

changes in our spending and taxation and get out of town by the end of October we will not have been careful. We will have simply rushed something through. We cannot get it done in October, and we cannot wait till February.

And so we in Congress ought to be willing to be here through the month of November to do what this country needs but to do it carefully.

#### NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM DEMONSTRATION FEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### CAPITAL GAINS

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first before I discuss what I intend to discuss here for a few minutes, a matter of importance, the National Park System, let me make a brief comment on capital gains.

Depending on when the effective date of the capital gains cut came in, it is unlikely that a whole lot of people in the stock market have capital gains. But we are also looking at real estate questions, at companies expanding. And the idea that somehow we will spend our way out of a recession, rather than grow our way out, is backwards. If we do not have real substantive incentives to get people back to work in all sectors of our economy, we are in deep trouble in this economy.

#### DEMONSTRATION FEES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about demonstration fees. This was supposedly a test to see whether it would relieve the financial pressures on our national parks. At some point, either this demonstration has worked or it has not. It is time to either make them permanent or remove them. In fact, we have had very few complaints, almost none at most parks. The fees range from \$10 to \$30 to enter the park, negligible compared to most entertainment in America. Fees for special services for those related costs, camping, back country expenses, are logical because the money goes directly to pay for those expenses.

These fee dollars have helped supplement the park's complete projects efforts. For example, 6 percent in 1999 of Yellowstone Park's revenue were from the demonstrations fee. The less attended park, Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, netted about \$300,000 a year for projects. In the year 2000 that included projects such as boundary fence repair, overlook trails, radio-collar elk monitoring, trailhead and interior trail signs throughout the park, new laser slide programs for a visitor center and an archeological exhibit at the Medora Visitor Center.

Fee uses are diverse, visitor service usage intensive with these fees and all, help fund unmet park needs. The long-range source problem is that Congress and/or the President keep adding additional units to the National Park Service. This has been especially true or has actually been true since the foundation of the Park System and will always be true. It is only a question of degree. So the park service gets more units and their budget does not increase at the rate of responsibilities.

So we have developed associations like the Rocky Mountain National Nature Association at the Rocky Mountain National Park or the Yosemite Fund at Yosemite National Park, plus concession fees to help meet these needs.

The demonstration fees have also helped supplement these budgets. This has, in fact, led to an unofficial "crown jewel" approach. Former Park Director James Ridenhour argued that Congressional "park-barreling" was diluting the national vision and uniqueness of the National Park System. In fact, the major natural parks plus the major cultural parks have the strongest financial support groups and the most demo fees. People are voting with their own dollars by giving it through the funds, associations, and their park fees.

These demonstration fees should be made permanent because they have become an essential part of preserving our most popular and beloved parks. But, ironically, the National Park pass is beginning to threaten the success story. This was further complicated by our so-called technical corrections to the National Parks' Omnibus Management Act.

Each park has historically kept most of the demonstration fee collected at the gate. Because most projects require planning of multiple years, they plan ahead. Parks also get to keep a significant percentage of the national parks pass fees sold at that park. But as more parks put in demo fees and as demo fees have risen, those who visit multiple parks or visit one park frequently obviously purchase a pass. The more passes sold disadvantage the more remote parks. Demonstration fees not collected or passes not sold at those parks dramatically reduce the revenue at those parks which was, after all, the original purpose.

Furthermore, the Technical Corrections Act set aside 15 percent of sales for administration and promotion of the National Parks Pass. Obviously we have administration costs, and that is a whole other subject. But why are we promoting the national parks pass? National sales and Internet take dollars from specific parks, draining the original intent. There is no data to suggest that promoting the pass in general increases usage of the parks. It just goes to the Washington office rather than the individual park. And even if it did increase usage, that is the wrong goal.

Parks with demonstration fees which need a pass are generally nearly overcrowded in peak seasons already. Why would we want to have more people go to them? Every person who purchases a day pass at a park is given the option of purchasing a national parks pass, so no one is getting shortchanged. Furthermore, the cost of the national parks pass has become too low. As some parks go up to \$30, we need to re-evaluate the system.

We need to look at making it \$100 and there are two problems with that: Low-income families and local residents. A ZIP code criteria for a lower fee is a possibility. Although there is no philosophical defense for that, it may need to be a practical consideration. A refundable tax credit for low-income families would address the income problem. It would cost the government nothing because the people who laid out the \$100 are just getting it back, likely would cost the parks little, but would eliminate the complaint that poor families could not afford the \$100. If we do not address this problem, our park revenue is going to decline. It is something we must address for the sake of our national parks.

#### ANTITERRORISM AND HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the CIA has a budget of over \$30 billion. The FBI has a budget of over \$3 billion. In addition, \$10 to \$12 billion are specifically designated to fighting terrorism. Yet, with all this money and power, we were not warned of the events that befell us on September 11.

Since the tragic attacks, our officials have located and arrested hundreds of suspects, frozen millions of dollars of assets and gotten authority to launch a military attack against the ring leaders in Afghanistan. It seems the war against terrorists or guerillas, if one really believes we are in an actual war, has so far been carried out satisfactorily and under current law. But the question is do we really need a war against the civil liberties of the American people?

We should never casually sacrifice any of our freedoms for the sake of a perceived security. Most security, especially in a free society, is best carried out by individuals protecting their own property and their own lives. The founders certainly understood this and is the main reason we have the second amendment. We cannot have a policeman stationed in each of our homes to prevent burglaries, but owners with property with possession of a gun can easily do it. A new giant agency for homeland security cannot provide security, but it can severely undermine

our liberties. This approach may well, in the long run, make many Americans feel less secure.

The principle of private property ownership did not work to prevent the tragedies of September 11, and there is a reason for that. The cries have gone out that due to the failure of the airlines to protect us, we must nationalize every aspect of aviation security. This reflects a serious error in judgment and will lead us further away from the principle of private property ownership and toward increasing government dependency and control with further sacrifice of our freedoms.

□ 1945

More dollars and more Federal control over the airline industries are not likely to give us the security we all seek.

All industrial plants in the United States enjoy reasonably good security. They are protected not by the local police but by owners putting up barbed wire fences, hiring guards with guns, and requiring identification cards to enter. All this, without any violation of anyone's civil liberties. And in a free society private owners have a right, if not an obligation, to profile if it enhances security. This technique of providing security through private property ownership is about to be rejected in its entirety for the airline industry.

The problem was that the principle of private property was already undermined for the airlines by partial federalization of security by FAA regulations. Airports are owned by various government entities. The system that failed us prior to 9-11 not only was strictly controlled by government regulations, it specifically denied the right of owners to defend their property with a gun. At one time, guns were permitted on airlines to protect the U.S. mail. But for more than 40 years, airlines have not been allowed to protect human life with firearms.

Some argue that pilots have enough to worry about flying the airplane and have no time to be concerned about a gun. How come drivers of armored vehicles can handle both? Why do we permit more protection for money being hauled around the country in a truck than we do for passengers on an airline? If government management of airline security has already failed us, why should we expect expanding the role of government in this area to be successful? One thing for sure, we can expect it to get very expensive and the lines to get a lot longer. The Government's idea of security is asking "who packed your bag"; "has the bag been with you since you packed it"; and requiring plastic knives to be used on all flights while taking fingernail clippers away from pilots.

Pilots overwhelmingly support their right to be armed, some even threatening not to fly if they are not per-

mitted to do so. This could be done quickly and cheaply by merely removing the prohibition against it, as my bill, H.R. 2896, would do. We must not forget four well-placed guns could have prevented the entire tragedy of 9-11.

This is a crucial time in our history. Our policy of foreign interventionism has contributed to this international crisis. How we define our enemies will determine how long we fight and when the war is over. The expense will be worth it if we make the right decisions. Targeting the forces of bin Laden makes sense, but invading eight to 10 countries without a precise goal will prove to be a policy of folly, lasting indefinitely, growing in size and cost in terms of dollars and lives, and something for which most Americans will eventually grow weary.

Our prayers and hopes are with our President that he continues to use wise judgment in accomplishing this difficult task, something he has been doing remarkably well under the very difficult circumstances.

But here at home it is surely a prime responsibility of all Members to remain vigilant and not, out of fear and panic, sacrifice the rights of Americans in our effort to maximize security.

Since the President has already done a good job in locating, apprehending, and defunding those associated with the 9/11 attacks while using current existing laws we should not further sacrifice our liberties with a vague promise of providing more security. We do not need a giant new national agency in order to impose a concept of Homeland Security that challenges our civil liberties. This is an idea whose time has not yet come.

#### FARMWORKER HOUSING CONDITIONS IN U.S.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time today to discuss an issue that is very important to me and, hopefully, to the Nation, and that is the issue of housing conditions of farm workers in this country.

The Housing Assistance Council released their report on findings from a survey of farm worker housing conditions on September 20, 2001. Structural problems, broken appliances, overcrowded living conditions were common findings among farm workers' homes. Unfortunately, families with children are suffering the worst conditions.

This survey is the first nationwide of farm worker housing in 20 years and confirms what smaller studies and anecdotal descriptions have been saying all along; that is, farm workers work incredibly hard to put food on other people's tables, but all too often live in dismal conditions.

The survey revealed that half of the homes surveyed were overcrowded, and

three-quarters of those crowded units were occupied by families with children. Twenty-two percent lacked at least one functioning major appliance, such as stove, refrigerator, bathtubs or toilets; twenty-two percent had serious structural problems; and more than half lacked access to a working laundry machine.

Children lived in two-thirds, or 65 percent, of the units classified as severely substandard; and 60 percent of the homes were adjacent to fields where pesticides were applied.

I recognize that there are several needs that this country faces today, security being among the first, education, health care, nutrition and poverty. This study dramatizes many of those needs, and the main need being that hardworking Americans and their children should not be living in squalid and unhealthy conditions. These are housing conditions that none of us could stand to be in, not even for a second. Nobody should be subjected to such adversity.

This major research project was conducted over a 3-year period, from 1997 through 2000. Data on 4,625 housing units in 22 States and Puerto Rico were collected in a non-random survey by more than 100 outreach workers and 16 organizations that work with farm workers around the country, and analyzed by the Housing Assistance Council. Major funding was provided by USDA and HUD.

I continue to be impressed by the quality and the content of this study and other studies conducted by HAC. After reading the study, I was appalled to learn that in America we still have such horrendous living conditions. We have made very little progress in this area. It is disheartening and disappointing that we live in such a rich country and do not make available decent housing to invited farm workers, where the law requires that we should, to those who are tilling our fields and picking the fruits and vegetables which help feed all our families.

It is particularly worrisome to note that such a large proportion of farm worker families with children live adjacent to fields where pesticides are sprayed. This means that they are affected with long-term effects in their families and in their bodies.

I would like to focus on the fact that we do need more money to fund these programs, both the USDA as well as HUD. It is imperative that we recognize that many of these Federal programs, such as HUD, can assist our farm workers. On this floor, during the HUD administration appropriation, we voted against this. We should put monies back into HUD to make sure we assist in this program. The report clearly shows the need for a full-scale national study for farm workers, especially pertaining to housing, education, and health.