

that will preserve and strengthen the parks. It is the culmination of more than 2 years of work by the subcommittee. We have had hearings coast to coast. We have been in Colorado. We have been out in San Francisco. There are many different kinds of parks. We had the same reaction at the hearings: that there needs to be more resources; they need to be managed better; we need to have more support; we need to deal with gateway communities; and have better communications. I think these things will be strengthened. We passed a bill that, I think, will do much of that.

I want to take a moment to thank some of the people who were involved. We hear a lot about the difficulty of passing legislation, and it is difficult. Everyone has, legitimately, different ideas about how things ought to be done; indeed, philosophies of how they might be done. The media, of course, emphasizes the conflicts that we have, and we have conflicts. Here, although most everyone will agree with parks, there are conflicts about how we resolve these things.

I am so pleased we had an opportunity to come together with people on both sides of the aisle, with people in the administration, with people in the Congress. No one got everything they wanted. We had to make concessions. We had to make changes, give up some things, add some things. But that is the way the legislative process has to work.

I particularly thank Senator MURKOWSKI, the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for all of his guidance on this legislation. Without his help, of course, we wouldn't have had this bill before the Senate. The chairman went out of his way to ensure that negotiations stayed on track. As you know, Alaska has some unique things. He helped to make this thing work.

I also thank Senator BUMPERS, the ranking minority member of the committee. I know personally that he has worked on some of these things. He has worked on the issue of concessions in particular for at least 10 years. He made some concessions on this issue. Without him, frankly, we wouldn't have a bill, particularly over in the House where he worked at it. I just say to the Senator from Arkansas that I really appreciate his help and appreciate the attitude that he brought here to this debate.

I thank Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt. It is no secret that we don't always agree with a lot of things, like public lands. Bruce Babbitt worked as hard as anyone could be asked to work. He came from California to work with our staff on this. He helped form a compromise.

Also, I thank Assistant Secretary Don Barry—these folks worked very hard—as well as BOB BENNETT. There is a whole list of people. Over in the House, JIM HANSEN and Chairman DON YOUNG worked very hard as well.

Finally, I thank the staff, of course, at all levels in the Senate, in the committee, particularly my personal associates: Liz Brimmer, my chief of staff; Dan Naatz, legislative director; Jim O'Toole, who is the director of the committee staff; and Steve Shackleton, a fellow, who worked originally with us on the bill.

I wanted to come to the floor to say a couple of things. One is, I am very pleased we passed this. I think it is going to help parks.

Second, I am impressed with the system when we really do work together and cooperate to come up with something that is a compromise and reach the goals with which we began.

Mr. President, I thank you for the time and say, again, I am very pleased we were able to bring this to passage in the Senate.

#### VISION 20-20 LEGISLATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today is a historic day for the Congress, the National Park Service and the American people. After two years of intense negotiations, hearings from coast to coast, and a great deal of hard work I am pleased to inform my colleagues that we have National Park Service Reform.

More importantly, after eight years of disagreement, and as part of the National Park Service reform package, we have achieved victory; we have come together in true bi-partisan fashion, and we have reformed the management and administration of concession operations in the National Park Service System.

Under this legislation, and in addition to concession reform, we have provided the National Park Service with increased opportunities, in cooperation with colleges and universities, to conduct scientific research in our parks so that in future years resource management decisions can be based more on sound science as opposed to emotion and guess work.

We direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop a comprehensive training program for employees in all professional careers in the work force of the National Park Service to ensure that personnel have the best, up-to-date knowledge, skills and abilities with which to manage, interpret and protect the resources of the National Park System.

As we all know the management and administration of parks is becoming more complex. We require managers who are fully prepared to take on the challenges that the next century will offer. The Secretary is directed to develop a training program which will ensure that future park managers will come from the cream of the crop and will be fully prepared to assume the responsibilities that management and administration of multiple park programs will demand.

We have established procedures for the establishment of new units of the

National Park System to ensure that only those areas of truly national significance are authorized.

Mr. President, the original bill passed by the Senate contained new fee authorities which would have allowed the actual users of the System to shoulder more of the responsibility to decrease the \$8 billion dollar back-log in maintenance and infrastructure repair needed in our parks. Unfortunately, the other Body decided to delete these provisions from this legislative package. I regret this decision; however, I want you to know that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is going to address the fee systems for all of the agencies under our jurisdiction early in the next Congress. There are needs to be met and problems to be resolved in this specific arena.

Senator THOMAS came up with a park passport and stamp as an entrance pass to our National Parks. The winning design of the stamp will be through a competitive process each year, a similar process to the popular Duck Stamp that we are all familiar with. It's a great marketing tool and should increase revenues. Along that same line we are directing the National Park Foundation to assist other park friends groups. The Foundation possesses a great deal of expertise in fund raising and philanthropic activities. Sharing that expertise will benefit hundreds of parks across this Nation.

We also direct the Secretary and provide him the authority to lease unused Park Service buildings and enter into expanded cooperative agreements in the hope that the private sector will take advantage of occupying and maintaining some of these unused structures, thereby off-setting expenditures by the Service.

Mr. President, Senator THOMAS, Senator BUMPERS, Senator BENNETT, and Secretary Babbitt entered into negotiations on concession reform. The end result is before you today. All of these gentlemen deserve our congratulations and thanks for the time and energy each put into the effort.

This bill is a direct result of discussions amongst the House and Senate Committees, representatives of the concession industry, and other interest groups. It reflects, I believe, a fair and just resolution of some issues about which there is legitimate disagreement. The recent amendment offered by Representative MILLER alters the terms of that agreement to some degree, but it remains a piece of legislation I can still support and endorse. However, I do think the amendment does give rise to a need for some clarification.

Protection of the existing possessory interests of concessioners is an important element of this legislation. Possessory interest is a significant and valuable right. It reflects the capital investment of the concessioner. It was one of the foundations on which the 1965 Concessions Act was built and it

can not be simply eliminated. The concessioners are entitled to the protections which the 1965 Act promised.

For those reasons I think we must make clear what the Miller amendment does not do. In authorizing the Secretary to, in the future, alter the treatment of possessory interests, it does not empower him to do what Congress has specifically chosen not to do, by which I mean deny those concessioners the value of their existing possessory interest. Regardless of what the Secretary may ultimately decide, those existing possessory interest will remain a valuable and legally protected right for which concessioners must be compensated. They will remain entitled to see their investment protected and to receive the benefit of their bargain.

Mr. President, on another point, we have just received a GAO study that tells us that many of our existing concession facilities are below standard and deteriorating. Visitors to our parks should not expect to stay in a facility that cannot pass the minimum requirements that apply to those hotels and motels on the borders of our parks. On that note, and as I have previously stated the negotiations that lead to this compromise were difficult to say the least. Each had to come across the table, no one got everything they wanted except the American people, and they got a lot.

The provisions of this compromise mean that we will have the expertise of the private sector to assist and advise the National Park Service in the management and administration of concession operations. I am confident that under this scenario concession operations have no where to go but to produce better quality services.

The private sector will be more than glad to provide major investments in new and existing facilities because they are able to maintain a financial interest in the properties. There is a great incentive for the operators to maintain their facilities and infrastructure to the highest standards possible. If they don't, the provisions provide for a decrease in the dollar amount of interest they are entitled to receive.

Finally, concession operators will be paying more in fees which go back to the parks.

Mr. President, I personally want to thank Senator THOMAS for the extreme effort that he has put forth in this endeavor. In my years in the Senate I have never seen a Senator work harder on this contentious issue. He has done the impossible.

And, last but not least, I want to say thank you to the Committee staff, for the hard work, the lost weekends, the evenings and for the great work.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for the next 15 minutes uninterrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the President.

#### EDUCATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as the ranking member on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—my chairman is the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER—we have been involved, as I am sure everyone knows, in a lot of negotiations over the last several days regarding the education portion of the bill. There are some other items there also, but basically on education.

After reading some of the newspaper accounts and listening to some of the speeches on the Senate floor, I can only come to the realization that perhaps the American people are a little bit confused now about what is going on. I respectfully submit that may be the point of what is going on—to try to confuse the American people. I am going to try to set the record a little bit straight here, in my limited amount of time.

I was in my office a little while ago listening to the Senator from Texas talk about education. He had a chart. He went on to say that only 37 cents of every dollar that comes in here, I think in the Department of Education, actually gets back out to the local schools.

Having been involved both on the authorizing committee for now 14 years and on the Appropriations Committee, an equal amount of time on Education, I was quite astounded by this figure because I never heard this figure before. So I decided to go back and find out exactly what were the facts.

So I guess the best place to look is in the committee report, compiled not by the Democrats but by the Republicans,—by Senator SPECTER for the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, I will say this, and most gratefully say, he and his staff have worked very closely with me and our appropriations staff in putting out this report.

So I looked in the report, to check on administrative costs for the Department of Education, because I never heard that figure, 37 cents. I thought, "Boy, if that's the truth, I might join the Senator from Texas in this argument." So I looked it up. In this report—this is the document right here; big and thick, has a lot of numbers in it, very boring reading—the committee

recommendation for the Department of Education is \$34.4 billion. That number is likely to increase as a result of the negotiations on the final bill.

So then I said, "OK, how much does the Department of Education spend administering these programs?" Well, here is the line item. It is right here in the book. You do not have to go very far. General Departmental Management: \$101 million. Well, I am not the best at math, but I tried to figure this out. And as best I can come, that is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total money that we appropriate to the Department of Education goes for administration—less than one-half of 1 percent.

I then asked my staff to find out how much of was spent for administration at the State level. And that is about 2 percent. So 2.5 percent of all the money we take in that we give the Department of Education goes for administration; therefore providing 97.5 percent to local school districts and students. That is right; out of every \$1 that goes to the Department of Education, 97 cents-plus goes out to schools and to students.

Where the heck that 37-cent figure, that the Senator from Texas had, came from, I have not the foggiest idea. I have his comments. I still do not understand where he got that figure. The only thing I can expect is that maybe he did not take into account Pell grants that go directly to students that are paid to schools. I do not know. Whatever the reason is, that is not the correct figure. It is not chewed up in administration.

The documentation is right here in black and white in the committee report. It just seems that all we have is we just have a lot of rhetoric around here and somehow we are supposed to take the rhetoric for substance.

The substance is there. It is not a secret. You can find out how much goes for administration, and it is not as much as the Senator from Texas said. Fully 97 cents of every dollar that goes to the Department of Education goes out to schools, goes out to students.

Again, it seems now that what I am hearing is that the Republicans, in the negotiations, are saying that they are going to match us dollar-for-dollar, but they just want to throw the money out there in the Title VI block grant to the States, so they can do with it basically what they want. So the sort of hue and cry is "We'll give money to the States and let the States do what they want."

There is a better way. To deal with class size, the President has an initiative to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in this country. The President and those of us on this side of the aisle, what we want to do is put that money through title I reading and math program to reduce class sizes. I am told the Republicans want to send it out through the Title VI block grant.

Again, I am sure that the American people watching me speak here are saying, "Gobbledygook, Title I, Title VI,