

the 1989–90 academic year, the number of degrees awarded by the member institutions of The College Fund/UNCF have increased 64 percent in biology, 39 percent in mathematics, and 31 percent in physics and chemistry.

At Morehouse College, more than 1/3 of our graduates are in science and engineering. And, last year at Morehouse, we received federal support to establish a Center of Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Education. The Center's mission is to increase the number of underrepresented groups pursuing careers in science, mathematics and engineering by providing scholarships and recruiting male and female high school students to participate in intensive summer programs, and by providing professional development activities and research experiences for public high school teachers.

I do not single out this program because it is unique, but because it is an example of the kind of initiatives we need more of to ensure diversity in the sciences, and to ensure that our world will not be cheated out of the best we—that is all of us—can offer.

As I indicated earlier, the arguments I have made for diversity in the sciences are equally compelling when applied to business and other fields. In fact, American businesses particularly those that are becoming more and more multi-national and global in their operations, are making these arguments. No major American company has renounced its commitment to diversity. In fact, if anything, these companies are enhancing their commitment.

It is ironic that when it comes to affirmative action, the most potentially retrogressive sector of American society is not the business and commercial world, but higher education—an area we would hope and expect to lead the nation in setting a positive example for inclusion and diversity.

The University of California, a multi-billion dollar operation, is the only major institution in the nation that has formally withdrawn its commitment to such programs. Only one board of directors or regents of any institution in the nation has voluntarily changed its course, and that is a major university. There is a message in this for those of us in higher education.

This development is particularly sobering when we reflect on the fact that the birthplace of the Civil Rights Movement, and in many ways, the birthplace of the feminist movement for equal rights for women, grew out of the protest activities and the scholarly writings and research of individuals in the university and college community.

Indeed how ironic—and how unfortunate—it would be if we allowed higher education institutions, which have paved the way for so much progress in the area of diversity, to be the vanguard leading us back into the past.

I do not think this will happen, for I know the vast majority of my colleagues in higher education are committed to a vision of an inclusive, diverse society. But, it is incumbent on us in higher education, and indeed all of education, to continue to make the case, present the arguments, and marshal the evidence that the struggles and challenges of present-day affirmative action programs will ultimately benefit us all.

PROTECTING PUBLIC LANDS

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1997

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, over the past 20 years, the demands on our public lands

and resources have been steadily increasing. Growing interest in the kinds of recreational opportunities offered by our national parks, forests, and other lands has led to overcrowding at many of the most popular parks, and increased visitorship almost everywhere. At the same time, the need for the land management agencies to advance their mission of resource protection has also increased. Growth and development has reduced wildlife habitat, has increased the demand for pure and clean water, and has intensified the environmental stresses on undeveloped land, including many of the lands owned by all the American people and managed for them by the Federal Government.

But while the demands have been increasing, the share of the Federal budget devoted to these resources has been declining. The agencies have been asked more and more to pay their own way—as if the work they do did not benefit all Americans. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, originally intended to provide a secure and steady source of funding to acquire critically important properties for public benefit, has fallen into disuse: Its funds are now used primarily to lend money to the Treasury for other purposes.

If we have not seen the stresses on our parks and forests and refuges with our own eyes, all of us have at least read about them—the constant traffic at parks like Yosemite and Grand Canyon, the sagging roof at Independence Hall, the damage done to Anasazi ruins in the Southwest that the Government can't afford to guard. Our national treasures are decaying. Our citizens who want to visit and enjoy them can't be accommodated. And our natural resources—our pure water, our wildlife—are suffering.

It is time that we reverse direction and start increasing our investment in these resources, and increasing our attention to these problems. I'm pleased to say that over 150 organizations from all around the country—national groups and local groups, conservation groups and recreation groups, sportspeople and environmentalists, hikers, hunters, fishers, and scientists, have joined together to endorse a specific and detailed proposal for gradually and steadily increasing investment in these resources over the next 5 years. Their proposal would help to alleviate the strain on the land management agencies, help them deal with their backlog of repair and restoration projects, and help them to serve the needs and demands of the American public.

Their proposal is by no means a budget buster. On the contrary, if we do not pay attention to these issues, we will be squandering our capital, the lands, and resources we hold in trust for the American people. We cannot afford to keep deferring these needs any more than we could afford to defer fixing a broken pipe or a leaky roof in our own homes.

We will be hearing more about this proposal in the months ahead, as we consider the budget and appropriations for next year. I am sharing it with all my colleagues in the House today, and I ask everyone to give it serious consideration. Appropriately, the great-grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt provided an introduction for the plan, carrying on his family's distinguished tradition of support for public lands and the protection of irreplaceable resources.

I am urging your full consideration of the attached funding recommendations—sup-

ported by 150 environmental, recreation, and conservation groups—for our public lands and wildlife systems.

America's public lands and resources belong to—and benefit—all citizens in numerous ways. They represent a magnificent natural heritage that will be squandered without adequate commitment of funding to support dedicated staff and other resources necessary for proper stewardship. These irreplaceable national assets: Protect wildlife, rare and endangered species, and other living resources; help to keep our air and water clean and pure; supply renewable and non-renewable resources; support vital industries like fishing and resource dependent recreation resulting in billions of dollars of direct and indirect economic benefits for local communities; generate millions of annual recreational visits by enthusiasts engaging in activities like wildlife viewing, photography, camping, family picnics, hunting, and fishing; provide untold hours of enjoyment for millions of American families as well as solace and renewal for those wanting the solitude of a wilderness experience; and satisfy our deeply rooted national ethic to keep wild America alive and thriving.

Given the overwhelming importance of these resources to present and future generations of Americans, the only fiscally responsible course is to invest adequately in their stewardship and management even as we take needed steps to balance the federal budget. Indeed, denying critically needed funding is fiscally irresponsible and shortsighted—the neglect caused by deficient funding will result in destruction and degradation of these valuable assets that is far more costly in the long run than providing the funds to properly care for them today. The attached proposal makes prudent and modest recommendations for necessary funding increases that will help to protect our public assets and ensure that our children and grandchildren will continue to enjoy and benefit from them.

As President Theodore Roosevelt said, "Wild beasts and birds are by right not the property merely of the people who are alive today, but the property of unborn generations whose belongings we have no right to squander." We owe our unborn future generations a fiscal legacy that acknowledges and sustains their natural legacy.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT IV.

PUBLIC LANDS FUNDING INITIATIVE

INTRODUCTION

The public lands of the United States—our National Parks, Forests, Grasslands, and Wildlife Refuges—are held in trust for current and future generations of Americans. Since the election a number of organizations from the environmental, recreation, and conservation community have been meeting to coordinate an initiative to address the funding needs of America's public lands. The public lands community plans to make this a long-term campaign that will help frame the budget debate while focusing on the message that we can balance the federal budget without abandoning America's public lands.

We plan to convince a majority in Congress that this is an area where additional cuts are not justified, and further, that incremental increases in the public lands budget are necessary to protect the nation's forests, parks, refuges, and wildlife. A successful effort will mean that we can maintain accessibility to these lands and improve their ecological health.

This proposal establishes annualized budget goals for several Department of Interior agencies and the U.S. Forest Service. The environmental, conservation, and recreational community will also be working toward

eliminating ecologically damaging federal programs and subsidies.

BUDGETARY GROWTH: AN INCREMENTAL APPROACH

The following table depicts needed increases in FY97 spending levels for the 602(b) Interior and Related Agencies Budget Allocation. The table identifies the budgetary in-

creases necessary to accommodate public land management over a six-year period. Under this scenario, much needed funding for currently unmet public land conservation needs can be achieved by FY03 through annual increases in the 602(b) budget allocation.

The FY97 Interior Appropriation, less emergency funds, is \$12.4 billion in budget

authority. The first line in the table (Resulting Allocation) presents, in real dollars, the recommended annual funding increases relative to FY97 and not the total allocation for Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee. The second line represents the funding additions to FY97 level for the agencies and programs specified in this document.

INCREASED 602(b) ALLOCATIONS: AN INCREMENTAL APPROACH TO BUDGET GROWTH INCREASES OVER FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING LEVELS

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—						
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Resulting allocation	\$12.4	\$12.97	\$13.33	\$13.68	\$14.04	\$14.39	\$14.68
602(b) Increase	—	0.57	0.93	1.28	1.64	1.99	2.28
Increase from previous FY (%)	—	4.60	2.78	2.63	2.63	2.49	2.02

The proposal speaks to the funding needs and program areas of the agencies and programs identified herein only. It does not account for or anticipate changes in funding levels for other agencies or programs that also receive funding through the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. Nor does it anticipate specific cost savings or budget offsets that may be achieved through reductions in other programs areas within the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. It further does not address funding needs for natural resource and environment programs and agencies which receive funding through appropriation bills other than Interior and Related Agencies.

INCREASED FUNDING NEEDS

In developing our recommendations, we examined budget priorities for the four federal land management agencies: Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. In addition, we considered Land and Water Conservation Fund needs. Increases outlined for each allocation are to be achieved over a six-year period.

Fish and Wildlife Service: proposed increase of \$495 million

Increases are needed for the Fish and Wildlife Service in National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS) Operations and Maintenance (O&M) and Endangered Species activities.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is the only federal public land system dedicated primarily to the conservation of fish and wildlife. Chronic underfunding of Refuge Operations and Maintenance has led to the degradation of refuge habitat and wildlife populations and put at risk popular wildlife oriented recreation programs. The Fish and Wildlife Service has identified a \$440 million maintenance backlog and an annual operations deficit of \$150 million.

More than 200 refuges have no staff and 97% of refuges operate at minimum funding levels with substantial maintenance backlogs. Exotic species, inadequate water supplies, and other problems plague many refuges, undermining the ability to meet wildlife objectives. Programs to help recover endangered, threatened, and candidate species, restore habitats, and address resource threats are left unaccomplished on an increasing number of stations. Continued failure to address this severe funding shortfall will jeopardize the integrity of the NWRS.

Funding for the Endangered Species Act has been chronically inadequate and the Agency has experienced an increase in tasks related to endangered and threatened species. For example, the Fish and Wildlife Service has become increasingly responsible for scientific monitoring for the conservation of endangered and threatened species on federal lands in addition to the increased costs related to designing and implementing Habitat Conservation Plans. The Fish and

Wildlife Service has been sharply criticized for failing to complete its duties, yet it has never been given adequate funds to accomplish its goals. The result is implementation that is sometimes scientifically weak or frustratingly slow for permit applicants.

Adequate funding will promote speedier, less costly recovery, and smooth implementation, ultimately minimizing conflict surrounding ESA. In addition, it is important to note that the anticipated reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act could result in new obligations under the law. The funding recommendations herein cover only current obligations and may require adjustment pending the outcome of reauthorization.

Bureau of Management: proposed increase of \$150 million

The BLM needs increased funding for Management of Lands and Resources. Because of the scope and diversity of its land base, the BLM faces the opportunities and challenges of managing for over 3,000 species of vertebrates and 25,000 plant species in habitats ranging from the Pacific sea coast to the arctic tundra to the Sonoran Desert. BLM lands offer a variety of recreational opportunities and cultural resources and generate significant associated revenues. Yet, many species in each of these habitats are experiencing degrading habitats and declining populations. Likewise, many public land recreational opportunities are either hampered by degrading resource conditions or are themselves the cause of public land resource damage.

Ecological and cultural resource monitoring, restoration, and protection must be elevated to a top priority for the BLM. To that end, funding for riparian restoration and protection, fish and wildlife management, and wilderness management must be increased, as well as funding for the management of cultural resources and recreational activities including staff support on public lands.

Forest Service: proposed increase of \$225 million

Estimates of Forest Service funding needs include Recreation, Ecosystem Research, Fish and Wildlife, and Trails. Funding in these and other critical areas fell short in FY97, and estimates indicate a need for incremental increases in funding for trails, recreation, and ecosystem research. Fish and Wildlife activities are also underfunded including migratory bird management, and Partners in Flight. The condition of the trails, campgrounds, restrooms, and other recreation facilities at our nation's forests is key to the public's experience outdoors. Maintenance and reconstruction funds have not kept up with increased use. For example, the Forest Service estimates that the value of the backlog of trail reconstruction work has climbed to over \$267 million.

The Forest Service's trail system is larger than all the other trail systems in the nation with over 124,000 miles of trail. Because of in-

adequate funds, the Forest Service has been deferring 20 to 30 thousand miles of trail reconstruction every year since the 1980s.

National Park Service: proposed increase of \$600 million

The National Park system today faces tremendous threats and challenges, including degradation of cultural, scenic, and natural resources, air and water pollution, internal and external development, and overcrowding. These threats have a direct impact on the quality of the National Park experience and the National Park Service's ability to protect and manage America's Park resources.

The Park Service's ability to adequately address these threats is limited by insufficient funding for monitoring, scientific assessment, research, resource protection and interpretation, and staff support. In constant dollars, the total National Park Service congressional appropriation declined by more than \$200 million between 1983 and 1997. At the same time, Congress assigned the Park Service more than 400 additional construction projects than it requested—costing more than \$867 million. In addition, Congress designated nine new heritage areas at the end of the 104th Congress without appropriating money to fund them. Finally, the Agency needs sufficient funds to enable it to address ongoing operations and maintenance needs and certain backlogged maintenance needs as well.

Land and Water Conservation Fund: proposed increase of \$750 million

Congress has provided for an annual revenue stream of \$900 million, funded primarily from OCS receipts, for federal and state land acquisition and recreation projects. Yet the average funding for these purposes over the last seventeen years has been approximately one-fourth of the authorized level.

Full appropriation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund is critical to provide for investment in natural and cultural resources conservation, watershed protection, wildlife habitat, and recreational resources. Unrestrained development and dramatic population increases threaten the quality of existing public lands. The need to purchase and conserve additional available land and water resources is increasingly urgent. This is true at the federal and state level, and the Congress should recommit to statewide assistance by funding the State Grant Program.

USGS Biological Resources Division: proposed increase of \$60 million

Increases are needed to supply the science support necessary to understand the biological resources located on federal lands, to assess the environmental changes impacting on these biological resources, and to develop recommendations for management actions necessary to conserve the lands for the future. No integrated monitoring strategy for

Federal Lands exists which can inventory critical biological species and communities at the local level and suggest solutions to land managers for conservation of these resources. Additionally, Federal trust resources such as migratory birds and endangered species, common to all Federal lands are coming under additional pressure through degradation of wildlife habitats; more emphasis on science support for adaptive management recommendations for system management in aquatic resources, and integrate biological information with geologic, hydrologic, and demographic databases.

General

Particularly where the BLM and Forest Service are concerned, there are any number of environmentally beneficial cost savings and budget offsets that could be achieved by increasing revenues for extractive uses (mining, grazing) and by eliminating costly subsidies. In addition, the Fee Demonstration Program, commercial user fees, and concession fees are also potential sources of revenue and cost offsets.

While it is clear that substantial savings and budgetary offsets can be achieved through these types of reforms, the purpose here is not to develop a comprehensive package of recommended budget cuts and offsets, but to identify the unfunded and underfunded spending priorities that are being targeted by the public lands community.

ALEXIS HERMAN, SECRETARY OF
LABOR NOMINEE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1997

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support a friend, and a confidant in Alexis Herman in her nomination for Secretary of Labor. Alexis Herman is no stranger to hard work. She has always worked hard to find practical solutions to the issues and challenges that American workers face. As Director of the White House Office of Public Liaison, Alexis Herman was known for her handling of delicate relations with diverse groups. President Clinton has given Alexis Herman a chance to put those skills to test again when he nominated her as Labor Secretary against the wishes of key labor constituencies. Mr. Speaker, Alexis Herman understands work and she understands workers.

Mr. Speaker, Alexis Herman has a proven track record. She is not only a longtime advocate for women and minorities but she is a product of a politically active home. Upon her graduation from Xavier University in New Orleans, she returned to her hometown of Mobile, AL, to help desegregate her old high school.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues here in the House and in the other Chamber look pass Alexis Herman being a woman and a Clinton supporter and realize her potential to be one of the best Secretaries of Labor this country can ever have. In my opinion, Alexis Herman is a wonderful choice for Secretary of Labor. She knows and understands working families' concerns, and I look forward to working closely with her.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR REBUILD-
ING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT OF
1997

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1997

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce the Partnership for Rebuilding America's Schools Act of 1997.

This is an exciting day for me. I began working on this issue with Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN nearly 2 years ago. Now, thanks to the leadership of President Clinton, we are finally beginning to tackle this problem.

Today, all over America, our schools are inadequate, overcrowded, and literally falling down. In Miami, students learn to read and write in temporary trailers. Here in our Nation's Capital, schools are closed for violating the fire code. In New York City, students dodge falling plaster and attend class in hallways and bathrooms.

A GAO report released last summer confirmed the worst. Record numbers of school buildings across America are in disrepair. One-third of all schools—serving 14 million students—need extensive repairs. About 60 percent of schools need to have roofs, walls, or floors fixed.

With school enrollment skyrocketing, this problem will only get worse.

It's time for the Federal Government to act. The bill we are introducing today will provide \$5 billion in Federal funding for school construction across the Nation. Funds will be distributed to the 50 States and the 100 largest school districts based on the numbers of school children in poverty.

This bill won't completely solve the problem, but it will make a crucial difference. For the first time the Federal Government will enter into a partnership with our local communities to rebuild our schools.

We know that America is only as good as our schools—and we know that this is a local problem that deserves a national response.

The situation in New York City is dire. A survey conducted by my office revealed 25 percent of New York City public schools hold classes in bathrooms, locker rooms, hallways, cafeterias, and storage areas. Almost half of school buildings have roofs, floors, and walls in need of repair.

A report by the New York City Commission on School Facilities revealed the following: Nearly half of New York City's school children are taught in severely overcrowded classrooms; 270 schools need new roofs; over half of the city's schools are over 55 years old; and approximately one-fourth still have coal-burning boilers.

We simply cannot prepare America's children for the 21st century in 19th century schools. Students cannot learn when the walls of their classrooms are crumbling down around them. We can't teach computer technology next to coal-burning boilers.

I expect that there will be opposition to this bill. We know that not everyone believes the Federal Government should address this problem. I join today with the 41 original cosponsors of the Partnership for Rebuilding America's Schools Act to state that the Federal Government can no longer afford to ignore this ticking timebomb. Government at all levels

must work together to solve this national crisis.

PARK OVERGRAZED BY
EXCESSIVE NUMBERS OF ANIMALS

HON. RICK HILL

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1997

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Yellowstone National Park faces an environmental crisis. For the past 30 years, the pseudoscience of natural regulation has guided park management. Scientists recently testified before the Parks Subcommittee that natural regulation is foolish, misguided, and not an appropriate nor a practical management philosophy for wildlife management. Robert Ross, a retired Soil Conservation Service officer for range conservation, has been a close observer of changing range conditions and wildlife use in Yellowstone National Park. His comments urging hands-on, appropriate management of habitat are well made and I commend them to my colleagues. I submit his recent article into the RECORD.

[From the Gazette, Mar. 16, 1997]

CONTROLS ON HABITAT URGED

PARK OVERGRAZED BY EXCESSIVE NUMBERS OF
ANIMALS

(By Robert L. Ross)

"A business that had been fascinating to me before suddenly became distasteful. I wanted no more of it. I never wanted to own again an animal I could not feed and shelter."

This remark was made by Granville Stuart, an early day Montana rancher, legislator and statesman. The remark was made in the spring of 1887 following a winter of severe cold and deep snow—a winter much the same as 1996-97.

One wonders if Yellowstone National Park officials have nightmares over the thousands of starving elk and bison in the park. Starving because there are five to six times more elk and bison in the park than the winter forage will support. Actually, park people are probably hoping for more of the critters to starve. That would help solve some of their overpopulation problems. However, it must be a terrible way to die. Shooting is more humane.

The park personnel try to cover their mismanagement by saying elk and bison are "naturally migrating animals." Cattle, horses and sheep are also naturally migratory. However, ranchers curtail their instinct to migrate by building and maintaining fences to keep them in the confines of the pastures and off their neighbor's land.

Ranchers also: (1) control their numbers to the available forage by selling excess animals for slaughter; (2) provide for adequate feed in adverse weather conditions; (3) control disease such as brucellosis, etc.; (4) encourage hunting on their private lands to control wildlife numbers.

In 1963-64 the Soil Conservation Service, at the park's request, conducted a range site and condition inventory of the Northern Winter Range. It was determined the range would safely carry about 350 bison and 5,000 elk plus smaller numbers of deer, moose, antelope and bighorn sheep. At this suggested animal population, the Northern Winter Range could be maintained in good condition.

When the elk and bison population was reduced to the available forage (in the 1950s