

onto Main Street. It goes into hardware stores, and it goes into the grocery stores, and it goes into the used car lot and everywhere else—the banks, too, if there is some left over. Maybe it even goes for recreation or vacations. For the most part, however, usually the little that is left over goes back into the ranch to improve the ranch. I don't think people understand that ranching is the economic backbone for many rural communities in the West. When one rancher goes down, the whole community is affected. People up in the administration like to talk about the interconnectedness of ecosystems. Well, the rural ranching communities are a great example of an interconnected community. One element goes down, and the whole system crashes.

It seems to me, knowing what I do, as a western Senator, about ranching, when you kill the ranching industry—you also kill Main Street. I believe a disproportionate increase in a fee could do just that, and there are many studies that have indicated that a fee increase would indeed have devastating repercussions for the rancher and the community. This is obviously a serious issue to many small towns in the West, in probably eight or nine States at the very least. A blind and politically driven fee increase would result in putting real hard-working people on the welfare lines, and destroying property tax bases in our region. I do not think that is what our goal ought to be.

The Senator from Arkansas also mentioned one person in particular which he used to convince folks, in his catch-all kind of shotgun attack, that large ranchers are the same as corporate ranchers. That man was a man by the name of Dan Russell. I happen to personally know Dan Russell, although I do not know him well. I met him years ago, clear back in the 1960's. I disagree strongly with the Senator from Arkansas' characterization of his operation as some type of heartless, profit-driven corporate industry.

Dan Russell's family has ranches for almost 100 years on both sides of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California and Nevada, too. He probably made 98 percent of his money or more from ranching, although he has probably invested in other things, too. Yes, he did make money, but I do not think that is against the law and it should not be against the law.

Dan Russell may have made money, but one factor that the Senator from Arkansas failed to mention is that Dan is known as one of the most community-minded people in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Dan's profit has been a profit for his community. If you go to Folsom, CA, a small town northeast of Sacramento, you find the Dan Russell Arena, which Dan donated. A lot of events are held there for the community. He is known as a civic leader and community-minded citizen who has made his money through real ranching, not because he

had an interest in Texaco or something else. Dan's contributions to his local community should be commended, not condemned.

I would now like to address the issue of fair market value. This issue comes up in this debate time after time. There is a great misperception about the fees for public lands, as if, somehow, ranchers in the West are ripping off the taxpayer because they do not pay the same amount for their AUM as a rancher in some other State that has to rent private land. I have private land. My wife's family used to have permits. I can tell you there is a big difference between private land and permits on public lands. The public land permits do not have the same sorts of benefits you could get on private land. Developments, improvements, anything you would not have to pay or provide on private lands, you have to pay for out of your own pocket on public lands. You get a lot more for your money with private rentals than you do with the permits. I think it is simply a bad comparison.

I would like to illustrate the ludicrous nature of this comparison with a couple of examples. I live out West where, if you want to go get your own Christmas tree at Christmas, you can do it on public lands. You can get a \$5 permit from the Forest Service and go cut a tree. Virtually any tree of any size that you can carry out of there, is only \$5. Yet, if you go downtown to any city in America and you buy a tree on the lot, it will probably cost you \$5 a foot. So how do you go about comparing the two? If you use the same rationale in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, we should start charging folks \$5 a foot for the trees on Forest Service land. I have a hunch though, that if you told everybody who wanted to go out in the forest and cut his or her own Christmas tree, many of whom have built traditions off of this practice year after year, that we were going to charge them \$5 a foot for any tree they pack out of the forest, they would probably get pretty darned angry about it. Is it fair? How about this example: In Denver, CO, if you go to the zoo to see eagles, hawks, coyotes, snakes, alligators, elk, and deer or whatever kind of animal, you pay \$6. If you drive about 30 minutes from the zoo to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, you could easily see a lot of these animals, and you wouldn't be charged a cent. Under the Senator from Arkansas' logic with fair market value, maybe we ought to charge anybody who wants to see a deer, who goes out in the forest, \$6 to go out and look at deer. There would be a national uprising if we even suggested something like that.

This business about fair market value is simply a classic case of apples and oranges. It does not fit and it is not fair.

Finally, I would like to address another example that demonstrates the difficulties in ranching on public lands.

Currently, under the rangeland reform regulations and the Bingaman substitute amendment, the permittees on public lands who have put money into improvements are not allowed to have any ownership over the investments they make. The ranchers simply have to put in that money themselves—there are no Federal grants to assist them—and they get very little in return in the end. Under the Domenici bill, there are real incentives for permittees to improve their allotments. Unless you provide real incentives for the rancher, the condition of the range will continue to be substandard. This is not the fault or responsibility of the rancher. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government. It just makes sense—people have to feel empowered, they have to feel like they have a stake in what they work on, in order for them to be proactive in improving the conditions.

In any event, I did want to come down just for a moment and voice my opposition to both the Jeffords amendment and the Bumpers amendment. I think they are both just shots in the dark, and by trying to go after the big corporations they will create casualties amongst the hard-working family ranchers of the West.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, just for a moment, I, too, cannot resist the opportunity to make some comment on what we have heard over the last few minutes. I guess it is because I have heard it a half a dozen times since I came here to the Congress in 1989. Every year this same thing goes on, we go through this same business.

Basically, the first decision you have to make is the question of, as the previous speaker said, "highly subsidized grazing." Let me quote for you a study that was made by Pepperdine University. It was a comparative analysis of economic and financial conditions. It happened to be in Montana, between ranchers who have Federal lands and those who do not. These are just a few of the findings.

Montana ranchers who rely upon access to Federal lands and grazing do not have a competitive advantage over other ranchers in the State. Livestock operators with direct access to Federal forage do not enjoy significant economic or financial advantages over ranchers who do not utilize Federal forage.

It goes on and on. This is not my study; it is an academic study from Pepperdine University.

The point of the matter is, there is a great deal of difference between what you buy in State lands and what you buy in private lands and what you get in public lands. The Senator was talking about comparing it to Arkansas. What do they get, 35, 40 inches of moisture a year? In Wyoming, we get 6 or 8. There is a substantial difference there. Out in the Red Desert, where much of this land is, it takes 100 acres for one animal unit year. That is what it takes. It is different.

State lands you can fence. State lands you can—they are better quality lands. Generally they are small, isolated tracts that are enclosed. It is not comparable.

The Senator was talking about \$1.35. Our bill does not talk about \$1.35, it talks about \$1.85. It talks about going up from where we were. It has a formula based on the price and the value of cattle. It does not treat different people differently.

The Senator keeps mentioning the Rock Springs Grazing Association, that it is a great corporation. It is not a great corporation. It is a combination of relatively small ranches.

I keep hearing about it every year, the same thing. I just do not understand it. It is interesting, of course, that all those who talk about this come from nonpublic-land States. I guess that might have something to do with it.

In any event, I oppose these propositions. I think the formula has nothing to do with the price of cattle. It has nothing to do with the idea of what it is you are buying. Anyone who thinks there is a comparative value between private leasing and public lands just has not taken a look at it. They just have not taken a look at it.

Madam President, I am sure we will talk about this some more tomorrow, and should. But I want to tell you that this whole idea of trying to establish two classes of users is not even supported by the Secretary of the Interior over time. It has never been used before. The idea that the whole thing is subsidized simply is not the case. It is a matter of utilizing the resources on a multiple-use basis.

Tell me how many private land leases are also shared with hunters and fishermen and leased to oil? They are not that way. That is not the way it is. So, it is interesting to me that we continue to have this same discussion every time this comes up. Fortunately, that position does not generally prevail.

Madam President, we will pursue it some more tomorrow. For tonight, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Just for a minute I want to speak on the bill before us, and then I want to ask permission to speak as in morning business for about 7 or 8 minutes.

Before I speak in morning business, most of the time I only speak on agricultural issues as they relate to the Midwest—the cattle, the pork, the production of corn, production of soybeans, and some wheat. But I think a lot of things that could be said on that issue can be said on this bill as well.

Part of the problem that the Senators from the West are having comes from a lot of constituents who are legitimately expressing concern about the environment, legitimately expressing concern about the good management and a good economic return for the Federal Government on land that the taxpayers own, who do all this legitimately. But they forget, in the

process, they are not appreciating what the consumer of America has in the way of production of food in America.

I think too often the 98 percent of the people in this country who are not producing food—remember, that is 2 percent of the people in this country producing the food that the other 98 percent eat, or another way to put it, one farmer in America will produce enough food not only for Americans but for people outside of America to feed another 124 people—the 98 percent do not really appreciate the fact that food grows on farms, it does not grow in supermarkets.

They are so used to going to the supermarket, getting anything they want anytime they want it and just pay for it. Every time you pay for it, you think you are paying for a very expensive item. But, in fact, food in the United States, not only being of the highest quality, is also a cheaper product in America than any other country in the world.

The consumers of America spend about 9 or 10 percent of their disposable income on food. Look at any other country, and the percentage is in the high teens and low twenties, and in some of the countries of Eastern Europe, it could be 40 percent of income spent just on food.

I know none of you is going to buy the argument when I say we are talking about subsidies for farmers. Just think of the subsidy that the consumers of America get from the efficient production of food in America that consumers in other places in the world do not get from production of food by their farmers.

I do not expect anybody to buy the argument that the farmers of America are subsidizing the food bill of consumers of America by 40 percent, but that is a fact, because we produce so efficiently, we produce such a high-quality product that it is just a little irksome for those of us who are involved in agriculture to sit around here and listen to this lack of appreciation of what the farmers do for the consumers of America, what 2 percent of the people do for the other 98 percent, what we not only do in the way of production of food and fiber, but what we do to create jobs in America, because whatever starts out at the natural resources of America, whether it be on the row-crop farms of the Midwest or the grazing lands of the West, the start of that product there, when you trace that product from the farm through the consumer of America, you are talking about a food and fiber chain that is 20 percent of the gross national product of America.

That is jobs for a lot of people other than the 2 percent of the people who are farmers. Quite frankly, a lot of income returned on labor is much greater than the return that the farmer gets for labor.

So you can go ahead in this debate over the next day or two and have all the fun you want to about doing what you think is right for the environment or what you think is right for a return

on investment for the taxpayers who have money invested in public land and give the farmers of America a bad time. We probably have to take it because we are such a small segment of the population, but I would like to see, once in a while, an appreciation from the people in the Congress of the United States, not only this body but the other body as well, for the 2 percent of the people who provide a good product and a cheap product for the consumers of America.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 7 minutes.

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

THE VOID IN MORAL LEADERSHIP—PART II

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, yesterday, I spoke about the void in moral leadership in the White House.

I felt obliged, as Teddy Roosevelt said, to speak the truth about the President.

Let me quote him once more.

Some of my colleagues may not have heard me yesterday.

He said it is absolutely necessary that we have full liberty to tell the truth about the President and his acts.

Any other attitude in an American citizen is both base and servile.

To announce that there must be no criticism of the President . . . is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public . . .

It is even more important to tell the truth, pleasant or unpleasant, about him than about anyone else.

I quoted yesterday from another great President, also named Roosevelt. Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said,

The Presidency is not merely an administrative office . . .

It is more than an engineering job . . .

It is pre-eminently a place of moral leadership.

That is why it is important to reflect on this issue.

I speak about the moral leadership issue because I believe it is critical.

Because it is lacking.

I make a distinction between leadership and moral leadership.

Leadership means the capacity for exercising responsible authority.

There are many in this body who are outstanding leaders.

This is reflected in the many important laws we write for the Nation.

Moral leadership is different.

Moral leadership means we do not just pass laws for the rest of the Nation, and exempt ourselves.

It means we pass laws and we apply them to ourselves, as well.

We set the example.

We say one thing, and we do it, too.

That is what I mean by moral leadership.

This Congress, for example, in one of its very first deeds, passed the Congressional Accountability Act.