

and public lands of our country are now receiving those kinds of restrictions.

Some people like to hike in our back country, others like simply the peace and the solitude, while others prefer to ride ATVs in the woods. Some prefer to camp in a more developed facility, while others prefer primitive spots.

The point is, the recreational opportunities on our public lands should be as diverse as America's public interests. On the same note, we can use the natural resources we need in an environmentally responsible manner and still have plenty of opportunities to recreate. In fact, recreation and resource interests can team together to help each other.

In my own State of Idaho in the Clearwater National Forest we have seen a dramatic decline in our elk herds in large part because of a lack of habitat. This is a massive amount of public land. Yet by its management—the suppression of wildfires, the inability of the Forest Service to manage using controlled burns but changing the habitat and the character of the land itself—one of the Nation's largest elk herds collapsed. In the winters of 1996 and 1997, thousands of elk starved to death simply by the mismanagement of our public lands by a Forest Service that would not seek the diversity of landscape that is so critically necessary to maintain those unique elk herds and the vibrancy of the land itself.

Rather than fight each other, elk conservation groups, the Forest Service, and the timber industry are coming together to develop a plan to mechanically thin some of the areas and use prescribed burns and others to treat nearly a million acres to increase elk habitat. Yet on the outside there are some conservation groups that say even thinning a tree is cutting a tree and should not be allowed. How absurd.

Why deny the right of good stewards to manage land in a way that creates diversity and balance so that Idaho can reclaim its heritage of having a large elk herd, and at the same time having more than 4 million acres of wilderness, and at the same time having a vibrant Forest Service products industry, while at the same time having growth within the State as one of its No. 1 economies tourism and recreation. That is a wise and balanced approach toward managing our public lands instead of this single attitude of "lock 'em out, preserve, and deny" the ability to manage public resources in a diverse and balanced way. We need all of our public lands to be used in a way that appeals to all of our citizens, not to just a single, relatively narrow-minded group.

Public land management, because of this, is now embroiled in fights, in appeals, in litigation. Every decision made by our public lands managers

ends up in court, oftentimes fought out over weeks, months, and years. While all of that has been going on, the Congress of the United States has sat idly by and watched, simply hoping it would play itself out when, in fact, the fight seems to have intensified.

Differing interests have to come together to realize we all have one common goal: To use our land in a responsible manner, in a sustainable manner, in a balanced manner, in the kind of way that will meet most of our interests, and do so to assure a quality environment and an abundant wildlife habitat. I believe all of those things can be done.

Over the last several years, I have held over 50 hearings on the management of the U.S. Forest Service and why it can't make decisions, and when it does, why those decisions are in court. Why has it become largely the most dysfunctional agency of our Federal Government? Yet it has a phenomenally great legacy of appropriate management and responsible caretakership of the land.

As a result of that, I have introduced S. 1320, a comprehensive reform on the public land laws primarily governing the Forest Service but also reflecting on the BLM. However, until we all realize there is room for everyone on our public lands instead of just "lock 'em up and keep 'em out" solely in the name of the environment; that we can utilize our resources in a wise and sustainable manner; that we can continue to accept these lands in a way that offer a resource to our Treasury, along with a resource to our mind; then I think we will continue to be in litigation. Successful management of our public lands realizes a balanced approach, a diverse approach, and one that I think our country can take great comfort in the legacy of the past. In all fairness, we ought to be a bit embarrassed about our current situation.

Last Saturday was National Public Lands Day. It shouldn't be viewed as just one that talks about the quality of our parks and recreational areas. It should be reflective of the millions and millions of acres of public lands in my State and other Western States that by their own diversity assure an abundant resource, abundant revenue, and opportunities not only for recreational solitude but economic opportunity in the communities that reside on and near those public lands. I hope a lifetime from now our public lands will be as vibrant as they are today, but will be managed in a much more diverse and multiple-use way than it appears we are heading at this moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Under the previous order the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

## TAXES

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, for the people of America who are interested in where we are on the tax cuts and the President's message regarding the veto, I thought I might share my version of what has happened.

First of all, the main reason the President has given for vetoing the tax bill is we need to take care of Social Security and Medicare first.

The question is, When will the American people ever get a tax cut? If we don't ask that question, we don't put anything in perspective as to where we are and where we will be.

I will share why I believe the tax cut was right and why I believe what the President is talking about is not right and will probably yield to no tax cut to the American people.

First, I might ask rhetorically, how long has the President been President? I guess he has been President almost 7 years. He will then have an eighth year. Whatever legacy he will leave the American people is close at hand. Why have we not solved Social Security in the 6 years and 9 months he has been President? But now that we have a surplus, when we can give the American people a little piece of it in a tax cut, all of a sudden the President thinks we ought to save Social Security. Why didn't we save it last year or the year before?

Why didn't we save it after the President conducted hearings in three or four cities in America and said he understood it and he thought he knew what we ought to do and he sends a package. However, in terms of reform he does almost nothing and sets up a new fund to put in a piece of everybody's Social Security money, not in individual investment accounts but, in a new trust fund to be run by—whom? Seven or nine people; appointed by whom? The Government of the United States. Who believes the Government is going to manage the funds for Social Security in a way to make money and enhance the value of their pension plans? Who believes that? Hardly anyone.

Second, who believes we ought to have the Federal Government, with appointed people, investing billions and billions, maybe even trillions of dollars in the stock of America and in bonds in America, without being very concerned whether they will distort the market? Instead of being a free market with equities, loans and bonds, it will be a market controlled by what the Federal Government thinks? Just think of that, a year after it exists there will be somebody on the floor of this Senate saying: We should not invest any of that money from Social Security in cigarette companies. Boy, everyone will say, of course, we should do that. Then next year there will be a report that obesity comes from McDonald's

and other companies that sell us quick-fix foods. So somebody will say: Why would we want to invest money in McDonald's? They add to obesity in America. Then, who knows what else? We will distort the American market.

Everybody who is thinking understands the President has not submitted anything credible on Social Security. Is it not interesting, there we are showing a \$3.4 trillion surplus over the next decade, \$2 trillion of which belongs to Social Security, and they will get it—but what about the rest of it? Should we sit around and wait to spend it? Or should we give some of it back in an orderly manner over a decade?

Mr. President, your concerns about Social Security and Medicare do not ring true. They come into existence when you do not want to give the American taxpayers a tax cut. That is why all of a sudden they come up. Now you have even indicated we might be able to get that done in a few weeks. Get what done? Fix Social Security and Medicare, which you have not been able to fix in almost 7 years in office? In a few weeks we can fix it so we can give the American people a tax cut?

Friends, you understand in a Republican budget there is a very large set-aside that is not spent on anything that can be used to repair Medicare. The problem is the President does not have a plan into which anybody wants to buy. He sent us a plan to fix prescription drugs for a part of America that might need them under Medicare, and nobody likes his plan—Democrat or Republican. So why doesn't he sit down and talk seriously about fixing that?

A commission that was bipartisan, that came up with a reasonably good plan—bipartisan, bicameral, citizens and legislators—he caused that to be distorted and thrown away by asking his representatives to vote no when everybody else voted yes. Because we needed a supermajority, it failed by one vote. We had a plan.

If I were a senior, I would say: Madam President, it looks to me as if you do not want my children and my grandchildren to have a tax cut because you are trying to use as an excuse that we have to fix Medicare and Social Security when you do not need that money that is going in the tax cut to fix either of them. Why did it take him so long to fix them, if all of a sudden we must fix them in the next few weeks in order to get a tax cut?

Frankly, there are a lot of other reasons the President has given, but these are the ones that are politically aimed at America. If you read the polls, if you ask the question the wrong way, Americans will say: Fix Medicare and Social Security first. But if you said to them in a poll question: If we have sufficient money left over to give the American people a tax cut and we have enough money for Social Security and Medi-

care, would you want to give them a tax cut? watch the answer. The answer, instead of what they are quoting around, would be 85 percent. That happens to be the facts.

#### EDUCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about education because somehow or another we have ourselves involved in competing resolutions about the funding of education when we do not know how much education is going to get funded because the appropriation bill has not been produced yet. If this were a court of law, the Daschle resolution would be dismissed as being premature. There is no issue yet. But we will have to debate it and vote on it. Before we are finished, the Appropriations Committee that handles Labor-Health and Human Services will produce a bill that is more consistent with the budget resolution than anything else.

Regardless of what it looked like 3 or 4 weeks ago, they are going to have sufficient resources. Remember, the President of the United States advance appropriated, in his function and in his budget, \$21 billion. We are going to do some of the same things because they are legitimate and proper. When you take that into consideration, frankly, the Daschle resolution is talking about a nonreality.

I can say there is a high probability, and if I had one more afternoon to go talk to a couple of Senators on that committee, I would predict with certainty—but I can say with almost certainty—the subcommittee of the Senate on Labor-Health and Human Services will appropriate more money in education than the President put in his budget. When you combine what they are going to give, it will be more than the President's.

Is it going to have every single item in it? I do not know. In fact, before we vote on the final determination of education funding, the Senate will debate the issue on an appropriations bill which I have just described which will have more funding in it than the President's. We will probably decide in a floor fight on this floor how that education program should be structured. I think the occupant of the chair knows that Republicans have been working very hard at loosening up this money from the strings and rigidities of Washington into something that will go local schools in a looser fashion, from which we can get accountability and flexibility. We give flexibility and we expect accountability. It will not be all the line items the President wants, but it will be more money than the President requested.

So I do not know what we are voting about in these resolutions. They are premature. The only guidance we have is the budget resolution that Repub-

licans voted for and which said that of the domestic programs, there are a number of priorities but the highest one is education. The Senator occupying the chair voted for that resolution. In fact, it said we should appropriate, over the next 5 years, in excess of \$28 billion—\$26 or \$28 billion more than we had been appropriating regularly under the President's approach. Over 10 years, it should be somewhere around \$85 billion or \$90 billion more. That is the only direction and guidance we have.

That is not binding. But if ever there was something you know you are going to do when you pass a budget resolution, it is this because the American people think it is right. But the American people do not think we are making headway with the existing education programs. They would be thrilled if we gave more money and did it differently. Why should we be doing it the same old way which we have been doing it, which has no accountability and is all targeted whether the schools need it or not? They have to put on the same pair of socks and same shoes in every school district in America. They have to fit into the same shoes in order to get the Federal money, whether they have the problems or not.

Then we have the great program that we call IDEA, where we told them you get started with special education and we will end up paying a substantial portion of it. We did not. We cheated. We made them pay a lot more than they were supposed to after we mandated it. Under Republican leadership, we are putting more and more money into that program for special education because we told them to do it, and we said we would pay a certain percent and we never came close. We keep putting more in than the President. The President complains about some targeted program we do not fund, but we fund IDEA and it loosens up money the States would otherwise have to spend for a program that we mandated, that we never lived up to our commitment on, and that is pretty good and we probably will do that this year, provide more funding than the President asked for.

So I don't know, when this 5:30 vote comes, what we are voting on. I think we ought to put them both off and let's see what the appropriations subcommittee does. But if we do not, I can say I don't know why anybody would vote for the Daschle resolution. It is a statement of unreality. It is a statement of hypotheticals. It is a statement of: Here is how much money they have to spend in that subcommittee, so I am going to do some arithmetic and assume everything is going to get cut 17 percent. That is about where the 17-percent number comes from, but it does not mean anything because nobody suggests that all the money Labor-Health and Human Services gets