and thin the forest through the removal of trees, some of this pain and suffering might have been avoided.

While it is the Forest Service's duty to manage the lands entrusted to them, we in the Congress also must take some blame. It seems that we have forgotten to provide the leadership the agency needs to understand our expectation of them.

This is not new. Many of us have stood on this floor and many experts have spoken on the issue of forest health for a decade—whether it is the lower Sierras or the San Bernardino or the forests of Idaho or all of the Great Basin region of the West. We have 190 million acres now of dead and dying forests. The great tragedy is that California, with the Santa Ana winds that come this time of year, set up the perfect scenario, and now the great tragedy is hitting.

This Congress has to deal with the issue. Senator FEINSTEIN has been on the Senate floor working with it. She and I have worked together with the appropriate committees—the Agriculture Committee, and my colleague, MIKE CRAPO, Senator COCHRAN, Senator DOMENICI—we have all come together to try to solve this problem. We have a solution and it is H.R. 1904, and it is a positive step forward.

It is now time for this Senate to debate this bill, vote it up or down. I see my colleague from California on the floor. I turn to her and most sincerely say, Mr. President, I express great sadness and sorrow for the tragedy now underway in her State. I wish it was over. But the firestorm that is sweeping across southern California today will only die with the winds and when we begin a positive effort at restoring the health of our natural lands and forested areas.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

On March 17, 1999, Murietta, CA, resident Randy Bowen, who is black, was attacked at a party in the Lake Skinner Hills. Bowen's two white assailants were self-proclaimed white supremacists. They first hit Bowen in the head with a bottle and, when he fled, slashed his back using a straight razor. Both men were found guilty of committing a hate crime.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER TREATMENT AND CRIME REDUCTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act is a good bipartisan bill that would help State and local governments deal effectively with a serious law enforcement and mental health problem—the extent to which mentally ill individuals commit crimes and recidivate without ever receiving appropriate attention from the mental health, law enforcement, or corrections systems. I am pleased that the bill passed the Judiciary Committee unanimously last week, and the Senate unanimously last night.

I have enjoyed working on this bill with Senator DEWINE, who has shown commitment and leadership on this issue. I am also pleased that Senators CANTWELL, DOMENICI, DURBIN, GRASSLEY, and HATCH have joined Senator DEWINE and I as cosponsors of this bill.

The issues this bill addresses have received increasing attention of late. For example, Human Rights Watch released a report just last week discussing the fact ''that jails and prisons have become the Nation's default mental health system.'' The first recommendation in the report was for Congress to enact this bill.

All too often, people with mental illness rotate repeatedly between the criminal justice system and the streets of our communities, committing a series of minor offenses. The ever scarcer time of our law enforcement officers is being occupied by these offenders who divert them from more urgent responsibilities. Meanwhile, offenders find themselves in prisons or jails, where little or no appropriate medical care is available for them. This bill gives State and local governments the tools to break this cycle, for the good of law enforcement, corrections officers, the public safety, and mentally ill offenders themselves.

I held a Judiciary Committee hearing last June on the criminal justice system and mentally ill offenders. At that hearing, we heard from State mental health officials, law enforcement officers, corrections officials, and the representative of counties around our Nation. All of our witnesses agreed that people with untreated mental illness are more likely to commit crimes, and that our State mental health systems, prisons, and jails do not have the resources they need to treat the mentally ill, and prevent crime and recidivism. We know that more than 16 percent of adults incarcerated in U.S. jails and prisons have a mental illness, that about 20 percent of youth in the juvenile justice system have serious mental health problems, and that up to 40 percent of adults who suffer from a serious mental illness will come into contact with the American criminal justice system at some point in their lives. We know these things, but we have not done enough about them at the Federal level, and our State and local officials need our help.

The bill does not mandate a ''one size fits all'' approach to addressing this issue. Rather, it allows grantees to use the funding authorized under the bill for mental health courts or other court-based programs, for training for criminal justice and mental health system personnel, and for better mental health treatment in our communities and within the corrections system. The funding is also generous enough to make a real difference, with $100 million authorized for each of the next two fiscal years. This is an area where government spending can not only do good but can also save money in the long run—a dollar spent today to get mentally ill offenders effective medical care can save many dollars in law enforcement costs in the long run.

This bill has brought law enforcement officers and mental health professionals together, as we have seen at both of the hearings the committee has held on this issue.

Now that we have passed this bill, I would hope the Senate could turn its attention to S. 486, the Paul Wellstone Mental Health Equitable Treatment Act. Senators DOMENICI and KENNEDY introduced this bill in February and it has 66 cosponsors. It would provide for equal insurance coverage for mental health benefits, and would do a great deal to accomplish some of the same objectives we seek to achieve through this bill. I would hope that we could find an hour in the time we have remaining in this session to debate and pass this bipartisan and broadly supported bill.

AUTHORITARIANISM IN RUSSIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the arrest of Russian businessman Mikhail Khodorkovsky by Russian security agents last weekend is of grave consequence to U.S.-Russia relations. It caps a chilling and aggressive turn toward authoritarianism in Vladimir Putin's Russia. It is past time for all friends of Russia, and all who support strong U.S.-Russia relations, to speak out about the ascendant role of the Russian security services in the Kremlin, President Putin's suppression of free media, the government's politicized prosecutions of its opponents, continuing and grievous human rights violations at the hands of the Russian army in Chechnya, and increased Russian meddling, intimidation, and harassment of its sovereign neighbors. American policy must change dramatically as a result of these developments, which have been in evidence for several years, for there can be no stability in U.S.-Russian relations, to say nothing of any strategic partnership, as long as Russia is moving away from the values of freedom and democratic progress so many Russians celebrated when the Soviet Union fell 12 years ago. I will have more to say on this matter, but for the moment I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to an incisive opinion article by Bruce Jackson entitled ''The Failure of Putin's Russia,'' published today

in the Washington Post, and an accompanying Post editorial entitled ''Pedaling Backward.''

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 2003]

THE FAILURE OF PUTIN'S RUSSIA

(By Bruce P. Jackson)

Every so often the arrest of one man involves more than the charges he may face and his fate before the court. In these rare instances, the legal proceedings are a distraction from the larger moral and strategic implications, and so they are intended to be. The arrest of Mikhail Khodorkovsky by Russian secret services in Siberia over the weekend is one such arrest.

The ''crimes'' of Khodorkovsky are considerable in the eyes of the special prosecutor and the new regime of former KGB officers who now surround President Vladimir Putin. As chairman of Yukos Oil, Khodorkovsky is a successful businessman who built the largest privately held company in Russia from the wreckage of the Soviet energy sector, converted his firm to Western business practices and entered into merger discussions with American corporate giants. This conduct alone might, in today's Russia, be considered a threat to the state, but the real charge behind the arrest contains much more.

This has been a year in which independent media and major independent business owners in Russia have been put out of business by the strong-arm tactics of the special prosecutor and the newly vigilant Federal Security Service (FSB), the agency that succeeded the KGB. In a climate that progressive Russian business executives compare to the fearful period of the 1950s, Khodorkovsky made the fatal mistake of expressing political opinions and having the temerity to provide financial support to opposition parties.

While this alone is insurrectionary behavior in the increasingly czarist world of President Putin, Khodorkovsky had the additional misfortune of being the last surviving oligarch. For those who have not kept up their Russian, ''oligarch'' is a term of art for ''rich Jews'' who made their money in the massive privatization of Soviet assets in the early 1990s. It is still not a good thing to be a successful Jew in historically anti-Semitic Russia.

Since Putin was elected president in 2000, every major figure exiled or arrested for financial crimes has been Jewish. In dollar terms, we are witnessing the largest illegal expropriation of Jewish property in Europe since the Nazi seizures during the 1930s.

Unfortunately, the implications of Khodorkovsky's arrest go beyond the suppression of democratic voices and the return of official anti-Semitism. This arrest must be seen in the context of increasingly aggressive, military and extrajudicial actions in Ukraine, Moldova, the South Caucasus and Chechnya. In the past month, Putin has demanded that Ukraine sign a concessionary economic treaty; Russian intelligence services have been detected behind election irregularities in Azerbaijan and Georgia and in influence-peddling in Moldova and Abkhazia; and Russian gunboats have confronted the Ukrainian Coast Guard in an illegal attempt to seize a valuable commercial waterway.

For the balance of his first term, Putin has skillfully taken advantage of America's necessary preoccupations with the war on terrorism and the liberation of Iraq. Now Moscow and the capitals of Eastern Europe are watching carefully to see how Washington responds to this latest crackdown. If the United States fails to take a hard line in response to such a high-visibility arrest, chauvinists in the Russian Ministry of Defense and the FSB will correctly conclude that there will be no meaningful response to the reestablishment of a neo-imperial sphere of influence in the new democracies to Russia's south and west. In addition to the expected Cold War thuggery and opportunistic financial seizures, we should expect that the new powers in Russia will rig the crucial elections in Ukraine and Georgia next year and continue to prop up the brutal dictatorship of Alexander Lukashenko in Belarus.

Finally, the incarceration of one man in Moscow's notorious Matrosskaya Tishina Prison poses painful questions for U.S. policy. It is now impossible to argue that President Bush's good-faith efforts at personal diplomacy with Putin have produced democratic outcomes. Indeed, each of Putin's visits to the Crawford ranch and Camp David has been followed by the cynical curtailment of democratic freedom inside Russia. While it remains unclear what positive qualities Bush detected in Putin's soul during their famous meeting in Slovenia, it is abundantly clear that this is the ''soul'' of a would-be Peter the Great.

If anyone should pay a price for the pursuit of thuggish policies, it is Putin. It's difficult to see why the U.S. Senate would even consider repealing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, the 1974 legislation under which Russia still must receive an annual waiver from the United States to maintain normal trade relations. On the contrary, Congress should probably consider additional sanctions. The FSB-led attack on Russian business has already cost American shareholders multiple billions in their savings. These losses will undoubtedly continue until some element of the rule of law returns to Moscow.

The arrest of one man has sent us a signal that our well-intentioned Russian policy has failed. We must now recognize that there has been a massive suppression of human rights and the imposition of a de facto Cold War-type administration in Moscow. It is not too soon to wonder if we are witnessing the formal beginning of a rollback of the democratic gains we have seen in Central and Eastern Europe, in Ukraine and elsewhere since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

Obviously, there will be some in Washington who will argue that all the oligarchs are probably guilty of some unspecified crime or another. And that we would be wise not to jeopardize our relationship with Putin for the sake of one man or one company. But there are some who are probably still waiting for the facts of the Dreyfus case before jumping to conclusions. The rest of us already know that we have been played for fools.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 2003]

PEDALING BACKWARD

Speaking to his cabinet yesterday, Russian President Vladimir Putin dismissed the speculation sparked by last weekend's arrest of Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Russia's richest man. ''Everyone should be equal under the law,'' President Putin said, ''irrespective of how many billions of dollars a person has on his personal or corporate account.''

Would that it were true. Whatever he may or may not have done, Mr. Khodorkovsky, chairman of the Yukos oil company, has not been arrested solely because he may have committed crimes. If the Russian government were to hold all wealthy businessmen to account for the laws they broke while accumulating capital over the past decade, far more people would be under arrest. In fact, Mr. Khodorkovsky's arrest has been widely understood in Russia as a political act—and possibly the beginning of a real change in official Russian attitudes toward private property and capitalism itself.

Mr. Khodorkovsky stands out in Russia because he has made his company and its books more transparent than had any of his rivals. Though the origins of his empire are shady, he is, in some ways, Russia's first real capitalist—and like a real capitalist, he hasn't hesitated to participate openly in the democratic system by donating money to political parties, including those who oppose Mr. Putin. Putting him under arrest sends a clear signal to other Russians that no one is safe from arbitrary prosecution, or from the political whims of the Kremlin.

It's also a signal that the Russian government cares far more about destroying its rivals than it does about genuinely improving the Russian economy. In recent months, there were signs that capital flight from Russia had stabilized, as Russian businessmen slowly began to feel more confident in the country's legal system. Following Mr. Khodorkovsky's arrest, the stock market crashed and the Russian ruble plunged, as rumors of new capital flight abounded. Large investors, including Western oil companies, may be confident they have enough Kremlin connections to stay in the country, but smaller investors are now more likely to stay away.

The Bush administration's reaction to this arrest may determine whether it sticks. Just a few weeks ago, President Bush endorsed ''President Putin's vision for Russia: a country . . . in which democracy and freedom and rule of law thrive.'' It's hard to see how President Putin's ''vision'' can include the rule of law if it also includes arbitrary prosecution. Certainly there are some within the administration who believe that a Russian strategic decision to start rolling back democracy and the rule of law will undermine the Russian-American relationship. But the president himself must now recognize that that is what now may be happening. Mr. Bush may be unable to persuade his friend Vladimir to behave differently, but it is vital that he try. The preservation of democracy in Russia is more than an ideal; it is a crucial U.S. interest.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I remind my colleagues of the vital importance of developing, and then maintaining, effective cybersecurity systems in our workplaces, our government offices, and our homes. We have all become acutely aware, as we confront the many possible threats to our national security, that much of our critical infrastructure is now run by computer networks. Illegal access to these networks can compromise the provision of power, telecommunications, and water in an instant. In the private sector, whole industries now rely on information technology in order to function. In addition, millions of Americans depend on their computers to explore the Internet, to access information and entertainment, and to preserve their personal records. At the same time they must protect their most significant, and often intimate, data—such as medical records and credit card information. With all this at risk, effective cybersecurity should be paramount in every corporation, government agency, and personal home.