



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2002

No. 67

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN EDWARDS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, You open Your heart to us. You assure us of Your unqualified and unlimited love. In spite of all the changes in our lives, You never change. We hear Your assurance, "I love you. I will never let you go. You are mine. I have chosen and called you to know, to love, and to serve Me."

In response, we open our hearts to You. We choose to be chosen. We accept Your love and forgiveness and turn our lives over to Your control. We confess anything we have said or done that deserves Your judgment. Cleanse our memory of any failures that would haunt us today and give us the courage to act on specific guidance You have given but we have been reluctant to put into action. We commit to You our families, our friends, and those with whom we work. Help us to communicate Your creative delight in each person's uniqueness and potential.

We dedicate this day's work of this Senate. Bless the Senators with a renewed sense of Your presence, a rededication of their calling to serve You and our Nation, and a reaffirmation of their dependence on You. Through our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHN EDWARDS led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication

to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2002.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN EDWARDS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. EDWARDS thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader, the Senator from Nevada, is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—H.R. 3009

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture motion filed on H.R. 3009.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate is going to be in a period of morning business until 10:30. Senator KENNEDY has the first half hour. At 10:30 the Senate will resume consideration of the trade bill, with 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees. At 11:30 we will vote on cloture on the Baucus substitute amendment. Senators have until 10:30 today to file.

If cloture is invoked today, we will go under the postcloture procedure. There are a number of germane amend-

ments. We hope we can work our way quickly through those.

The Appropriations Committee, at 2 o'clock today, is going to meet to mark up, we hope, the supplemental appropriations bill which Senator BYRD and the leader have indicated they would like to try to finish before the week's end.

We have a lot of work to do and not a lot of time to do it, so everyone is going to have to be cooperative if we are going to depart at a decent hour on Friday.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the first half of the time shall be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have 15 minutes, is that correct, or do we have the whole half hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 27 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is 27 minutes. I ask unanimous consent I be in control of that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I have done on other occasions, I want to bring attention of the Senate to where

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4657

we are in education funding, an issue which is of central concern to families all over this country. I think if we asked the families across America—I know around Massachusetts—they are obviously concerned, particularly in the last few days and certainly in the last few months about the dangers of terrorism. They want to be sure we are going to be able to support our forces overseas. They are very concerned about it.

In my State, even with the rosy predictions of some, we still have communities with sizable unemployment. Families have a great deal of uncertainty about their future.

But right underneath the surface are two other major issues. One is health care, and that is reflected in the cost of prescription drugs and the availability of prescription drugs, but, second, and equal to that, is the question of ensuring their children will receive a quality education.

We addressed that issue in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year. We worked together with President Bush. We are proud of the fact we were effective in working together, bridging many of the differences. We were able to get a sizable downpayment for that legislation.

We have still left many children behind. Even though the bill is called No Child Left Behind, we are still leaving millions of children behind. Under the administration's proposal, we are going to even leave additional children behind.

As this chart shows, as we started the proposal last year, the Bush proposal was 3.5 percent. We were able to effectively get it up to 20 percent.

All of us are very familiar with the statements, the comments the President has made about how we all have responsibility. Students have responsibility and accountability; schools have responsibility; parents have responsibility.

That raises another issue. In the drafting of the rules, I think all of us understand the first educator for a child is the parents. We have put a special requirement in the legislation to make sure parents will be involved every step along the way in the implementation of the act we passed last year.

So it brings us some dismay that the administration has failed to do that, and done this in such a way that the parents are now bringing a suit against the administration because they are being excluded at the local level. That makes no sense. We should welcome parents in at the local level. We should welcome parents into the process of the education of their children.

But very quickly, before leaving this chart, I, again, want to show from the 3.5-percent increase, we were able to raise that up to 20 percent. We heard the administration talk a great deal, with the great sense of pride they had, with all the additional resources, and now it is back to 2.8 percent.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Please.

Mr. DURBIN. I think the Senator has hit an important point when we talk about the future of education and teachers. That chart tells an interesting story.

In Illinois, when I went to one of the universities that graduates more teachers than other schools, I said: What are we going to do about the shortage of teachers which we are facing in America? How are we going to find more teachers?

They said: Certainly we need more teachers, and good teachers, but our biggest problem is retaining teachers. Teachers who are educated, who graduate with student loans and the burdens that they face, start teaching in a classroom and after 2 or 3 years get discouraged, leave the classroom and go into the private sector. They said that we have to find a way to retain good teachers.

That is also an important element.

What the Senator pointed out here is that if the Bush administration will not continue its funding level for teachers, there is going to be unpredictability, unreliability for the teacher in the future.

My State is facing budget problems. Most are. They are going to be cutting back on education. So the double hit from both State funding and the Bush administration's refusal to fund its own education bill is going to jeopardize the number of teachers who are going to be available.

I think that is going to create problems far beyond next year.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate what the Senator has pointed out. This chart indicates that \$742 million was added by the Congress last year for teacher quality. That is effectively zeroed out in terms of this year for teachers, in terms of recruiting teachers and in terms of retaining teachers. This is professional development.

I want to remind the American people that we have an administration which says, with the No. 1 domestic priority of education, we are confined to \$600 billion in tax cuts that they asked us to verify and make permanent for the future. And here we have virtually zero in terms of increasing the retention of teachers, training of teachers, and professional development.

Do the American people really believe this is the first domestic priority for the administration when they don't fund it and they asked the Congress to make permanent \$600 billion in tax cuts over the next 7 years?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield on another question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am happy to yield to the leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from Illinois said. Last weekend I spoke in South Dakota at the last

graduation of a high school at Hecla in my State. Hecla is closing its doors. They will no longer have a high school in that small town. What I find is that what is happening in Hecla is happening in places all over my State and in the country. Budgets are collapsing at the local level. They are not able to fund the priorities because the property tax base is shrinking. Every school administrator and every school district president I have talked to says they no longer have the budget they had just a couple of years ago. The situation is exacerbated by the tremendous loss of revenue at the local level.

On top of that, we now see a loss of revenue at the Federal level. Schools are getting caught in the squeeze. There is less money at the local level to hire teachers, to do what they have to do to improve the schools, and to ensure they have the proper classroom size at the very time of a double whammy by the administration which comes out with a budget that is sorely lacking in commitment of resources needed to meet the issues and challenges these schools are facing.

We are going to continue to see schools close, schools downsize, classes get larger, and students subjected to teachers who in some cases may not be qualified, in large measure because funding is not there.

We cannot have reform that we hear this administration wants without having resources. I appreciate very much the Senator from Massachusetts calling attention to that fact. But I ask: Does the Senator from Massachusetts have any similar situations he has experienced? Are schools not having that problem now not only in rural areas but in urban areas as well?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I think the Senator would agree with me that parents back home just want their children educated. They want a partnership. I imagine in South Dakota and Massachusetts they want a partnership to make sure we are going to have investment in children.

It is a question of priorities. The leader has pointed out what was happening in his State. This isn't just something that the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out. Here is an article from the Wall Street Journal. This is not an organ of the Democratic Party. It is a very extensive article about the tight budget posing a threat to the smaller class sizes, which as we have all seen has a direct impact on children learning.

The article says:

In the prosperous 1990's, cutting class sizes gained importance, fueled by a Clinton-era program providing Federal aid for teacher hiring. But now some districts can't afford smaller classes partly due to unexpected costs of the hiring they've already done, and partly because of the economic slowdown.

And it is escalating dramatically.

It is an extensive article. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 16, 2002]
TIGHT BUDGETS POSE A THREAT TO SMALL CLASSES

(By Robert Tomsho)

The crowded classroom may be coming back.

In the prosperous 1990s, cutting class sizes gained importance, fueled by a Clinton-era program providing federal aid for teacher hiring. But now some districts can't afford smaller classes partly due to unexpected costs of the hiring they've already done, and partly because of the economic slowdown.

Meanwhile, a new federal policy shift soon will permit states to spend federal money formerly dedicated to smaller classes on other school programs.

Districts that stopped maintaining smaller classes may not see class sizes go up for a few years. Still, worried advocates of small classes are starting to take action now to protect a policy widely popular among parents and teachers.

In 1996 the Irvine Unified School District, near Los Angeles, joined California's big push to reduce class sizes in kindergarten through third grade to no more than 20 students per class. With the state picking up 70% of the tab, the district hired about 200 teachers. Since then, related costs have increased as these new teachers moved up the pay scale. Because state funding hasn't kept up, Irvine had to tap local revenue, thereby increasing classes in the higher grades. Since the district began reducing K-3 class sizes in 1996, it has had to raise class sizes in grades 4-12 to an average of 35 students per class, up from 33. The jumps have been sharpest at the high-school level: Some classes have as many as 40 students.

Barbara Kadar, an Irvine first-grade teacher, says the program allowed her to spot individual problems early on. She says she's shocked at the policy reversal. "They found the goose that laid the golden egg, and now they're killing it."

At least nine other California school districts, out of 1,048, including the Cabrillo Unified School District, in Half Moon Bay, and Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District, in Livermore, made similar moves. State education officials expect many more districts to do the same by fall.

Similar funding cuts for class-size reduction programs have been proposed in Massachusetts, Wisconsin and other cash-strapped states. Even in places where state money for them has gone untouched, sharp cuts in state aid have forced districts to consider staff cuts that would result in higher class sizes. Brian Benzel, superintendent of schools in Spokane Wash., said: "We are going to be in a very difficult set of trade-offs."

Parents aren't likely to sympathize. This past month, dozens attended a meeting of the Riverside, Calif., board of education to protect its elimination of class-size reduction for the third grade. Meanwhile, in Memphis, amid a campaign by the local PTA, parents have been driving to the state Capitol in Nashville to demand that Tennessee legislators pass a budget that keeps the state's program. Recent polls show that an overwhelming margin of Florida voters back a constitutional amendment requiring the state to adequately fund a drive for smaller classes. "I can't go anywhere in public without someone coming up to me and saying that we have to do something," says state Sen. Debby Wasserman-Schultz, a Florida Democrat involved in an effort to put the proposed amendment on the November ballot.

For fiscal 2003, the Bush administration has combined the stand-alone federal class-size reduction program with a program intended to enhance teacher quality. Now, states and school districts can decide whether to use about \$2.85 billion in related funds for new hires or to bolster teacher quality. The move was designed to give states more "flexibility and accountability," says Eugene Hickok, U.S. undersecretary of education.

Critics say the federal move enables states to shrink their own programs and sets the stage for endless wrangling over future funding for such initiatives. "It's going to come down to how much clout the teachers and parents have," says retired Tennessee State University education professor Helen Pate-Bain, a prominent advocate of smaller classes and former head of the National Education Association, a teachers union.

About 25 states have class-size reduction programs. In 1998, President Clinton, who championed the cause, called the hiring of 100,000 new teachers and establishing the federal class-size reduction program.

Research over the years has indicated that smaller class sizes lead to higher achievement in the primary grades, with the most marked improvements occurring when a classroom has 20 or fewer students. The effect of small classes beyond third grade is more mixed. During the 30 years of reduction in the federal ratios, nationwide achievement trends were a mixed bag: Math scores rose steadily as science results fell for some age groups.

California, having already spent nearly \$8 billion since 1996 to hire 28,000 new teachers, expects to complete an evaluation of its program by summer. Meanwhile, its program has had some unintended effects: In its hiring binge, the state had to take on more uncertified teachers to fill its classrooms, and about two-thirds of districts cut other programs, such as in music and art, to keep the classes small.

Such side effects haven't blunted support for small classes. Earlier this year, California's program was barely touched by budget cuts. Even as individual districts cut their programs, the California PTA is lobbying the state for more funding for smaller classes. "Parents and teachers still strongly believe that this is good for their kids," says Teri Burns, California's deputy superintendent of education, governmental affairs. "That pressure is still there."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this is at a time when the administration is asking for \$600 billion more in tax cuts. We cannot help the parents, the small towns, communities, and working families make sure they are going to have a qualified teacher in every classroom in South Dakota, in Illinois, and New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for an observation?

Mr. KENNEDY. Please.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, the point the Senator from Massachusetts is making with regard to cutting the resources we have available for education and then not funding the mandates really bites in the State of New Jersey. We have a \$6 billion budget deficit in the upcoming year. Educational funding is going to have to be cut just to balance the budget. We have serious conflicts going on between teachers and administrations across the State.

If I have heard the Senator correctly, we are going to have virtually no in-

crease in education spending at the Federal level this year at a time when we have decided we want to make permanent these tax cuts which really are going to people who are doing extraordinarily well in society.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has defined the choice. This is a question of priority which the Senator has outlined, the challenges in his home State, and what the choices are.

The administration, whatever we think about the past tax cuts, has now requested of this Congress \$600 billion more. The administration indicates that they have two priorities: Low-income children and special needs children.

I see both of my colleagues are here on this issue. They have indicated that the President has these two priorities.

Look at the special needs children. If we fund the \$1 billion each year, as the administration proposed, it would take 33 years to fully fund IDEA. A first grader at the time IDEA was first enacted would be 67 years old by the time the Republicans' proposal fully funded IDEA.

That is the program that helps communities with special needs children. That program was fully funded when it passed here and went to the conference when the Republicans ran the Senate. When it came back, it was zeroed out. It was called special interest funding.

Then, as a matter of principle, the decision was made by our colleague and friend, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS. He said that isn't enough. He became an independent because he did not believe meeting our responsibilities to special needs children was a boondoggle or pork spending.

I don't think the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from New Jersey believe that either. I want to know if they believe, as I do, that this is a national priority and should be a national priority, and that we ought to be willing to make sure we meet our commitment to those families who have the special needs children and to the taxpayers in those communities to make sure it is adequately funded.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is the important point, the last statement is the important point, because school districts in Illinois, New Jersey, and Massachusetts are facing a Federal mandate. Children with special needs, with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, and other problems are going to have to be given every opportunity to learn and be productive members of society.

That is something Congress and the Federal Government said to the local school districts. Yet we have not provided them the opportunity to do it.

The Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, and the Senator from Massachusetts, as well as the Senator from New Jersey and I, want the Federal Government to keep its words. We do not want to say to school districts: This is your responsibility; you figure

out how to pay for it. In some States, school districts have to move children great distances to find that special learning situation and environment where they can prosper, and at great expense. That is money taken out of the regular classrooms, from the students and teachers. We need to make sure there is quality education for all kids.

The Bush administration says it is a good mandate. But if they want to spend additional money for tax cuts, we can't see it. They want to put \$600 billion more into tax cuts primarily for wealthy Americans and not for education, for teachers, for students, and particularly for children with special needs. That is exactly the burden my school districts face in Illinois.

Mr. KENNEDY. There are smaller towns and communities that have children with special needs. When the school districts attempt to provide for children with special needs, suddenly the property tax rates go up in the local towns and communities. Parents feel they are blessed to have children with special needs. They understand the challenges faced in trying to take care of those children. I have never met a parent who does not believe in some way that child gives them an additional sense of purpose in life. All we are trying to say as a nation is we are going to try to help relieve that community from those very special kinds of additional obligations. We are going to provide some help—not all but some help and assistance.

Can either Senator explain to me why that is a lesser priority than trying to have this \$600 billion tax cut? That is the choice. Are we going to help small towns? They can be in North Carolina the State of our Presiding Officer, or they can be in South Carolina. They can be in western Massachusetts, southern Illinois, or any part of the State of New Jersey. But these local communities are hurting and hurting deeply.

We have a lot of lip service, but if we are to follow what the administration has said in terms of funding for IDEA, it is going to take us another 33 years in order to do it.

Mr. CORZINE. If the Senator will yield for just a moment, I will make the observation this is not only for small communities. I think about towns such as Camden and Newark in the State of New Jersey, where class sizes average about 30. Many of these children who have special needs are mainstreamed, but they have special programs to try to lift those with learning disabilities.

These towns and cities do not have the tax base to even raise the necessary money. So what happens is, in fact, we are forcing failure to comply with the law, failure to meet the needs of our children. And if we, as a nation, do not begin to prioritize these elements of our population in this educational process, we are going to recycle these problems because it just goes

on and on, and it is extraordinarily dangerous in our small towns and cities for our urban kids, particularly where you combine the problem of large class size and special needs for kids who have been mainstreamed in classrooms because there are no other choices.

I hope we can speak strongly about doing what we always argue: That we want to make sure we fully fund IDEA. It is not happening. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his effort.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator because we have recognized this IDEA program has been built upon the Supreme Court holdings about responsibility. We have the responsibility to make sure education is going to be available and accessible to children with special needs. That is effectively the Court's decision.

So we have said we are going to provide help and assistance. We have failed to do so. As the Senator points out, the fact is, 25 years ago there were 4 million children who were effectively either being kept at home or pushed off in different kinds of settings who never had the opportunity for education. Now we know those children are working their way through.

What we have found, in terms of the graduation rates, employment rates, and even the college graduation rates, they have all dramatically increased. And the difference it has made is extraordinary in terms of their lives, living lives of independence and even being taxpayers.

My friend from New Jersey is in the Chamber. I want to mention one other area in which I know he is interested; that is, what has happened with the Pell grants.

We just have a brief opportunity. We have seen what the cost of education has been, the shrinking buying power of the Pell grants. We know how important this is in terms of children. The average income is \$17,000 for those who are eligible for the Pell grants.

We found out back in the mid-1970s that paid for about 80 percent of the tuition for children who went to 4-year public colleges less so in private institutions. Now we have seen that purchasing power go down.

Does the Senator not agree with me that we, at some time, made a decision we were going to try to make sure that children of ability and talent, from wherever they came, whatever part of the country—despite their families' resources—would be able to gain entrance into a fine school or college in New Jersey or Massachusetts or any other State, that they would be able, with their limited means, to put together the Pell grants, have the Work-Study Program, and with their summer income—the extra work they might be able to do—have an education?

Will the Senator comment about what has happened with that Pell grant which has really been the key to opportunity? We will hear a lot of speeches

in this body and a lot of speeches being made in America about the importance of education and how that opens the doors of opportunity. Does the Senator from New Jersey not agree with me that effectively we are closing those doors for a very significant number of Americans and, therefore, we are losing, at least for those young Americans, the real hope and opportunity that education provides?

Mr. CORZINE. The Senator from Massachusetts is exactly correct. It is extraordinarily disappointing that we have seen this kind of trend, particularly at our public universities, which were really designed to give every American access to higher education. I have not studied the numbers in the last couple months, but I think the average earnings of a college graduate relative to a high school graduate are almost double for someone who completes a 4-year college degree.

If we do not understand that reflects productivity into our economy and into our society, we are making a huge mistake. This kind of underfunding of access to the American promise, the American dream, I find hard to conceive. I know it has been important in my life, and it has been for many of our colleagues.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the Senator's comments because this Nation had been committed to that value. We had the land-grant colleges in the 1870s, which was the beginning of the commitment to make sure children with limited means would be able to go to college. We had the GI bill after World War II, and every evaluation shows that those who received the GI bill paid five times as much in taxes as it actually cost.

We had this commitment in the early 1960s with the Pell grants and the Stafford loans to put together, and day after day, when we have failed to fund this program, we are increasingly denying that opportunity for millions of Americans.

We have a responsibility to invest in the children of this country. The choice is clear: Are we going to follow what the President has suggested, \$600 billion more in terms of tax cuts, or are we going to invest in the children of this country in K-12 to help provide help and assistance to those families, the special needs children, and the gifted and talented children, to take advantage of the Pell grants, or to otherwise be denied the education?

Mr. President, this is a matter of importance to every family. We want to give them the assurances that we on this side, on the Democratic side, are going to stand with the families. We are going to fight for this funding because it is our priority, their priority, and we will do everything we possibly can to make it a reality.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: Am I scheduled now in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further use of time on the majority side, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 2540 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call to the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. THOMAS. We are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, we have been very involved in relatively few issues over the past 6 weeks. We were on energy, and for about 3 weeks we have been on trade. Obviously, our attention has been very strongly on terrorism and doing the things that are necessary both overseas and internally. At the same time, we have talked among ourselves, of course, and one of the elements is to do normal business.

Today, I want to talk about an issue that is quite often normal business, particularly for those of us in the West, and that is public lands. Of course, there are a lot of aspects to public lands.

In States such as Wyoming, about 50 percent of the State belongs to the Federal Government, and therefore what is done with public lands has a great deal to do with our economy and our activities. We feel very strongly about it, of course. It is a big issue for us. The idea of multiple use is one that is always debatable and is being discussed. There are different kinds of public lands. There are those set aside for wilderness, for a special use, for a special reason, and there are those with various restrictions, set aside for parks or U.S. forests. So there are constant issues that relate to the use of that land.

Of course, much of our domestic energy is produced on public lands. So we need to make sure we can work on the extraction of energy and domestic production and, at the same time, maintain the quality of the environment. That is a debatable issue. I think we can do that, and we have demonstrated

in Wyoming that you can have multiple use and production of resources, and you can have grazing and, at the same time, protect the land and the environment. So energy has become very much an issue.

As you know, the whole question over ANWR was the idea that we now look overseas for about 60 percent of our energy. We need to increase our domestic production so we become less dependent upon others. That continues to be an issue. But it is not only ANWR. That was simply the poster child. The fact is, in the West it is a very continuing and important issue. We are involved in doing EISs right now, and EPA and endangered species issues, which go together to make decisions.

Access is also very important. People like to visit public lands with multiple use. The question of roads comes up. Most people agree that outside of the wilderness, limited roads are the answer. Again, we have to protect the environment.

One of the things we have pushed for and continue to do so—and this administration has promised to do and I think is doing—is to allow for more flexibility and more local input. It is true the locals cannot make the decisions regarding public lands, but they can have very helpful input into how they are managed.

We are also talking about the use of snow machines in Yellowstone Park. Of course, there is some controversy about that. Some people don't think there ought to be anybody in the park in the wintertime. Millions of cars are there in the summer, but there are only a few thousand in the winter and that seems to upset them. Nobody is suggesting we continue to do it as we have in the past. But there are now reliable sources that can make quieter machines so that they can be managed better and separated from cross-country skiers. You can do a number of things to allow the owners to participate in public lands.

Another issue that has been discussed is the matter of fires. We are into that season now and we have already had forest and grass fires in some places. Certainly, we are better prepared for that now, partly because we have had three dry years. The Forest Service has invested a great deal more in personnel and equipment to deal with that problem.

One of the other issues that sometimes is controversial is the idea of trying to prevent forest fires by the removal of excess forage and fuel. It is something that has been done and can be done, and we have not done enough of it perhaps. We ought to be able to do some thinning in various places that will make fires less likely to occur, rather than putting all of our emphasis on fighting a fire after it has begun.

So public lands has a lot of interesting issues and always will, of course. There are people on both sides that sort of take extreme positions. Some

say we should not touch those lands; they should be set aside totally. Others are not concerned about damage to the environment. So we need to find a reasonable middle ground so we can have access, so we can have multiple use and, at the same time, we can preserve the resource.

I want to talk briefly today about one aspect of it and that is our national parks. National parks are different, at least for one reason, in that they were set aside as national parks for a specific reason. The reason that is so different is the BLM lands—Bureau of Land Management. Most of the lands in Wyoming were not set aside, they were residual, what was left after the Homestead Act had been completed. So they may or may not have any particular significant character to them. Parks, on the other hand, do have significant character or they would not be designated as parks. So we have been working on that.

In 1998, I was successful in passing Vision 2014 in which we dealt for the first time in a number of years with ways to help strengthen parks, in terms of management and their concessions, and in terms of dealing with the natural resource needs, and dealing with financing of national parks. It provides for improved management, increased accountability. As in any other issue, there has to be accountability when you are talking about millions of dollars. Of course, it has to be management when you are talking about millions of people going there. So we were very pleased with that law. I think it is doing some things that are very useful.

Part of the funding in the past has been what has been called the demonstration fee project, which created park passes. That has been in place now for 3 years. The National Park Foundation has been instrumental in its success. Now there is a very attractive portfolio and picture and so on, and persons can buy this pass, which does two things. One, it gives accessibility to all 385 national parks and also helps to contribute to the sustenance of those parks. We certainly want to continue that program, but we are now going to be working on something that does expire. It is called the Demonstration Fee Program. It expires at the end of this year. It has been in existence for about 5 years. It was an opportunity for some small additional fee on certain parks and allowed for income and the opportunity to make expenditures on what is good for visitors in the parks. It extended not only to the Park Service but also the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Forest Service.

It turns out the collection of the fee in many places is very difficult. In fact, with the BLM it is almost impossible. If there is a public land forest, and in some instances there are facilities, they can probably do that, but it is very difficult. On the other hand, parks almost always have an admission site, a gate for entry.