

these feeding assistants would have to complete a state-reviewed training and competency evaluation, and would only complete a limited number of tasks under onsite supervision by a licensed health professional. I believe that these safeguards, among others, would ensure the quality of care without obviating the need for CNAs and other nurse professionals in long-term care facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues this year to ensure that our nursing facilities have the staff and resources necessary to care for our families and friends in the years to come.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROMOTION  
RESOLUTION OF 2001

**HON. GENE GREEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague Mr. BURTON, to introduce the National Health Promotion Resolution of 2001. This resolution recognizes the importance of health promotion and disease prevention, and expresses the sense of Congress that more should be done to integrate lifestyle improvement programs into national policy, health care workplaces, families and communities.

Modifiable lifestyle factors such as smoking, sedentary lifestyle, poor nutrition, unmanaged stress, and obesity account for approximately half of premature deaths in the United States. Spending on chronic diseases related to lifestyle and other preventable diseases accounts for an estimated 70 percent of total health care spending. With the pending retirement of the baby-boom-generation, the financial burden of these preventable diseases will further threaten the solvency of the Medicare program.

Health promotion programs have the potential to improve health, improve quality of life, reduce health care costs, and boost productivity. The Institute of Medicine has recommended that additional research is required to determine the most effective strategies at the individual, organizational, community, and societal level to create lasting health behavior changes, reduce medical utilization and enhance work-place productivity. Unfortunately, a very small percentage of health care spending, is devoted to health promotion.

The National Health Promotion Resolution of 2001 expresses the sense of Congress that more must be done in this area. In light of the pending crisis facing our Medicare system, the federal government stands to benefit greatly from the potential reduction in costs associated with an aggressive health promotion agenda.

This bipartisan legislation has forty original cosponsors, including the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BURTON, who has worked closely with me and my office to shape this into a meaningful resolution. It is my hope that we will continue to work together to further our commitment to health promotion and disease prevention.

I urge my colleagues to join us on this important resolution.

SNOWMOBILES IN NATIONAL  
PARKS

**HON. RUSH D. HOLT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with 17 of my colleagues, a bill to protect America's national parks from what is expected to be the next environmental rollback by the Bush Administration—an effort to overturn the National Park Service (NPS) decision to phase out snowmobile use in Yellowstone and Grand Teton national parks.

In response to a 1997 lawsuit, the NPS prepared an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the 100,000 snowmobiles entering Yellowstone and Grand Teton each winter. The NPS determined that those snowmobiles produce noise that can be heard by other visitors as much as 95% of the time, produce more air pollution than all other motor vehicles in Yellowstone throughout the year, and disturb bison and wildlife when they already face the stresses of brutal winter conditions. Because of these and other impacts, the NPS adopted a new rule to phase out by the winter of 2003-2004 all snowmobile use in Yellowstone and most of that use in Grand Teton, with expanded service by snowcoaches (multi-passenger vehicles) to provide continued wintertime access to the parks. The rule, the culmination of a 3½ year process, was published in the Federal Register on January 22, 2001.

Three key facts about the Yellowstone-Grand Teton snowmobile rule:

First, it is strongly supported by the public—by most public comments on the EIS, and fully 85% of the public comments on the proposed rule.

Second, the National Park Service determined not only that the snowmobile use in these parks is inappropriate, but also that it is unlawful. The Service determined that it violates the basic NPS mandate, in its Organic Act of 1916, to keep the scenery, natural and historic objects, and wildlife of national parks “unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” The Park Service determines that the snowmobile use violates the Clean Air Act. The Service determined that the snowmobile use violates two Executive Orders, one by President Nixon and one by President Carter, setting standards for snowmobile use in national parks. And the Service determined that it violates the NPS's own general regulation on snowmobile use, in effect since 1983, that prohibits snowmobile use in parks that disturbs wildlife or damages other park resources.

Third, this is the first time in the NPS's 84-year history that it has determined that a use it has authorized in parks has gotten so out of control that it has ended up violating the mandate of the Service's Organic Act. In that sense alone, the NPS decision to end all snowmobile use in Yellowstone and most use in Grand Teton is historic.

Still, the Bush Administration has this rule in its sights. It has already delayed its effective date. Now there are published reports that the Administration wants to settle a legal challenge from snowmobile groups, in a backdoor attempt to overturn the rule without going through a new, public process.

Yellowstone and Grand Teton are not the only national parks where inappropriate and unlawful snowmobile use is occurring.

Last year, in response to a petition by 60 environmental organizations, the NPS acknowledged that much of the snowmobile use it has allowed to occur in other national parks violates, in four separate ways, some of the same requirements that are being violated in Yellowstone and Grand Teton. First, in nearly every instance, the Park Service merely allowed areas that were already open to snowmobile use to stay open, without reviewing them to determine if that use is consistent with protection of park resources, as required by President Nixon's Executive Order.

Second, the NPS has allowed snowmobile use to occur in two parks and on some trails without designating them for that use through a public rulemaking process, which is required by the NPS's general regulations.

Third, the NPS has consistently failed to monitor the effects of the snowmobile use it has allowed to occur, as required by President Nixon's Executive Order.

Finally, the NPS concluded that it has allowed snowmobile use to continue that violates the substantive standards of the two applicable Executive Orders and its general regulations. The Park Service concluded that in many instances snowmobiles disrupt the natural wintertime quiet of the parks, disturb the enjoyment of other visitors, adversely affect wildlife, and otherwise harm the resources, values, and management objectives of the parks, all of which is prohibited by the standards of the Executive Orders and the NPS's own regulations. Based on these impacts, the NPS determined that, in general, recreational snowmobile use is not an appropriate use of most national parks.

The NPS developed a plan to end inappropriate snowmobile use and to come into compliance with the standards governing snowmobile use in national parks. That plan would limit snowmobile use in national parks (other than in Alaska and in Voyageurs National Park, where special statutes apply) to short crossing routes providing access to adjacent public lands open to snowmobile use, and to routes providing necessary access to private lands in or adjacent to parks. Under this approach, of the 43 units of the national park system where some snowmobile use is now occurring, that use would be ended in 12 (including Yellowstone), would be allowed to continue but in more limited fashion in 10 (including Grand Teton), and would be allowed to continue without change in 21.

However, in addition to reviewing the Yellowstone-Grand Teton rule, the Bush Administration has halted the rulemaking process to implement this overall NPS approach to snowmobiles in other parks. Because of the Administration's policy, the NPS has not yet been able to finalize a rule proposed last December to restrict snowmobile use in Rocky Mountain National Park, and has not been able to propose other regulatory changes with respect to other parks.

The legislation my colleagues and I are introducing would legislatively adopt the sound approach the National Park Service developed last year to end inappropriate snowmobile use in national parks and come into compliance with the long-established standards of law that are supposed to govern that use. The bill would allow continued snowmobile use in

parks when that use meets the current standards of law and is necessary to provide snowmobile access to adjacent public lands that are open to snowmobile use, or to provide access to private lands within or next to the parks. The bill would continue to allow snowmobile use without change next winter, to provide time for new regulations to be adopted under the bill. And in Yellowstone and Grand Teton, the bill would allow an extra year before it takes effect, to accommodate the phase-out period established by the Park Service in its recent rulemaking. Finally, the bill would affect only a portion of the 670 miles of snowmobile trails in all national parks—or a mere one-half of one percent of all 130,000 miles of trails in the United States.

Let's end inappropriate snowmobile use that shatters the wintertime quiet of the national parks, pollutes their air, disturbs wildlife, and bothers other visitors to the parks. Let's keep our national parks, our most special lands, unimpaired for the enjoyment of today's Americans and future generations.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE NSF AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2001

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to authorize funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) for the next four fiscal years. The bill provides for increases of 15% for each year, which together with the 13% appropriations increase for fiscal year 2001, will result in a doubling of NSF's budget by the fourth year of the bill.

The need for this legislative proposal to provide a substantial funding increase for NSF is beyond doubt, and the case supporting this bill can be simply stated:

Federally supported basic research is fundamental to the nation's economic health;

NSF plays a vital role in support of basic research and education across all fields of science and engineering; and

There is ample evidence that the current level of federal research investment is inadequate, particularly for the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

The connection between research funding and the strength of the economy has been expounded by such diverse sources as former presidential science advisor Allen Bromley, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, former speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security.

Dr. Bromley, who was former President Bush's science advisor from 1989–1993, commented on the inadequacy of the research and development portion of the Administration's FY 2002 funding request in a March 9 New York Times op-ed. He pointed out the potential damage of proposed budget cuts for NSF, NASA and the Department of Energy agencies, which he characterized as the three primary sources of ideas and personnel in the high-tech economy. His key point was that the future budget surpluses on which the large proposed tax cut depends are tied to research investments made today. He said:

The proposed cuts to scientific research are a self-defeating policy. Congress must increase the federal investment in science. No science, no surplus. It's that simple.

The importance of research to the economy was stressed by Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan in recent testimony before the House Budget Committee also. In response to a question on the need for government support for research, Greenspan responded,

On the issue of research, there is just no question that if you're going to have technology as the base of your economy, which we do, research is crucial. If we don't [enhance the incentives to do research in this economy], we're going to find that we are in a position where we may have awesome technologies, but if you don't continuously nurture them, they won't continue to exist.

The recent report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, known as the Hart-Rudman Commission, makes a strong case for the importance of funding for basic research and technology development. The Commission found that, "it is from investment in basic science that the most valuable long-run dividends are realized" and "[the federal] role remains not least because our basic and applied research efforts in areas of critical national interest will not be pursued by a civil sector that emphasizes short- to mid-term return on investment." On the basis of its findings, the Commission recommends a doubling of all federal funding for science and technology research and development by 2010.

In testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on the Hart-Rudman Commission report, former Speaker Gingrich stated that,

The revolution in science requires larger investments in basic research; we are not getting the money today.

He also pointed out the importance of NSF's support for basic science research.

I agree with Mr. Gingrich on the key role NSF plays in sustaining the nation's research enterprise. NSF-supported researchers have collected 100 Nobel Prizes over the years. They have received recognition for work in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine, and economics. In nearly every field of science and engineering are examples of NSF-sponsored research that led to important discoveries and applications:

NSF-funded research in atmospheric chemistry identified ozone depletion over the Antarctic, or the "ozone hole" as it has come to be known. In 1986, NSF researchers established chlorofluorocarbons as the probable cause of the Antarctic ozone hole. Since CFCs are used in many commercial applications, this discovery has driven a search for benign substitutes and also led to regulation of CFC emissions.

When most people think of the Internet they mean the World Wide Web and the Web Browsers, like Netscape, that allow them to find the information they seek. The browser made the World Wide Web. The first browser of note was Mosaic, and a student working at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois developed it. This is one of NSF's four original Supercomputing Centers.

In industry, the acronym CAD/CAM brings to mind the best in design and manufacturing techniques. NSF-funded research on solid modeling led to the widespread use of Computer-Aided Design and Computer-Aided Man-

ufacturing. The keys to success were advances in the underlying mathematics and in linking the academic and industrial leaders in the field.

NSF's contributions are also manifest through the accomplishments of scientists and engineers, who were trained under NSF awards. It is well known that the great majority of the seminal work in developing such technologies as cell phones, fiber optics, and computer assisted design was performed by private industry—at labs like Corning, AT&T, and Motorola. A recent NSF sponsored study has shown that many scientists and engineers, who went to graduate school on NSF fellowships and research assistantships, often played important roles in the development of these and other technologies. In a number of cases, they became the entrepreneurs who created new firms and markets. To use the words of the authors of the study—"NSF emerges consistently as a major—often the major, source of support for education and training of the Ph.D. scientists and engineers who went on to make major contributions.

The resources NSF provides for support of research and education are relatively small, but the impact is great. The agency expends only 3.8% of federal R&D funds, but provides 23% of basic research funding at academic institutions. For specific research areas, the NSF role at universities is even larger: it funds 36% of research in the physical sciences, 49% in the environmental sciences, 50% in engineering, 72% in mathematics, and 78% in computer science. NSF research awards and direct research fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, the future scientists and engineers essential to fuel our high-tech economy.

Furthermore, NSF programs help to improve science education for all students and to prepare them for citizenship in a world increasingly dominated by technology. Today we continue to have manpower shortages in many high technology fields. The ideal way to alleviate the shortages is by ensuring that children of all races and both genders receive the basic grounding in science and mathematics that will prepare them to pursue careers as scientists, engineers and technologists. We cannot allow inadequate funding to cripple NSF's efforts in this area.

There is really no debate on whether support of basic research is an appropriate role of the federal government. The basic economic argument is well understood. Industry will underinvest in basic research because individual companies cannot capture the full benefits of advances in fundamental knowledge that come from funding basic research.

The question, rather, is what ought to be the level of the federal research investment? The bill I am introducing takes the position that it is too low, particularly for basic research in the fields for which NSF is a major funding agency: the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

The National Research Council's Board on Science, Technology and Economic Policy analyzed federal funding data for FY 1993 through FY 1997. They found that support, in constant dollars, for electrical engineering had declined by 13%, electrical engineering by 36%, mechanical engineering by 50%, physics by 29%, chemistry by 9%, and mathematics by 6%. Even including the substantial increases for research for biomedical sciences