest fires of the West. In

my home State of Georgia, we don't have a significant threat from fire in our forests because we receive adequate moisture throughout the year. According to the Georgia Forestry Commission, my State experiences approximately 8 thousand fires each year damaging or destroying approximately 38,000 acres of forestland.

However with 24.6 million acres of forestland in the State of Georgia, which is nearly two-thirds of my home State, major outbreaks of disease caused by pathogens and insects such as the southern pine beetle pose a significant threat to forests in the South. In 2002 alone, damage caused by the southern pine beetle totaled over \$150 million.

The forest community has waited long enough for comprehensive forest management legislation. It is time for the Senate to pass this legislation so that Americans have the tools to manage our Nation's forests—by putting out fires and by reducing disease and insect pressure. This act will help our Nation's forest to flourish for generations to come.

GIVE US A VOTE, PART II

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as a Senator frustrated by this situation, I rise today to respond to comments made by my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, regarding the Healthy Forest Restoration Act, H.R. 1904. As he chose to address the entire Senate, I too am following his lead in addressing the entire Senate. I appreciate Mr. BINGAMAN's attention to this issue and look forward to future discussions with him on this issue.

However, I am perplexed and troubled by some of my colleague's statements and feel it is important to include some additional information for the RECORD.

First, on June 26, the Agriculture Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1904 and many of our colleagues, including myself, took the time to attend the hearing, listen to the testimony, and participate in the discussions. Mr. BINGAMAN could have done the same, but chose not to.

In the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, we then held a hearing on July 22. The purpose of this hearing was to examine the impacts of fires, insects and disease on forest lands. And we looked at processes for implementing hazardous fuels reduction projects more expeditiously.

The committee also considered S. 1314, the Collaborative Forest Health Act, Mr. BINGAMAN's bill; H.R. 1904 the Healthy Forest Restoration Act; as well as other related legislation that addresses these issues.

During that hearing, Senator BINGAMAN hardly even mentioned his bill and had very few questions about H.R. 1904.

In Mr. BINGAMAN's statement to the Senate, he brought up having concerns about many of the issues covered at the hearing. If he had so many questions, I have to wonder why he waited until now to ask them?

Two Senators who did engage at the hearing, Senator WYDEN and Senator FEINSTEIN, asked probing questions that helped the bipartisan group, hosted by Mr. COCHRAN, find a commonsense solution.

Second, Mr. BINGAMAN's staff was invited to the table, at the point discussions of the major issues began in earnest and were never excluded from being a part of the discussions that developed the compromise amendment. In fact, his staff attended several of the negotiations sessions, but chose to stop being a part of the discussions.

At that time in the discussions, all the major issues related to Title I—old growth, judicial review, large tree retention—were still in flux and any contributions they would have made could have been a fruitful part of the discussion. But, again, they chose not to participate.

In addition, his staff attended the all-staff briefing once the compromise amendment was agreed to by the bipartisan group of Senators participating in the discussions and Mr. BINGAMAN's staff was very active in that briefing. And it is my understanding that they asked many of the questions and received answers for the issues Mr. BINGAMAN now is questioning.

It is one thing to disagree about the approach we have taken and offer amendments to modify that approach and another to foster needless delay.

If any of my colleagues would like a personal briefing on the compromise amendment, and the process in which it was developed, I am certain that the cosponsors of this amendment would join me in sitting down with anyone who would like to be a part of this discussion.

While Senator BINGAMAN has supported active management and wants to be a part of the solution, it would appear that he is taking a play out of the environmentalist's handbook and is delaying the process through stalling, such as asking for a hearing on the amendment.

I believe the Senate should not get into the habit of holding hearings on amendments because a Senator chose not to participate in the process.

Again, this is a move the radical environmental community uses time and time again to prevent hazardous fuel reduction projects from going forward. In the vernacular of forest appeals, Mr. BINGAMAN has stayed involved just enough to meet the standing requirements, he has held his water till the appeal period is just about over and now he is launching his appeal.

The question now is, what now? The environmental community usually files a lawsuit when they don't see the results they wanted. Will Senator BINGAMAN try to filibuster this important legislation? Or will he step forward to offer amendments to make the modifications he believes need to be made.

There have been two unanimous consent requests offered that included the

opportunity to offer amendments on the very issues that the Senator brought up today. Yet he has objected both times. A third unanimous consent request that is even more broad was offered this morning.

It is time to move on and proceed to a debate on the floor of the Senate. This is important legislation that needs to be signed into law so that we can start to address the hazardous fuels problems that are threatening our communities.

This legislation will result in a more public, expedited, process for moving hazardous fuels projects through the NEPA process.

It provides for the development of a new and improved predecisional protest process for projects authorized under this bill. The new process will replace the highly contentious, time consuming, appeals process that currently delays many forest health projects.

It directs that all preliminary injunctions be reviewed every 60 days, with the opportunity for the parties to update the judges on changes in conditions so the court may respond to those changes if needed, something that Senators WYDEN and FEINSTEIN desired.

Finally, it reminds the courts that when weighing the equities that they should balance the impact to the ecosystem of the short and long-term effects of undertaking the project against the short and long-term effects of not undertaking the project. I am sure there are communities in New Mexico that would welcome this balancing of the harms.

It is time for the Senate to take action on this issue. I ask my colleagues to join me in bringing this legislation up for consideration.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to congratulate Catherine Bertini, former Executive Director of the United Nations World Food Program, for her selection as recipient of the 2003 World Food Prize, presented in a ceremony in Des Moines, IA on October 16.

Ms. Bertini has worked long and hard and with innovation and creativity to rid the world of the scourge of hunger. For her efforts this recognition is richly deserved. As the leader of the World Food Program between 1992 and 2002, Ms. Bertini directed programs responsible for addressing hunger around the world, providing assistance to an estimated 700 million people during that period. Because of her dedication and leadership, millions are alive today whose need for assistance would otherwise have been ignored.

Catherine Bertini is the twenty-first recipient of the World Food Prize, and the second civil servant so honored. During her tenure at the World Food Program, or WFP, Ms. Bertini reorganized the agency and improved its logistical capacity, while focusing attention on delivering food aid through women in the developing world, and thereby nourishing women and girls