

As the Senior Senator for California, I also know how vital the entertainment industry is to my home State, where more than 150,000 people are employed in more than 1,000 entertainment-related companies.

The academy, itself, was founded in 1946 by Syd Cassyd, and elected a year later Edgar Bergan as president. Under his direction, the academy first produced the Emmy Awards in 1948. The organization went national when it merged with the New York Academy in 1947 with Ed Sullivan as its first president.

The academy continued to expand adding new chapters throughout the United States.

Today, with 9,000 members, the academy is the largest organization in the television industry. In addition to the Emmys for which it is best known, the academy also runs an intern program for college students interested in film and holds student film competitions. In 1984, the academy formed its first steering committee on drug and alcohol abuse and began its work with a 2-day seminar in Washington, DC with First Lady Nancy Reagan. A decade later, the academy sponsored another meeting—this one focusing on the information superhighway—with our Vice President, AL GORE.

Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences as a leader in the entertainment industry. I commend the academy on its growth and creativity over the past 50 years and I look forward to the next 50.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask that I might be able to speak for about 10 minutes in morning business.

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

#### OMNIBUS PARKS BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest from many Members in the disposition of the omnibus parks bill. As the Chair is aware, we as a committee, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, met in conference and reported out the Presidio package several days ago, which contains 126 separate sections covering some 41 States.

We sent it over to the House. There was an implication regarding taxes on one particular section. We attempted to clear it over here. We had an objection. That objection has been addressed. It is my understanding that, procedurally, this matter can move from this body, assuming there is no further objection.

There is another track that is underway by some Members—mostly from the other body—that suggest that the disposition of the omnibus parks bill should be in the appropriation bill, the CR that is forming. I find that extraordinary because there are authorizers and there are appropriators. My com-

mittee, as an authorizing committee, has done its job. The Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Representative YOUNG, has done its job. We got our packages together. We had further communicated with the White House over a week ago, addressing specifically certain contentious sections and asking for a disposition.

There are, initially, four major items in dispute. One was the Utah wilderness issue. The administration saw fit to initiate the invocation of the Antiquities Act to take care of the Utah wilderness. In other words, it was a land grab; the administration simply took 1.8 million acres and didn't notify the Utah delegation—the Governor, the Members of the Senate or the House. It was really a land grab, with no public process, which this administration highlights as part of their philosophy. We had been debating Utah wilderness for an extensive period of time and hadn't resolved it. But the democratic process was going on, people were being heard, different views were being heard.

It wasn't so long ago that we had an opportunity to debate the California wilderness bill. There was no antiquities application or land grab there. They let the democratic process move forward. The reason I point this out is because that was a contentious item, Utah wilderness. We withdrew it because of the threat of a veto.

Another contentious issue involved a 15-year extension for the only manufacturing plant in my State of Alaska. Without a 15-year extension, it could not make the \$200 million investment to change that plant from a conventional pulp plant to a chlorine-free plant. They needed that commitment. The Forest Service would put up the timber so they could amortize the investment. The administration chose to object to that. The problem is, of course, that there is no source of timber, other than Federal timber, because all of southeastern Alaska is part of the Tongass National Forest. The communities are in the forest. The communities were assured at the time the forest was created that there would be enough timber to maintain a modest timber industry. So out of the 17 million acres of the forest, we have digressed down to trying to maintain an industry on about 1.7 million acres.

The pathetic part of it is, Mr. President, only roughly half of the timber is suitable for pulp. It is either dead, dying, or immature, in the sense that there is not enough soil to continue to maintain growth to full maturity. It has no other use. The reason this pulp mill was created is so we would have a tax base—this is the only year-round manufacturing plant in the State—and to secure jobs, and we would not have to export the pulp out of the State of Alaska—at that time, it was the territory of Alaska—down to the mills in the State of Washington, or to British Columbia, or Oregon.

Well, by the administration's dictate of lack of support for the extension,

this mill will close. So the Senator from Alaska has taken his hit. I withdrew that from the omnibus parks package. Then we had the grazing issue. The administration objected to the fee structure of grazing on public land—the traditional Western use of public land. So we withdrew that. Then we moved up to Minnesota and we had the Boundary Waters Area. This was a question of whether you could use small motorized four-wheelers to haul small boats, canoes, and so forth, over a trail between the lake system. It is all right for the young folks to get 10 people out there and push it, but some of the older folks need some motorized assistance. They objected to that. So we took that out.

Mr. President, as justification for that I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the OMB outlining the objections be printed in the RECORD, along with a list.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT  
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 25, 1996.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,  
Majority Leader,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LOTT: I am writing to provide the Administration's initial views on the conference report on H.R. 1296, the Omnibus Parks Legislation, that was filed last night. We are still in the process of reviewing this extensive legislation and understand that a number of changes were made to the conference report from the version of the bill we reviewed late last week. But, on the basis of our review of the conference report language, the President would veto the conference report.

The conference report still includes provisions that are unacceptable to the Administration including: unwarranted boundary reductions to the Shenandoah and Richmond Battlefield National Parks in Virginia, special interest benefits adversely affecting the management of the Sequoia National Park in California, permanent changes in the process for regulating rights of way across national parks and other federal lands, unfavorable modification of the Ketchikan Pulp Company contract in the Tongass National Forest, erosion of coastal barrier island protections in Florida, and mandated changes that would significantly alter and delay the completion of the Tongass Land Management Plan.

We have repeatedly stated our strong support for legislation to improve the management of the Presidio in San Francisco, use Federal funds to help acquire the Sterling Forest in the New York/New Jersey Highlands Regions, and establish the Tallgrass Prairie National in Kansas. We have also repeatedly stated our strong willingness to work with you to develop bipartisan, compromise legislation that protects our Nation's natural resources. This conference report does not meet that test. We remain willing to work with you to develop a compromise package that could be included in a bill to provide continuing appropriations for FY 1997.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. RAINES,  
Director.

## H.R. 1296, OMNIBUS PARKS BILL

Sec.	Title
101	Presidio (CA).
201	Yucca House (AZ) boundary.
202	Zion NP (UT) boundary.
203	Pictured Rocks (MI) boundary.
204	Independent Hall (PA) boundary.
205	Craters of the Moon (ID) boundary.
206	Hagerman Fossil Beds boundary.
207	Wupatki (AZ) boundary.
208	Walnut Canyon (AZ) boundary adj.
209	Butte County (CA) conveyance.
210	Taos Pueblo (NM) land transfer.
211	Colonial (VA) NHP transfer.
212	Cuprum (ID) relief (FS).
213	Ranch A (WY) land conveyance.
214	Douglas (WY) relinquishment of interest.
215	Modoc (CA) NF boundary expansion.
217	Cumberland Gap (VA) NHP exchange.
221	Merced (CA) irrigation district exchange.
222	Father Aull (NM) land transfer.
301	Targhee (ID) NF land exchange.
302	Anaktuvuk Pass (AK) land exchange.
305	Arkansas and Oklahoma land exchange.
306	Big Thicket (TX) land exchange.
307	Lost Creek (MT) land exchange.
308	Cleveland (CA) NF land exchange.
310	BLM reauthorization.
402	Rio Puerco (NM) watershed.
403	Old Spanish Trail study.
404	Great Western Trail (CO and others).
407	Lamprey (NH) wild and scenic river.
408	West Virginia rivers amendments.
409	Wild & Scenic River technical amend.
410	North St. Vrain Creek (CO) protection.
501	Selma-Montgomery (AL) historic trail.
503	Kaloko-Honokohau (HI) commission ext.
504	Boston Library (MA) carry NPS material.
505	Women's Rights NHP (NY) amendments.
506	Black Rev. War Patriots memorial ext.
507	Hist. Black Colleges historic buildings.
508	Martin Luther King memorial in D.C.
509	ACHP reauthorization.
510	Great Falls (NJ) Historic District.
511	New Bedford (MA) Nat. His. District.
512	Nicodemus (KS) Nat. His. Site.
513	Unalaska (AK) affiliated area.
514	Japanese American memorial in D.C.
515	Manzanar (CA) NHS land exchange.
516	AIDS Memorial Grove (CA) memorial.
601	U.S. Civil War Center (LA) at LSU.
605	American Battlefield Protection.
606	Chikamauga (GA) NHP auth. increase.
702	Delaware Water Gap (PA) fees.
801	Remove limit on park buildings.
802	Authority for NPS to transport children.
804	NPS museum properties.
805	Volunteers in parks.
807	Carl Garner cleanup day.
808	Fort Pulaski (GA) reservation removal.
809	Laura Hudson Vis. Center (LA) renaming.
810	Lagomarsino Vis. Center (CA) renaming.
812	Dayton (OH) Aviation Heritage amend.
813	Angeles NF (CA) transfer prohibition.
814	Grand Lake Cemetery.
817	William Smullin (OR) BLM visitor center.
901	Blackstone (MA) heritage area amend.
902	Illinois & Michigan Canal (IL) NHA amend.
1001	Tallgrass Prairie (KS) Nat'l Preserve.
1011	Sterling Forest (NY/NJ).
1023	Recreation lakes commission.
1024	Bisti/De-Na-Zin (WV) wilderness expand.
1025	Opal Creek (OR) wilderness and rec. area.
1026	Upper Klamath Basin (OR) restoration.
1027	Deschutes Basin (OR) restoration.
1030	Bull Run (OR) watershed protection.
1031	Oregon Islands (OR) wilderness additions.
1032	Umpqua River (OR) land exchange study.
1033	Boston Harbor Islands (MA) NRA.
1035	Elkhorn Ridge (CA) BLM substitute timber.
Added in conference:	
313	Kenai Natives (AK) land exchange—House version only.
1042	Katmai (AK) NP subsistence fishing.
1101	California Bay Delta Environment.
(NPS advises it could support individual heritage area designations if overall program authority in HR 1296 is deleted or replaced with HR 1301.)	
	Essex (MA) NHA.
	Ohio and Erie Canal (OH) NHA.
	Augusta (GA) NHA.
	Steel Industry (PA) NHA.
	South Carolina NHA.
	Tennessee Civil War NHA.
	West Virginia Coal NHA.
	Great Northern Frontier (NY) study.
	Lower Eastern Shore (MD) study.
	Champlain Valley (VT) study.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, that being done, we assumed that the administration may have mild objection to others. But last night we had a proposal from the administration. I want those that are watching in the offices to pay particular attention because I am going to refer to those in the balance of my remarks because, if you look at them, I

can't say they are nonpartisan. They are very partisan as to what they now want omitted from the package. So it seems like they have goalposts on wheels because now they want more omitted. Not only do they want more omitted but they do not want this package that the authorizers have completed in both the House and Senate. They don't want this package to be presented in the two bodies.

As evidence of that, Mr. President, I read the accompanying letter dated September 25. I think just the last sentence is in order. The letter is from Franklin D. Raines, Director of the Executive Offices of the President. "This conference report"—which is our authorizing effort—"does not meet the test. We remain willing to work with you to develop a compromise package that could be included in a bill to provide continuing appropriations."

So what they want to do is they want to cherry pick this 126-section, 41-State report—over 2 years of effort. Some of these things have been before my committee for over 4 years. Our committee acted in a bipartisan manner. We took the issues on the merits.

Let me show you what the administration proposed last night, and you can judge for yourselves.

Of course, title I, the Presidio, which we all support, is included. But when we get into title II, the Boundary Adjustments and Conveyances, it is rather interesting.

Section 216 they want omitted. That is conveyance to the city of Sumpter, OR. That happens to be Senator HATFIELD.

Section 218, Shenandoah National Park: That is Senator WARNER. Senator JEFFORDS has an interest I believe, and Senator ROBB also has an interest.

Section 219, Tulare conveyance: The Colorado delegation and perhaps the Utah delegation has an interest.

Section 220, the Alpine School District: Senator HATFIELD. They want that omitted.

Section 223, Coastal Barrier Resource System in Florida: Senator MACK, Senator GRAHAM, and I believe the Governor of Florida, a Democrat, happens to feel very strongly that this should be in there. They want that stricken.

There is a Unified School District. I think that is the California issue.

Several in Alaska: The Alaska Peninsula Subsurface Consolidation, which is a very, very small consolidation on the Alaskan Peninsula.

But here is a big one they want stricken: Snowbasin Land Exchange Act. That is big in Utah. That is big in the Olympics. That is big in Idaho. That is big out west. This is going to allow a land exchange so Utah can hold the winter Olympics. They want it stricken out of here. They don't want it. They don't want that land exchange. There are some, evidently, environmental objections somewhere. It must be a lot stronger than we thought. We held hearings on it. The

base of support from the States and the Olympic Committee spoke for itself.

Sand Hollow Land Exchange: Another Utah issue they want stricken.

Out in Colorado, section 311, 312, 313: Land exchange with the city of Greeley, CO, for the water supply and storage company.

And, then there are a couple more: Gates of the Arctic Land Preserve Exchange; the Native's association land exchange.

They own our State. There is no question about that. As we try to make adjustments to accommodate our citizens, we go through a process of hearings, get the input, and get the State administration involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I was not aware there was a time limit on morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a time limit on morning business.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that I may have another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I will try to be a little more rapid.

Colorado, section 101: Cache La Poudre corridor, Senator BROWN, Senator CAMPBELL.

RS2477, Section 405: An Alaskan issue.

They want to strike 406, the Hanford Reach protection which is out in the State of Washington.

Section 502, which is an historic area, the Vancouver National Historical Reserve: GORTON; MURRAY. They want to strike that.

Civil and Revolutionary War sites: That is section 602.

The Corinth, Mississippi Battlefield Act: I believe Senator LOTT.

The Richmond National Battlefield Park: Senator WARNER, and perhaps Senator ROBB.

Section 604, the Revolutionary War, and the War of 1812 Historic Preservation Study: Senator JEFFORDS.

The Shenandoah Valley Battlefield: Senator WARNER and Senator ROBB.

Ski area permit for rental charges they want stricken.

Visitors' services they want stricken. This is a park fee.

Glacier Bay National Park: Section 704 stricken.

And then out in the West: Senator BOND, Senator ASHCROFT, section 803, referral, burros and horses.

And, moving on, another Alaskan issue, 806, Katmai.

Senator CAMPBELL, section 811: Expenditure of Funds Outside Authorized Boundaries of the Rocky Mountain National Park, stricken.

Section 815: National Park Service Administration Reform; Senator BAUCUS, and Senator FEINSTEIN, I believe.

Mineral King, additional permits, Section 816, stricken.

Section 818, Calumet Ecological Park: I believe that is Senator SIMON, and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

Moving over to others: Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex, stricken; 1021, Senator CAMPBELL, National Park Foundation, Senator BUMPERS and myself, stricken; 1027, 1028, 1029, the Deschutes basin ecosystem, Senator HATFIELD; Mount Hood Corridor Land Exchange, HATFIELD; creation of a forest; Senator HATFIELD; 1034, Natchez National Historical Park, Senator COCHRAN; and the rest of them are in this section 1035; and a few Alaskan issues of little consequence.

Mr. President, the point I want to conclude with is we as authorizers have done our job. There is an effort now to circumvent the legitimate process of the authorizers by momentum of the administration to put this in the appropriations package. I have committed to Senator GORTON. If they want to put the whole thing in, that is one thing. But I am not going to see the effort made by our authorizing committee and our conferees to have this simply cherry picked. Otherwise, there is absolutely no reason for our existence. If the appropriations process is going to pick up and cherry pick what we have done when we are ready to go, we have our holdings—at least I am sure on our side—addressed because of the way this process would proceed. The way this process would proceed, Mr. President, since we are ready to send it back over to the House by taking off the technical blue slip because of the tax implications, but we have to do that, of course, without objection. We are ready to do that.

Our job is done. The only risk to this is in sending it and subjecting it to a vote for recommitment. If the vote fails, the package is dead. But it will not fail. It will not fail in the House. It will not fail here. Give us a chance to vote on the package. Give us a chance to vote on what the authorizers have done here.

I implore my colleagues, particularly those who have been around here for a while, to recognize what this attempt is all about. They did not think we could get a consensus on the parks omnibus package. They thought all along they would be able to cherry-pick what they want out of it, but we fooled them. We got our job done. And now they are using the momentum of some in the minority to suggest they are going to go ahead anyway.

Well, we will see about that. We are ready to go. Our job is done. And to suggest some expeditious action by including it in the appropriations process at this late stage simply is not the way the Senate is supposed to function. I know that all of us get frustrated from time to time relative to our chairmanships, but this is a travesty of the process if this is a successful effort to cherry-pick those things and put them in the appropriations process when we are ready to go now. We can have it done today. We should be allowed to proceed.

So I hope that the leadership would reflect on that at noon when we pro-

ceed with the remainder of the calendar and just how we are going to treat these provisions, specifically the omnibus parks legislation, because at noon we will be ready to go subject to an objection. If there is an objection, I hope those objecting will come up with an alternative so that we can meet their objections, because our job is done. Technically, there is no reason why the parks omnibus package should not move ahead as it was intended and designed to do and as reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I certainly understand and sympathize with the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], who, as chairman of an authorizing committee, has before us an important bill on which time has been spent and many hearings have been held. It is enormously frustrating not to be able to have that put before us and acted upon. I am very supportive of the efforts he spoke of regarding the Presidio bill.

#### WORK FORCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I wish also to speak as chairman of an authorizing committee, the Labor and Human Resources Committee, about my frustration that we cannot act on a piece of legislation I think is very important. It deals with job training reform. It is called the Work Force and Career Development Act. Numerous hearings have been held on this bill over the past 2 years of the 104th Congress. It passed the Senate with only two dissenting votes. It passed the House. And now we have on the calendar a conference report. It is enormously disappointing to me that in the final days of the 104th Congress we are subject to dilatory tactics, and if legislation is not going to be called up today, or at the latest Monday, there is no hope of it succeeding.

So I would like to speak for a moment, before this legislation will be put in the dust bin of the 104th Congress, on the need for major job training reform. I would like to speak on why I believe it was so important for us to have been able to consider this legislation and my disappointment that it cannot be brought forward.

The legislation would have reformed our job training and training-related programs. There is no doubt that the current maze of training programs is woefully inadequate to address the very real and immediate needs of workers for training and education. I think nothing makes us more aware of this than reports we have continually heard about how important skilled workers are to our work force today and the importance of vocational education.

Despite over \$5 billion which the Federal Government spends annually on our various job training programs, the results are less than impressive. Study after study has pointed out the waste and overlap among job training programs that now exists.

Just to name a few, in January of 1994, the General Accounting Office issued a report, entitled "Conflicting Requirements Hampered Delivery of Services."

Another GAO report was issued in March of 1994: "Most Federal Agencies Do Not Know if Their Programs Are Working Effectively." Other titles include: "Overlap Among Training Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency," and "Major Overhaul Needed To Reduce Costs, Streamline the Bureaucracy, and Improve Results."

According to a 1996 GAO report, entitled "Long-Term Earnings and Employment Outcomes," few training programs have been rigorously evaluated to assess their true impact on the long-term earnings of participants. While there may be some positive effects for participants shortly after training, the GAO found that over a 5-year period JTPA, the Job Training Partnership Act, participants rarely earn much more than comparable individuals who do not participate in that program, and their employment rates are only slightly higher. Despite months of training and placement assistance, the GAO could not attribute the higher earnings to JTPA training rather than to chance alone.

All too often, Mr. President, training programs spell disappointment for those who have sought assistance in building a better life for themselves and their families. That is why I think this is such a missed opportunity. We have talked and talked about reinventing government. That was an initiative that President Clinton, when he took office, announced he was going to undertake. This is a perfect example of where we had the opportunity to do so, and now we find we are thwarted from voting on the conference report on this important piece of legislation.

We heard testimony before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources from Ernestine Dunn who said that her experience with Federal job training programs was "a journey [she] thought would never end." She spent over 10 years and went through eight different job-training programs before getting the job skills and training she needed to get off welfare and into a permanent, well-paying job.

Her experience is not unique. With all the different programs and organizations that deliver services, people have difficulty knowing where to begin to look for assistance. As a result, they may go to the wrong agency or, worse, give up altogether. When training is provided, it often results in only part-time or temporary work. We must do better if we are going to create a world-class work force that can compete in the 21st century. I believe it is