Eagles and National Park Passports. Finally, H.R. 3283 would authorize all of the above agencies to retain and spend all offsetting receipts collected under the new fee program without further appropriation.

CBO estimates that NPS and other federal agencies would collect a total of $2.1 billion over the 2006–2014 period under H.R. 3283, or about $800 million more than we expect those agencies to collect under existing recreation fee authorities. We estimate that the agencies would spend about the same amount (i.e., around $2.1 billion) over that period, or about $1.5 billion more than they would be allowed to spend under existing law. (Under such law, beginning in January 2006, agencies generally may spend a much smaller percentage of fee collections than under H.R. 3283.) Thus, the net budgetary impact of enacting this legislation would be an increase in direct spending of about $700 million over the 2006–2014 period.

This legislation contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated net budgetary impact of H.R. 3283 is summarized in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

| | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recreation Fee Program: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Change in Offsetting Receipts: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | −66 | −85 | −87 | −88 | −90 | −92 | −94 | −96 | −98 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | −66 | −85 | −87 | −88 | −90 | −92 | −94 | −96 | −98 |
| Change in Spending: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 140 | 176 | 181 | 182 | 186 | 190 | 194 | 198 | 202 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 55 | 123 | 162 | 178 | 184 | 188 | 191 | 195 | 198 |
| Net Change in Direct Spending: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 74 | 91 | 94 | 94 | 96 | 98 | 100 | 102 | 104 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | −11 | 38 | 75 | 90 | 94 | 96 | 97 | 99 | 100 |

Basis of Estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the recreation fee program established by H.R. 3283 will be implemented during fiscal year 2005 and that the fees adopted by the affected agencies will sum to about the same level of offsetting receipts currently collected under the recreation fee demonstration program. This estimate is based on information provided by NPS (which collects and spends the vast majority of recreation fees), the Forest Service, the USFWS, the Bureau of Reclamation, and BLM.

*Recreation Fees and Spending Under Current Law*

Historically, the collection and spending of recreation fees by most federal agencies has been governed by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. That act authorizes these agencies to collect fees for use of, and in some cases entrance to, federal lands that have significant recreational resources, subject to rate caps and other limitations. It also allows most of the agencies to spend up to 15 percent of annual fee collections without further appropriation to offset the costs of collecting the fees. The remaining 85 percent of fee receipts are available only if subsequently appropriated.

In 1996, the Congress established a temporary recreation fee demonstration program authorizing the NPS and other federal land management agencies to charge higher fees at more sites than would otherwise be permitted under the LWCFA. Generally, under the demonstration program, the agencies may also spend without further appropriation 100 percent of all offsetting receipts collected at recreation sites. That spending authority applies for most agencies both to the additional receipts collected under the demonstration program and to the receipts that would have been collected under the more limited LWCFA fee authority. As a result, the demonstration program brings in an extra $80 million a year but results in higher spending authority of about $170 million a year.

Under current law, the demonstration program will expire at the end of calendar year 2005, and recreation receipts for most agencies will fall to their pre-1996 levels. Spending authority will also fall—to 85 percent of receipts (except for transportation fees, National Park Passports, USFWS entrance fees, all of which will continue to be available under other statutes such as the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998). Thus, while total receipts from recreation fees are expected to decrease from about $220 million to about $140 million a year, direct spending authority will be reduced by much more—from about $220 million to an estimated $45 million.

*Recreation Fees and Spending Under H.R. 3283*

H.R. 3283 would effectively authorize the continuation of the fees and spending allowed by the recreation fee demonstration program through 2014. Thus, the bill would have two budgetary effects. First, allowing the agencies to maintain fees charged under the demonstration program would increase offsetting receipts by a total of $800 million through 2014. Second, allowing all offsetting receipts from recreation fees to be spent without further appropriation would increase direct spending by $1.5 billion over the same time period. The net impact on the federal budget would be an increase in direct spending of about $700 million over the next nine years (after 2005).

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 3283 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Previous CBO estimate: On March 22, 2004, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 1107, the Recreation Fee Authority Act of 2004, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on February 11, 2004. S. 1107 and H.R. 3283 both authorize recreation fee programs, but the Senate bill only covers NPS fees while the House bill covers the Forest Service and all bureaus within the Department of the Interior.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Deborah Reis; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Marjorie Miller; and Impact on the Private Sector: Selena Caldera.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

## REV. DR. JAMES FORBES JR.: FROM THE PULPIT, A STRUGGLE FOR JUSTICE

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 19, 2004*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the service of Rev. Dr. James Forbes Jr., Senior Minister of the Riverside Church in New York. A constant and powerful voice for social equality, and freedom, his leadership has set an example to the community in New York's 15th Congressional District, in our Nation and around the world. A clergyman of the highest order, Dr. Forbes is also an activist who equates spirituality with justice.

On June 1, 1989, the Rev. Dr. James Alexander Forbes, Jr. was installed as the fifth Senior Minister of The Riverside Church. He is the first African-American to serve in that position at one of the largest multicultural congregations in the Nation. Dr. Forbes is an ordained minister in the American Baptist Churches and in the Original United Holy Church of America. He has served congregations around our Nation, inspired by his painful personal experience of bigotry in the segregated South.

Dr. Forbes was born in 1935 in Burgaw, North Carolina, where his father was a Pentecostal bishop. He was the second oldest of eight children. He has led numerous workshops, retreats, and conferences for the National Council of Churches of Christ USA, the National Association of Campus Ministry, the American Baptist Churches, the United Church of Christ, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Episcopal Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the United Methodist Church, and the Presbyterian Church (USA). He is a consultant to the Congress of National Black Churches and past President of The Martin Luther King Fellows. Dr. Forbes has earned three degrees and has been awarded 13 honorary degrees among other awards.

I am deeply impressed by Dr. Forbes commitment to using tools of mass communication to educate our country in the principles of social justice, through a national movement called ''progressive principles of justice''. I commend to the attention of my colleagues a profile of Dr. Forbes, which appeared in the New York Times on October 12, 2004. This article reminded me of Dr. Forbes' leadership in moving us closer to the day when we all sit down together as children of God.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 12, 2004]

FROM THE PULPIT, A STRUGGLE FOR JUSTICE

(By Chris Hedges)

In the battle over Jesus, what he stood for, what he represents and how faith is experienced and sustained, the Rev. Dr. James A. Forbes Jr., the senior minister of Riverside Church, is determined to provide an alternative vision to the one offered by religious conservatives.

He and other clergy members plan to employ the tools of mass communication, including television, to build a national movement for what he calls ''progressive principles of justice.'' In the last few weeks, with his public support for Senator John Kerry and his dire warnings about another four years of President Bush, he has jumped feet first into America's most divisive and, maybe, most important culture war.

''The issue facing religious people is justice,'' he said one recent Saturday morning in his office in the soaring Gothic church, which overlooks the Hudson River. ''How can we justify a corporate officer making a salary that is a thousand times more than the lowest-paid member of the corporation? Poverty is the real weapon of mass destruction. But in this capitalist society when we raise questions about the freedom of some to enjoy an inordinate proportion of the resources while others lack basic necessities, it becomes a hard and difficult discussion.''

Controversy is nothing new in the pulpit of Riverside Church. The Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., who was the senior minister before Dr. Forbes assumed the post in 1989, opened the church doors to political refugees from Central America and called for an end to the production of nuclear weapons. Dr. Forbes has welcomed gays and Buddhists into the congregation and has fostered the spontaneity of his own Pentecostal tradition, encouraging emotional personal testimony, applause and standing ovations. But times have changed. The social activism that was more widely accepted within the mainsteam church decades ago has given way to a narrower belief that stresses personal piety and devotion. Dr. Forbes, who travels the country trying to galvanize liberal clergy members into a national network, is often a voice crying in the wilderness.

He seeks, he said, to remind Americans that they also have carried out violence and oppression in the name of God.

''Christians have joined in this negativity,'' he said. ''Don't forget the Klan. They were bent on destroying innocent people. Bad people are not confined to any one religious tradition.''

Dr. Forbes, 69, dressed in a blue blazer and pressed gray slacks, speaks with the hypnotic rhythm of a preacher, his words cascading in slow, elegant waterfalls. He comes naturally to the pulpit, growing up the second oldest of eight children in Burgaw, N.C., where his father was a Pentecostal bishop.

Dr. Forbes shared a story he has told before. When his family sat down to dinner, his mother, who worked as a maid for a white family, always asked, ''Are all the children in?''

''And if there was a child not present, we had to prepare a plate for that child and put it in the oven before we could say grace and our Bible verses and eat,'' he said. ''That is the image I have of God. God, for me, is Momma Eternal. Before I eat, God asks, 'Are all the children in?' ''

He went to school to be a doctor, graduating with a degree in science from Howard University. But after ''being called'' to be a preacher, he enrolled at Union Theological Seminary. ''God called me to be a healer,'' he said, ''but a healer of souls and culture.''

He served in small churches in the South, earning a reputation as a preacher of power, and joined the civil rights movement. He participated in sit-ins at segregated lunch counters in Woolworth's stores.

In 1976 he returned to New York to be a professor of preaching and worship at Union, and from there went to the pulpit at Riverside. Dr. Forbes is married to Bettye Franks Forbes, a musician, and they have one son.

His Pentecostal background unsettles some in the congregation who see him as emotional and showy. The squabbles, however, do not dim what he defines as an era of ''renewal'' in which social justice values—values that drew him to the ministry—will again surge to the forefront.

Injustice, he said, is not an abstraction in his life. He knows the pain of being excluded. On the first day he was allowed to sit as a black man at a lunch counter at Woolworth's he sat next to a white woman who had already ordered her meal. When he sat down she stood and left, and he went home and wrote a poem:

Why did she move when I sat down?
Surely she could not tell so soon that my Saturday bath had worn away.
Or that savage passion had pushed me for a rape.
Perhaps it was the cash she carried in her purse.
She could not risk a theft so early in the month.
And who knows that on tomorrow t'would fall her lot
To drink her coffee from a cup my darkened hands had clutched?
So horrible was that moment, I too should have run away.
For prejudice has the odor of a dying beast.
Whether racist or rapist, both fall into the savage class.
And the greatest theft of all is to rob one's right to be.

## MULTINATIONALS WILL EMERGE AS MAIN WINNERS FROM CAFTA RATIFICATION

### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, November 19, 2004*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 2004, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, together with the United States, signed a free trade accord whose underlying principle is the aggressive protection and expansion of individual and corporate investor rights. These privileges come at the expense of environmental protection, legislative independence, and a nation's right to autonomously determine social and economic policy. Despite the assurances of its proponents, the Central America Free Trade Accord (CAFTA) is not likely to translate into a significant improvement for the region's atrocious labor rights record because it does not institute the fixed penalties and incentives required for such a profound change. The absence of such provisions is especially distressing in Central American societies that, in a twisted and deadly caricature of respectable collective bargaining, have historically witnessed hundreds of labor leaders gunned down and intimidated by hired hands on the payrolls of land owners and factory managers.

The agreement's limited and unbalanced scope is a result of a heavily delimited negotiating process that lacked any sense of transparency and only involved government-sponsored experts. Numerous NGO's, civic organizations, trade unions groups and political figures in both Central America and the U.S. have expressed their opposition to the agreement. In its present form, CAFTA represents a very significant undermining of the traditional sovereign rights of nations and exposes a lamentable deference on the part of Central American governments. This clearly demonstrates their intent of mainly serving privileged elements of their societies at the expense of the generality of their populations. Once implemented, CAFTA will, in fact, likely condemn the area's agricultural, service and industrial workers to further marginalization, with the accompanying risk that they might fall into abject poverty. Most likely, comparable Central American enterprises will be hard-pressed to successfully compete with foreign competitors because they lack the economies of scale, investor control, access to low interest loans, investor pool and an outreach to skilled management which is readily available to transnational commercial entities.

UNEVEN GROUND

If and when CAFTA is ratified, it will represent a momentous victory to business sectors in the U.S. and in Central America. The five Central American nations that are taking part in the agreement constitute a relatively underdeveloped region whose total GDP equals only $152 billion, or a negligible fraction of the U.S.'s $11 trillion economy. CAFTA fails to adequately consider this facet of the signatories' asymmetrical relationship. According to renowned Nicaraguan academic Rene Oscar Vargas, ''CAFTA is a vehicle for an increase of U.S. exports and an opportunity to maximize the potential of its basic industries: information technology, telecommunications, the service industry, agriculture and intellectual property.'' On another occasion Vargas commented, ''What is CAFTA but an agreement between unequal partners.''

The principle that states that free trade is beneficial to all those involved is misleading and simplistic as it disregards the fact that with unfettered access, the advantage almost always lies with the powerful. In its current format, CAFTA is the economic equivalent of a 220-pound heavyweight being allowed to step into the ring against a 112-pound flyweight. Although international trade and foreign investment are necessary components of any economy, it is a state's responsibility to prioritize the interests of all its citizens, not just the privileged few, and certainly not that of transnational corporations.

For the CAFTA agreement to be ratified, it must be approved by the legislature and signed by the president of each signatory country. A full and transparent reexamination of its costs and benefits, and who will be the winners and losers, is imperative because renegotiation of contested clauses will be all but impossible once the agreement is ratified. A look at Mexico's experience with NAFTA, and its unsuccessful attempts to renegotiate agriculture-related provisions, underscores the serious implications of ratifying CAFTA. Free-trade agreements are not in themselves pernicious instruments. However, they must prove beneficial to both parties, and the Central American Free Trade Agreement, in its current format, does not satisfy this overriding requirement. If this agreement is implemented without alterations, it could very well demonstrate that unscrupulousness and greed will prevail over the best interests of the citizens directly concerned.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IS THE PANACEA

Behind the rhetoric used to tout CAFTA's virtues—that it promotes a win-win scenario—the reality is that it will provide already well-heeled international and domestic corporations and investors with lucrative incentives, protections, and almost plenary immunity from prosecution. In Article 10.28 of the agreement, the