

the program by waiving some of the eligibility requirements. But even that has not worked to bring trade-impacted farmers into the program.

After several decades of trying with little success to squeeze farmers into eligibility rules designed for manufacturing workers it is time to try something new.

What this bill does is create a TAA program better tailored to the needs of farmers, ranchers, and fishermen. Basically, the program creates a new trigger for eligibility. Instead of having to show a layoff, the farmer, rancher or fisherman has to show commodity price declines related to imports.

The trigger is different, but the program serves the same purposes. It is basically a hybrid of the TAA for workers and TAA for firms programs, using parts of each that make sense for agricultural producers. It assists the farmer, rancher or fisherman to adjust to import competition, to retrain, to obtain technical assistance, and to have access to income support to tide them over during the process. And the income support is capped and is subject to gross income limitations to make sure that the program is not being abused.

The last important innovation in this bill deals with health insurance. One common criticism of the existing program is that it does nothing to help workers with health insurance.

It is virtually impossible for a worker to pay the mortgage, feed his family, and pay health insurance premiums on \$250 a week. The worker faces a terrible choice. He can retrain under TAA in the hope of a better job—but risk going without health insurance for his family for up to two years. Or he can pass up the opportunity to retrain for a better future and take a dead-end job right away to make ends meet.

The bipartisan Trade Deficit Review Commission concluded that lack of assistance with health insurance is a significant disincentive to complete TAA training. As I said before, this group unanimously recommended that the Government help workers bridge the insurance gap between old and new jobs. And that is what we have done with this bill. Again, Secretary Rumsfeld, Ambassador Hills, and Ambassador Zoellick agreed to this point.

The bill before us today includes a 73-percent advanceable, refundable tax credit for COBRA premiums for workers eligible for TAA benefits. TAA participants who are not eligible for COBRA can use the tax credit to purchase health insurance from various State-sponsored group plans.

This issue has been surprisingly controversial. I am not saying that there is only one right way to address this issue. But what has shocked me is the number of voices suggesting that we should do nothing at all; that is, that we not help people, who are displaced on account of trade, with health insurance. That is just not acceptable. I hope we are past that now and headed

toward a reasonable compromise and that we can move forward constructively to help people who need health insurance.

Now that I have gone over the main parts of the bill, I want to speak a little about the tradition of bipartisanship on trade adjustment assistance.

Since its inception, the TAA program has always enjoyed wide bipartisan support. As I said before, a lot of work has gone into making sure this bill is no exception.

Before the bill was drafted, we consulted widely with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We have continued that outreach throughout the process. I thank again, Senator BINGAMAN and Senator DASCHLE for their leadership on this issue. But I also thank Senator GRASSLEY, whose proposal with Senator CONRAD for a TAA for farmers program became the core of this bill. And I thank Senator SNOWE, who has made some very important contributions to the bill dealing with fishermen, small businesses, and other issues. Her support and sponsorship are very much appreciated.

We have also talked with the administration. They raised some technical and not-so-technical issues, and we have been able to come to understandings on many of them.

The administration wanted us to tighten up training waivers, and we did. They wanted us to cap the wage insurance program, and we did. They wanted us to revise TAA's on-the-job training provisions to work more like WIA. We did. They wanted us to clarify the definition of secondary workers and to make sure the Department of Labor has enough time to consider secondary worker petitions. We did that, too.

This process of give and take has been healthy. It has been useful. And I think the result is a good, solid, thoughtful bill, one that will make this program more fair, more efficient, and more user friendly.

If we want to rebuild the center on trade, improving trade adjustment assistance is critical. It is an integral part. It is a necessary part. I urge all my colleagues to support this provision and support the larger trade package, particularly when we proceed to consider it at a later point either this week or next.

I thank the Chair. And I particularly thank my friend from Alaska for his indulgence.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIDEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me further stipulate, Senators be limited to 10 minutes in time.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2481 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RAISING EPA TO CABINET-LEVEL STATUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in recent years, some of my colleagues have opposed elevating the Environmental Protection Agency to Cabinet-level status. You and I have argued that the protection of our public health and environment, EPA's mandate, is as important as the congressional mandates which guide other Cabinet-level agencies. If the EPA enjoyed the same status as the Department of Energy or the Interior Department, maybe EPA's policies would carry the day occasionally.

As things stand, EPA is certainly losing the battle within this administration from clean air to climate change to snowmobiles in our national parks. EPA's views are overridden, undervalued, and watered down.

Take the issue of snowmobiles in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. I have spoken about these issues before. I have offered amendments that have been adopted in this regard. Snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park has become popular in recent years; so popular, in fact, that the activities overwhelm the parks, its employees, and its wildlife.

Up to 1,000 snowmobilers enter the Yellowstone Park on winter weekends, most of them through the gateway community of West Yellowstone, MT. On steel cold days, a visible haze hangs over the park's gate and surrounding area. Rangers at this park wore Park Service-issued respirators this winter because the air quality had been so degraded by emissions from snowmobile engines.

I repeat, park rangers at Yellowstone National Park wore respirators because the air was so bad because of snowmobiles. These respirators were issued by the Park Service.

What have we come to when rangers have to wear a respirator in our national parks? At the very least, it is an embarrassment. I think it is a tragedy.

EPA, the protector of the air we breathe, wisely advocated banning snowmobiles due to their air quality impacts, but those were not the only impacts EPA raised. Snowmobiles also

stress Yellowstone's wildlife. The noise generated by so many snowmobiles, coupled with the vehicle's capacity to reach speeds of up to 90 miles an hour, force the park's wildlife, to say the least, to expend valuable energy to avoid contact with these snowmobilers.

The National Park Service studied the snowmobiles' impact on the parks for the better part of 10 years, receiving hundreds of thousands of public comments on this subject. The comment included those from the EPA. As I have said, EPA recommended a ban based on air quality concerns.

In November of 2000, the Park Service ordered the snowmobiles be gradually phased out in Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park and the 8-mile road connecting the two.

By the year 2004, snowmobiles would be banned completely from these parks. With so many proconservation Clinton-era policies, the Bush administration balked at implementing this rule. With the snowmobile industry in mind, rather than the millions of Americans who visit our parks, the White House ordered the Park Service to restudy the impact of snowmobiles on park resources.

The writing was on the wall that this administration expected the Park Service to reach a different conclusion when it reexamined the data. Perhaps they hoped the evidence would support the position they favored, some sort of a faith-based approach to science.

As part of the new review, EPA had the integrity and the courage to stick to the position it held throughout the history of this debate. I commend Governor Whitman for that.

In its public comments, EPA repeated the assertion from 3 years ago that banning snowmobiles is the best available protection for air quality and health of workers and visitors alike. EPA said even a limited number of snowmobiles may violate air quality standards.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments of the Environmental Protection Agency to the Assistant Superintendent at Grand Teton National Park setting out their position be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY, REGION VIII,
Denver, CO, April 23, 2002.

Re Draft supplemental EIS for winter use
CEQ #020130.

STEVEN F. IOBST,
Assistant Superintendent, Grand Teton National
Park, Moose, WY.

DEAR MR. IOBST: As a Cooperating Agency in the Supplemental Winter Use Planning Process, and in accordance with our responsibilities under the corresponding Memorandum of Agreement with the National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for Winter Use Plans at Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial

Parkway (the Parks). We provide the following comments to assist NPS in producing a document that meets the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the terms of the Settlement Agreement that led to this Supplement. These comments are provided in accordance with EPA's responsibilities under NEPA and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and we hope they will be useful to you as you complete this supplemental analysis.

EPA thanks the NPS for the opportunity to participate in this SEIS as a Cooperating Agency. NPS has again fully involved the Cooperating Agencies at every point in this process. NPS was extremely responsive to the Cooperating Agencies, and we appreciate the almost weekly opportunity to provide input and ask questions. We also appreciate NPS' efforts to fully evaluate and utilize applicable information and input from the Cooperating Agencies. While the Settlement Agreement set a very tight time frame for this analysis, and though NPS received much of the new information much later than expected, the NPS planning and analysis team is to be commended for doing a remarkable job in assembling this DSEIS.

This DSEIS amends the Final Winter Use EIS (FEIS) issued in October, 2000. The two primary purposes of the DSEIS are as follows: (1) to solicit more public input, and (2) to include data from new snowmobile technology and other new information. This DSEIS analyzes four alternatives that fall within the range of those alternatives presented in the FEIS.

Alternative 1a represents the November 2000 Record of Decision (ROD), fully phasing in the transfer of motorized access to snowcoaches by 2003-2004. The existing ROD implements FEIS Alternative G with minor modifications.

Alternative 1b is identical to 1a except implementation is extended one additional year, with full implementation in 2004-2005.

Alternative 2, at full implementation, requires 50 percent lower emissions on all snowmobiles, and caps snowmobiles in Yellowstone at 1,300/day pending a carrying capacity analysis.

Alternative 3, at full implementation, requires "best available technology" for reducing emissions and noise for all snowmobiles entering the Parks, and all snowmobiles would be accompanied by a NPS licensed guide. Alternative 3 caps use in Yellowstone at 930 snowmobiles per day until a carrying capacity analysis is completed.

EPA fully supports continued winter access to these National Parks. Given the analysis presented in the DSEIS, EPA is satisfied that if applicable regulation, law, and federal policy are followed. Park resources can be protected while maintaining motorized winter access to these Parks. While this comment letter will suggest some adjustments and additional analyses, EPA finds the Park Service again used the best-available information, scientific analyses, expert agency comment, and public input in assembling both the DSEIS and FEIS (as required by 40 CFR 1500.1(b)). The assessment of impacts in the DSEIS and FEIS is supported by an extremely thorough and credible body of human health, environmental, and wildlife science, much of which is site-specific to the Yellowstone ecosystem. NPS, academic and agency researchers have actively studied the impacts of snowmobile use for over 10 years in these Parks. The Yellowstone ecosystem has the benefit of more peer-reviewed scientific research on the effects of motorized winter recreation than any other place on earth.

EPA's primary concern with this supplemental analysis is that three of the four DSEIS alternatives (1b, 2 and 3) threaten to

exceed National or Montana Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide in the first year of implementation (2002-2003). NPS has the ability, information and authority to set interim limits to vehicle numbers that would assure compliance with Air Quality Standards. EPA encourages interim vehicle limits be sufficiently reduced in the FSEIS to assure compliance with these standards. Although complying with Air Quality Standards does not assure elimination of the impairment to visibility of human health caused by vehicle exhaust, it is an achievable first step toward resolving the impaired air quality in these Parks.

In November, 2000, NPS issued a Record of Decision (ROD) that resolved the winter-use threat to National and State air Quality Standards as well as the significant impairments to human health, visibility, wildlife and soundscapes. This remedy was to be implemented with actions taken this past winter (2001-2002), with full implementation in 2003-04. EPA recently learned that some actions required by the ROD to reduce impacts to air quality this past winter were not implemented. The ROD is an active policy document and represents an agreement with the public for managing winter use in these Parks. EPA is concerned that air quality, human health and visibility continued to be impaired this past season. As discussed in our enclosed Detailed Comments, EPA is suggesting that interim limits be adjusted in each of the SEIS alternatives to assure compliance with air quality standards beginning this coming season (2002-2003).

Environmentally preferred alternative

EPA has carefully considered the new information, analysis and alternatives presented in the DSEIS, and we find FEIS Alternative G remains the environmentally preferred alternative. The analysis presented in this EIS clearly indicates FEIS Alternative G would provide the best available protection to human health, wildlife, air quality, water quality, soundscapes, visitor experiences, and visibility while maintaining motorized and non-motorized winter access to these Parks. We are confident that Alternative G will fully comply with all applicable environmental regulations, policy and Executive Orders. EPA has no objections to this alternative.

EPA rating

Based primarily on the disclosure in this DSEIS that Alternatives 1b, 2 and 3 would likely result in noncompliance with air quality standards and that air quality could negatively impact human health, EPA is rating these three action alternatives EO-2 (Environmental Objections, 2—Insufficient Information). Alternatives 2 and 3 are likely to be inconsistent with NPS environmental policy regarding protection of air quality and related values. "EO-2" indicates that the EPA review has identified environmental impacts including possible violation of environmental regulations that can and should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the alternatives or consideration of additional project alternatives. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the Final SEIS (FSEIS). While Alternatives 1b, 2 and 3 all receive the same EO-2 rating, EPA notes that there are substantial differences in environmental performance between these alternatives (see enclosed Detailed Comments). EPA finds no environmental objection to the No Action Alternative (1a). A full description of EPA's EIS rating system is enclosed.

Because the decision maker can select from among alternatives in both the DSEIS and the FEIS, EPA is providing a brief assessment of the alternatives in the FEIS as

well. Because FEIS Alternatives A, B, C, D, E and F would likely not comply with environmental regulation, policy and executive orders, EPA has expressed environmental objections with these alternatives (see EPA comments on Draft and Final EISs). Again, EPA finds no environmental objection with Alternative G.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DSEIS and provide comments. A set of detailed comments on the DSEIS is enclosed. Thank you for your willingness to consider our comments at this stage of the process, and we hope they will be useful to you. Should you have questions regarding these comments, please contact Phil Strobel of my staff.

Sincerely,

MAX H. DODSON,
Assistant Regional Administrator for
Ecosystems Protection and Remediation.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is important to print this in the RECORD because the administration had already signaled it expected the EPA to again sacrifice its own best scientific judgment to the political will of special interests. Again, the administration is signaling that the agency views will not be afforded weight.

When the comments were revealed this past weekend, Administrator Whitman immediately came under fire to repudiate the longstanding policy of the EPA. While they have not gotten that far yet, EPA immediately instituted new policy designed to ensure that its views were in line with Cabinet-level counterparts. Perhaps elevating EPA to a Cabinet-level department would begin to change the outcome of these cases and elevate the importance of environmental protection to this administration. In this case, it is critically important that EPA and their views prevail.

I ask Governor Whitman to stand strong. Yellowstone and Grand Teton are national treasures. People visit from all over the world in all seasons to see Old Faithful and the Grand Teton range.

As I have said here before and other places, snowmobiling is an important form of recreation for many Americans. I snowmobile, and it is a lot of fun. Thousands of Nevadans snowmobile. But banning these vehicles from Yellowstone and Grand Teton will have almost no impact on the opportunities open to snowmobilers around this country. There are 130,000 miles of snowmobile trails in the United States. These two national parks have a combined total of 600 miles. If the Park Service bans snowmobiles from these places, there will still be 129,400 miles of trail for snowmobilers.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the value of the Environmental Protection Agency. To the administration, I hope they will join me in recognizing the value of our national parks and the need to preserve these wonderful national treasures of which Nevada has one, the Great Basin National Park, and it is a beauty. The Great Basin National Park is the second newest. We have a mountain peak that is about 13,000 feet high, but yet

below that the park has some of the desert foliage. It represents everything in the Great Basin.

In addition to that, the park has the oldest living attractions in the world in it, such as bristle corn pines more than 5,000 years old. So it is one of our great national parks.

I have talked about two national parks today that I am particularly concerned about and hope we do not have snowmobiles rushing through there and we do not see park rangers with their Smokey the Bear hats with a respirator.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, EVY DUBROW

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is rare that I get to extend a birthday greeting to someone older than I. It is even more uncommon for me to extend such a greeting to someone who has been working the halls of the U.S. Senate longer than I. Today, I do both. With delight, I want to take a few minutes to extend a very warm and sincere, if a little belated, birthday greeting to a dear friend, Ms. Evelyn Dubrow, whose birthday was May 6.

Affectionately, as well as professionally, known throughout Congress, Washington, D.C., and the labor unions around the country as "Evvy," she has been involved in the American labor movement for more than sixty years, most of the time as a labor lobbyist. She was with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, ILGWU, for more than forty years. More recently, she has been vice president and legislative director of the Union of Needle Trades, Industrial and Textile Employees, UNITE.

Today, women lobbyists are quite common on Capitol Hill. According to the Hill newspaper, women now account for about one-third of the Capitol's more than 11,000 registered lobbyists. When Evvy first arrived as a lobbyist in 1956, women lobbyists were rare, and the U.S. Senate was still overwhelmingly a men's club.

Evvy was not deterred. She had come with a determination and a cause—to improve the living and working conditions of American workers—and she was not to be denied. Her very first fight was opposing a proposal to outlaw secondary boycotts. For this effort, she enlisted none other than Massachusetts Senator John F. Kennedy, who sponsored her amendment.

Her next issue was seeking an increase in the minimum wage to an unheard-of level of one dollar an hour!

Since then, she has had a tireless and active role in helping to bring about most of the important laws on economic and social justice since the 1960s. She has worked on civil rights legislation, the establishment of Medicare, minimum wage, pension protection, and occupational safety and health rules. She stands for everything that is good and best about the American labor movement. As my good friend and colleague, Senator ERNEST

HOLLINGS said of her, "She is the union label."

Although Evvy stands less than five feet tall, I have seen her stand eye-ball-to-eye-ball with the likes of the 6 foot 5 inch Senator Bill Bradley, the 6 foot 6 inch Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, and 6 foot 7 inch Senator Alan Simpson.

And that is exactly the way she has always lobbied, eye-ball-to-eye-ball. It is not through the fax machine, or over the cell phone, or from e-mail. This little workhorse walks right into your office, meets you person-to-person, and makes her case.

Evvy is never heavy-handed. Good lobbying, she says, is "presenting your case and proving it," and that is what she does.

As a liberal labor lobbyist, her heroes have tended to be liberal Democrats, including Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and Hubert Humphrey. But on her list of heroes, she also includes Senator Barry Goldwater, hardly a liberal Democrat. When asked why she did so, Evvy replied, "He was completely honest and didn't mince words."

That is a perfect description of Evvy, she is "completely honest" and does not "mince words."

As a lobbyist on Capitol Hill for more than four decades, Evvy has become more than an institution, she has become a fixture in the U.S. Congress. She has known almost every member of the Congress from the first day she arrived, and today she is as well known, and just as equally at home in Congress, than many members.

In addition to the Members of Congress, she has befriended doorkeepers, receptionists, Capitol Hill police, and many others who work here. She always has a kind word and a smile for anyone and everyone.

Her credentials are as long as they are impressive. She worked a decade for the legendary president of the ILGWU, David Dubinsky. With but a single exception, she has attended every Democratic Convention since 1948. She has met with every President from Eisenhower to Clinton. She has been awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor. Perhaps her greatest accomplishment came years ago when she served as a babysitter for the likes of Al Gore and CHRIS DODD when their fathers were Senators.

But I want to make it clear, to most, if not all Members of Congress, she is more than a lobbyist. She is more than a friend. She is "Evvy!"

At any rally, any party, or any gathering in Washington, you will eventually hear someone say, "Evvy is here," and everyone knows exactly what is meant, and nearly everyone smiles. As I have heard it said many a time: "Everyone loves Evvy."

Indeed we do. Her admirers are many. Her friends are legion.

God bless you Evvy and happy birthday!