

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.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 permitted 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.