

and all 421 Members of the Congress who were here on that day voted in the affirmative for the new Education Land Grant Act.

How sad it is, Mr. Speaker, that the President, who rhetorically embraces the cause of children, has asked a liberal Senator in the other body to put a hold on that legislation. The gulf between rhetoric and reality is profound.

I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We only have just about 5 minutes left, but I want to say the Education Land Grant bill that the gentleman has introduced is a brilliant bill and earned quite a lot of support here in the House, and I would submit it did so because it typified the original deal, if you will, that existed with all of these Federal lands that we are here discussing, the national forestlands in particular, but also some of the other Federal lands. That is, these lands should be managed for multiple use, keeping in mind that they are to be used for livestock raising, for timber harvests, for mining, for recreation, for wildlife habitat management, for a whole assortment of forest products being used and taken from the forests, all of that within the context of sound forest management. Because if one is not in the forest working the land, taking care of it, keeping the diseased trees treated, getting the bugs out, helping to thin the forests so that they do not catch fire or deplete water resources and so on and so forth, if we fail to do all of those things, not only do we damage the environmental integrity that we are concerned about our national forests, but at the same time, by pushing people off of public lands, we do lose a valuable source of income for schools, for communities. Because these public lands, while they do not pay taxes, there is what is called a payment in lieu of taxes that comes from the economic activity that is generated by those lands.

So when the President pushes this policy forward, and I would ask the gentleman from Montana to elaborate further on this point, further restricting access to public lands means further restricting the economic activity on those lands; it means further restricting the management of those lands, and it threatens not only the forest health, but threatens severely the economic livelihoods of thousands of communities not just across the west, but across the whole country.

But I think disproportionately, that burden falls in our respective districts.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of Montana. The gentleman is exactly right. I have 10 national forests in my district, so when we learned of the President's intention to announce this, it was in the Post last week, we called those regional supervisors and said, how is this going to impact the regional forests? What we found is that the White House had not consulted with the regional forests or

with the individual forest supervisors, with the biologists that are out there in the field. This is a policy that was made up in the West Wing of the White House, not by the land managers out there that understand the resource.

That is why this policy, seven years of this administration, has been so devastating to the natural resources in the west, because they have made these as political decisions. They are decisions that have been made by people that do not understand these communities; they do not understand these resources, and they have made the wrong decisions.

They say they want to preserve the West, but as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out, the reason that the West is such a wonderful, beautiful place is the people that live there have been outstanding stewards of this land for as long as we have been there, and that has included multiple use of the land. We have mined the land, we have timber harvests, grazing on the lands, hiking, recreation on the land, and the resource is an incredible resource.

We know how to take care of the land, work with the land, live with the land. Frankly, we also understand that people are part of the environment too, that the environment is not just about birds and animals, it is about people too, and that a healthy environment for these communities is a prosperous community with opportunity as well.

That is what the President does not understand, that this decision is just the next step in this administration's top-down perspective on managing this natural resource. It is not only bad for these communities and for my district and my State, but it is bad for the environment as well.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Montana.

Just one final point. Again, the gulf between rhetoric and reality. In the 1960s, critics of Lyndon Johnson spoke of a credibility gap. With this administration, sadly, we have a credibility canyon such as the gulf between rhetoric and reality, and as my friend from Montana was making this point, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think of the slogan of the Clinton-Gore 1992 campaign: Putting People First. How falsely that rings in the years of western Americans.

I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from Montana and the gentleman who has left us now from Michigan for joining me in this Special Order, and we will come back as often and as frequently as we can to talk about the great accomplishments of the Republican Party.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). The Chair will re-

mind Members to refrain from characterizing Senate action.

THE BUDGET AND FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, while we are preparing up here to discuss my main topic this evening which will be the Federal public lands, the management tools, the history of multiple use in this country, Colorado water, Colorado recreation, and Colorado jobs, while we are preparing to set up for that, I want to mention a couple of comments on a subject that involves every state in the Union, and that is our budget.

□ 2030

Back here, we are right in the midst of some very tentative negotiations, very fragile negotiations would be an appropriate way to discuss it. The Federal budget is important to every citizen in America. This Federal budget helps determine the future of our generation and the kind of debt and the kind of opportunities we give to the next generation and the next generation and the next generation.

We have some very strong policy points that must be adopted or must be carried out, and those policy points are the Republicans' top priorities in regards to these budget negotiations. Number one, the defense of this country, this country must maintain a strong defense. We cannot be the second strongest kid on the block.

Number two, education. We can have a strong military. We can have a good economy but if we do not have a strong educational system, and when I talk about a strong educational system history will show that the best educational system is not run from Washington, D.C. down, as the Democrats would have it done but it is run from the local school districts up, education is absolutely crucial.

The third thing, for 40 years, while the other party was in control, they ran deficits year after year after year. It is very interesting to see them all of a sudden adopt fiduciary and fiscal responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. The plan and the budget we have to come up with, we will come up with, has to reduce that Federal debt.

In fact, I remember all the criticism given by the other side, the Democrats, when we took the majority: Do not fill us full of baloney that they are going to get rid of the annual deficit; do not tell us how the cuts in the programs and cutting government waste, which is one of our big targets, is going to help get rid of the annual deficits.

Well, today it is as if they were part of our team back then. They did not cooperate much. Some of them did but not all of them. Today they have forgotten all about that. We do not have

annual deficits. In fact, last year we had a \$1 billion surplus, after Social Security. We have heard a lot of discussions out there on Main Street about, well, maybe there is a surplus but it includes Social Security money. We have heard Republican after Republican and some conservative Democrats say, look, Social Security has to be preserved; we cannot count that in that surplus.

Last year we really had a true surplus of \$1 billion. Well, the key here and the key in our budget is to be able to go forward and take care of that Federal debt. We have the deficit taken care of. Now we have to shift from the annual deficit, which happens every year, did happen for 40-some years with the exception of a couple of years, I think in 1963 and 1964, now we have that taken care of, at least we are barely on top of it, and now we have to look at reducing the Federal debt. That is a high priority.

What is the other priority in these budget negotiations? Medicare. I can say that colleagues on both sides of the aisle are concerned about that, but concern is one thing. Doing something about it is something else. Of course, the final thing, Social Security, I do not know anybody that is not concerned about Social Security. I know a lot of people, however, that are not confident in Social Security and Social Security being there when they need it or being there when their children or their children's children need it. Those are our priorities in this Republican budget.

I can say when there is a so-called surplus, it is very easy to go out to the country, to go out to the communities and promise everybody that wants money that money. Those are the people that do not get it done. Those are the people that promise it. They are the ones that do not gather a lot of firewood for the fire at the campsite. It is very easy to do that, but the real tough decision is the party; the party that really has the tough decision is the party that has to try and balance this budget.

We have committed to the American people we will do everything we can to avoid spending Social Security money and at the same time enhance the military, enhance education, reduce the debt, help Social Security and help Medicare.

I think we are pretty darn close to doing it. That is the good news I have tonight, but let me say it is going to require some sacrifice. Now, we ask all to sacrifice. Now, I do not think cutting government waste is a real sacrifice, although some people make a living off government waste. I think it is something pretty easy to do, but there are a lot of programs out there that are good programs but maybe not urgent programs or necessary programs. We are asking the citizens of this country, team up with us. We can save Social Security. We can do something about Medicare. We can reduce

the Federal deficit. We can do something for education. We can have a strong defense in this country, and we can do it in a fiscally responsible way, but it means we have to tighten our belt.

It is always easy to pick between a good program and a bad program. That choice is pretty easy. Our choices today are between good and good programs. These are not easy choices, and in the way our legislative body is created the minority party does not have that responsibility so it is very easy for them to go out and promise to every American that certain products or programs or services will be delivered.

It is our job on this side to put the money in the account. We write the checks. We do not complain, but we know that we have to ask for a tightening of the belt. Now one of the things we are talking about is an across-the-board, 1 percent maybe, 1 percent out of every dollar, reduction in some of these agencies to help us save Social Security, get money into Medicare, help education, help the military defense and reduce the Federal debt. That is all we are asking.

Think about it on a person's own family budget, Mr. Speaker, at home at night. When someone's daughter or son comes home and says, dad and mom, if we can just save one penny on the dollar it can really help me with my future.

That is exactly what we are doing here. We are looking at the generation of their son's, their daughter's age or their grandson's or their granddaughter's age, we are looking at them and they are asking us to save one penny on the dollar. Let us reduce our expenditures by one penny on the dollar. Guess what? We can do it without going into the Social Security money. We can put money into education, we can put money into defense, we can reduce the debt and we can help Social Security, obviously, and Medicare. Those are important issues for us to consider. I will keep everyone advised as these negotiations continue to go on.

FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS SHOULD REMAIN PUBLIC

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to shift gears and talk about the Federal public lands. The largest landowner in the United States is the Federal Government, and by far, by far, the largest owners of land are the Federal Government, the State government, the city government, the local districts, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. We depend very heavily on the use of public lands.

I thought I would begin tonight by showing some examples of some beautiful public lands. Now, I am a little biased in this regard. My State, the State I represent, is the State of Colorado and I have been very fortunate to represent the 3rd District of the State of Colorado. Many people have been to Aspen, many have heard of Glenwood Springs or Steamboat or Telluride, or

Durango, Breckenridge, Summit County, Grand Junction. There are a number of different communities that some people have visited. They know about the Colorado Rockies. The Colorado Rockies are a gem. They are a diamond for the United States.

We need to do what we can do to preserve those while at the same time, while at the same time, allowing people to live out there. We are going to cover a little of that.

Let me, first of all, point out, this is in the district, I will use my red pointer here, we will see the red pointer on the sky above the mountains. This is the Maroon Bells, one of the most beautiful settings and I am sure many of my colleagues have been there. This is fall, obviously, which can be seen by the colors. Many, many thousands and thousands of visitors, whether handicapped, whether 19 years old and have great big legs, everybody gets to have access that can get here can go up there and see this beautiful, beautiful gem of our country, the Maroon Bells.

I know the Maroon Bells. I was born about 40 miles away. My brother climbed the Maroon Bells when he was 14 years old right there on that peak where the red dot is. Unfortunately, during that climb, a rock came off the top. He was in outward bound school, and it killed his instructor. He was 14 or 15 years old. We have a lot of family history and there are a lot of people in this country that have a lot of history in these mountain ranges. I am from the mountains. So are many of us, but the mountains are something we believe in. We have a strong heritage with the mountains. We want to protect the mountains.

Now, that is what this looks like today. See my red beeper, my little light there, the lake, that is how it looks today. Why does it look like that today? Is it because we allowed oil well drilling to go up on top of it? No. Is it because we put mines in there? No. Is it because we clear cut all the sides? No. Is it because we let them fish out the lake? No. Is it because we let them pollute the water? No.

What is my point? My point is that for 200 years and before that with the Native Americans, we have taken care of this land. Washington, D.C. would like to convince us that this thing is full of oil rigs, that the timber, that the small families that make a living off timber, go up there and clear cut this land, that the fishermen fish out the streams, that the streams are polluted and that the only way to do this is move the West Wing of the White House to now have that command center for the western United States. They think it matches: West Wing, western United States. So they come up with a program, 40 million acres.

Now, what does 40 million acres mean? Many people, if they own a home, they are on a lot size, maybe they have, I do not know, half an acre, a half an acre, where their home is located. Imagine 80 million times that

half an acre that they own and that is what the President today has proposed to, in essence, take off limits.

What I am saying here is, these are assets, these are museum pieces. These mountains are beautiful. We know this. We want to protect them, but we have to use common sense and in using common sense we cannot just do it for the elite people of this country. We have to consider the common man of this country, and I say that generically. We have to speak for the common person in this country. Do not forget about them.

Not everybody can have a farm or a ranch in Aspen, Colorado. Not everybody can own a home in Aspen, Colorado. I certainly could not afford it and most of my colleagues on this floor could not afford it, but that should not keep us from being able to go up and enjoy it. It should not keep us from being able to go up and recreate on it, like skiing. I can say within eyesight of Maroon Bells, one can see several of the major ski areas in the world. Have they polluted the Maroon Bells? No. Have they caused clear cutting in the Maroon Bells? No. Do they provide jobs for Colorado? Yes, thousands of jobs. Do a lot of people get to enjoy the recreation of skiing in Aspen, Colorado? Yes, lots. We have to be careful about allowing an administration, who by the way rarely sets foot in Colorado and last year when they locked off a big chunk of the State of Utah, they announced it, the President announced it, in the State of Arizona.

Come put your hands in the soil; come put your hands in the dirt, Mr. President. Come see what you are doing before you do it. Know a little something about it before you talk about it.

I know about it. I was raised there. My family has been there for generations.

Let me show my next display here. These are the Fourteeners. Look at this. All over Colorado, I will point out, there is the young Compadre Peak. This one is the mount of the Holy Cross right here where my finger is. I will put the red pointer so it can be tracked by the red pointer. Columbine Park, look at all of these.

□ 2045

We have over 54 of them. Over 14,000 feet in Colorado form these beautiful mountain ranges. Do my colleagues see any clear-cutting that has gone on? No. Do my colleagues see any oil rigs? No. Do my colleagues see tents and cities and condominiums and town homes all over those 14,000 foot peaks?

No. Why do my colleagues not see them? It is because we protect this land. But we protect it with common sense. We do not lock everybody out of there. One can ski on some of those mountains. One can cross country ski.

In the summer, guess what? We have discovered something. It is a wonderful sport. It is a fabulous sport. Mountain biking. One gets to mountain bike a lot

of this. Does it tear up those mountains? No. Are people who use those mountains responsible for the most part? Yes. For the ones who are not, let us go after them.

If this is an asset, if they are going to abuse it, kick them off. But do not kick them off in general just because they are human beings. Do not put all of the four systems of the United States into a museum.

The Federal lands, I will show my colleagues a couple other here real quick. This right here, this is a winter scene here in Colorado. Take a close look at that. Look at that snow. Do my colleagues see bulldozer tracks through that snow? No. My colleagues do not even see snow machine tracks through that snow. Why? Because we have designated trails. We manage those lands out there.

Those lands are not just important to the United States. They are important to those of us who make a living off of those lands. My in-laws, for example, David and Sue Ann Smith, my colleagues ought to visit them. They live in Meeker, Colorado. You want to talk about salt of the earth people. You want to talk about environmentalists. Do my colleagues know why they are environmentalists? They have got their hand in the soil every day.

Ask him what he thinks about that ranch. Ask him what he thinks about that ranch when people come up and offer him millions of dollars for that property. They do not want to sell it. They love that land. The Smith family is pretty representative of most of the ranching families.

I mean, the President is about to go out and destroy the way of the West, the territory. Remember the judge from the Supreme Court, "Go west, young man. Go west." Maybe it was Greeley, Horace Greeley said that. "Go west, young man. Go west."

Do not wipe it out. Do not make it an urban area. Do not restrict it for the President's museum at the White House. Work with us and help us protect this in a common sense approach, a common sense approach.

This is Colorado. These are more peaks that I want my colleagues to see. Beautiful, absolutely beautiful. Those are protected. President Clinton does not need to skip in and protect them any more than they are protected right now. We are preserving them. We know how to take care of this land.

What I am saying to my colleagues, in my district alone, and I say my district, the people's district that I am lucky enough and fortunate enough to represent, in that district alone, we have over 23 million acres of government-owned land, 23 million acres. We take darn good care of that land. We have a lot of uses of that land: recreational land, recreation, wilderness areas. We do have some timber. We have very little mining left anymore. We have a lot of different uses for that land.

President Theodore Roosevelt, I want to quote him, because the President in

the last couple of days wants to put out an image that he is the Theodore Roosevelt, the Teddy Roosevelt who rode in on the bucking Bronco to save the West. Let me tell my colleagues what Teddy Roosevelt said. I think it is very important here because he talks to the common man. President Teddy Roosevelt was known as a common man. He understood the ways of the east. He understood the ways of the West. I think before somebody lifts themselves to that standard, they ought to at least qualify for it.

Let us talk about Teddy Roosevelt. "Conservation. Conservation means development as much as it does protection. I recognize the right and the duty of this generation to develop and use the natural resources of our land. But I do not recognize the right to waste them or to rob by wasteful use the generations that come after us."

That is the approach, the balanced approach. In essence, what he is saying is there is a right for people to use these lands. But there is no right, no right by the people that use these lands to destroy these lands for future generations.

We have got really two extremes: One end of the spectrum over here, one end of the spectrum over here. This end of the spectrum says, "hey, we ought to be able to go out there and mine it and clear-cut it and develop it all we want." Over here on this extreme, we have got organizations like Earth First. "Lock them out. Put everything in wilderness. Take away the right of multiple use." I will talk about multiple use here in a minute. Take away those rights.

But do my colleagues know what? Most people in America and certainly most of the people that live here feel that, in the middle ground there, we can do both. We can allow some ski areas. We can allow cross country skiers. We can allow mountain bikers. We can raft on those wonderful, beautiful rivers in Colorado. We can hike.

Yeah, we can allow a power line to go across them to some of our communities that are circled by Federal lands. There are things we can do with Federal lands. We are going to restrict it. We are going to be balanced.

On the other hand, they also say there are places, the same group that says one can ski and ride on mountain bikes and raft down the rivers, that same group, the middle group, as I call it, the real Westerners, as I call it, also believe, hey, there are some areas like the Maroon Bells that we just saw, like this area right here to my left, just like this area where my hands are. There are some areas we need to lock those away. Let us put those into wilderness. Those are appropriate wilderness.

Or let us create a National Park, just like Senator CAMPBELL and I did with the Black Canyon National Monument. We just converted it to a National Park. Or let us create a new monument, or let us make this a special-use

area, or let us give this a species status, a certain endangered protected status. There is a reasonable ground in there.

What the President has done is laid his chip. He has staked out his ground on this extreme. To me, that is as offensive as the people over here that stake out their claim that say we ought to be able to mine it at any cost. Let us go in and cut the timber. We do not need selected timber cuts. Let's go in and cut it. That is as extreme as the President is attempting to do over here for Earth First, and that is clear-cut those forests, abandon those forests, and put them into the museum.

Let us talk about a concept that is very important, very important for the United States and for all of us to understand during my discussion this evening.

That is the concept of multiple use. Now, many of us, many of my colleagues may have never heard of what multiple use means. Well, obviously, one puts use together with multiple. It means many uses, many different kinds of uses.

Remember, just a couple of minutes ago in my comments, I talked about skiing, mountain biking, rafting, grazing, grazing one's cattle, timber, mining, lots of different uses, wilderness, environmental, fishing, things like that. Those are multiple uses.

I think this map is an excellent illustration if my colleagues can follow my red dot on the map. Obviously this is a map of the United States. This is government lands. My colleagues can see where the blob of government lands are. They are not in the east. There are some in the Carolinas. There are some up here in the northern part and Illinois and the Great Lakes. But the big bulk of Federal lands are right here.

Well, when the United States acquired these lands through different acquisition methods, the population was all along here in the east, and they decided they needed to move the population to the west.

Follow the red dot out to the west. Well, when they got them out here to Ohio and Nebraska and Kansas and Texas, Oklahoma, and some of these States out here, those are pretty fertile States. The way to encourage people to go out west when we wanted to settle the frontier back in the last century was to give them land grants or let them go out and put a stake in the ground and claim that land, 120 acres or 160 acres.

Let us go back to the map. In these areas, for example, in Kansas, in Nebraska, in the Dakotas, out here in the midwest farm country, one can support a family on 160 or 320 acres or some other type of government land grant.

But what was happening, and Washington was aware of it, is there were not many people coming into the mountains. They were not going into this area. They wanted to settle this area of the West. The question came up, how do we encourage our pioneers

to go to the west, to go beyond the Colorado Rockies or to get into the Rockies and into the mountains and go west? How do we encourage people to settle? Shall we give them 160 acres under land grant like we have to settle the midwest and up to Kansas and so on?

Well, the answer came back pretty simple. One is dealing with different terrain. The mountains cannot support per acre what the Great Plains States can support per acre. So if we give 160 acres to somebody for agriculture, and that was the driving industry, obviously back then, the agriculture and mining, if we give it to them for agriculture, they are not going to be able to make it off 160 acres. In fact, they need thousands of acres to do what somebody can do on 160 acres of real fertile land or 220 acres of real fertile land.

So they thought about it, and said, we cannot go out politically, and it may not even be right to go out, and give citizens several thousand acres of land simply through a land grant program. What can we do? How do we resolve this?

Therein was the birth of multiple use. That is a concept. That concept was the government said, okay, and again follow my pen on the demonstration here, the way we can get people to go up into this territory of the United States, let us introduce this concept of multiple use, which simply means that the government retains the ownership of the land, we will call it public lands, but the people have a right to use the lands.

Now, when I grew up, and when my father and mother grew up before me, and so on down back in the generations, there was a sign that hung out there. We still see it once in a while. But there was a sign that hung out there on public lands. For example, when one would go into the White River National Forest, one would see a sign that said "Welcome to the White River National Forest." Underneath it hung a sign that said a land of many uses. That is what the sign said.

Today there is a very concentrated attempt to take off the sign that says a "land of many uses", throw it in the trash, and put on a sign that says "no trespassing." That is the defeat of the concept of multiple use.

Now, maybe this would have worked. I doubt it, but maybe that "no trespassing" would have worked 150 years ago. But the government itself, this country itself encouraged its citizens, encouraged its people to become pioneers. Go out and settle the West. Be cowboys. Be farmers. Help this country. We need people in the West.

So generation after generation after generation, including not only my family, but my wife's family and our children, has spent generations in those mountains. That is how we make a living.

If one wants to put up one's "no trespassing" sign to those of us in the

West, one will break us. We are not large in number. We are large in heart. We have got a lot of heart in our feeling about this. But one will break us. Keep putting up that "no trespassing" sign. Unfortunately, a lot of people that are encouraging that are these over here on this extreme that I spoke about earlier.

My colleagues have to imagine, if they can pretend for a minute, that they are a ranch owner, that they own their own ranch. There are several things that they need to do to be a responsible ranch owner.

Number one, they need to visit. They need to go out into their fields. They need to get their hand into the dirt. Number two, they need to understand nature. They need not to defy nature. They need to work with nature. Nature renews a lot of natural resources such as water, only if they treat it right. So they have to understand nature.

The other thing that they have to do is manage different segments of that ranch. They may want to manage the strawberry patch on their ranch a little different than they manage their grazing area where they have got their cattle.

Well, it is the same thing here. The United States has millions and millions of acres in public lands. Let me give my colleagues some of those statistics. Ninety-one percent, almost 92 percent of the land that the Federal Government owns, almost 92 percent of the land that the Federal Government owns is in the western United States. Thirty-seven percent, almost 37 percent of the land in the State of Colorado, primarily in the mountains, is owned by the Federal Government.

□ 2100

The Forest Service, the BLM, and the National Park Service manage 95 percent of this land. The National Wild and Scenic Rivers system contains 10,900 miles of wild, scenic and recreational rivers. We have got a lot of land out there, and most of it is owned in the mountains by the Federal Government.

How do we manage that land? What kind of management tools do we have? Let me talk to my colleagues about a few of them. In order to manage Federal land, we do not need to lock everything up, as some proposals like the President. He says take 40 million acres. Again, colleagues, picture what 40 million acres is. Imagine how many people make a livelihood off of 40 million acres, 40 million.

We have lots of ways we can manage that land and protect it so it looks just like the beautiful Maroon Bells that I just got done showing my colleagues, or like the 54 Peaks over 14,000 feet that I just got down showing you, or the snowy scene in the Colorado Rockies that I just got done showing my colleagues.

We have ways to manage that land, protect it for the future, but reach that balance that Teddy Roosevelt spoke

about. Teddy Roosevelt said, "you have a right to develop." That was the word back then. Of course, it is a sin to use that word today. But back then that is exactly the word that Teddy Roosevelt meant. Today we use the word "use," you have the right for use. But you do not have the right for waste. You don't have the right for abuse, for destruction. And he is right. He is absolutely right.

Well, how do you manage this to help protect it? We have national parks. We have national monuments. We have national preserves. We have national reserves. We have national lake shores. National seashores. National rivers. National wild and scenic rivers. I just told you eleven-some thousand miles. National scenic trails. National historic sites. National military parks. National battlefield parks. National battlefield site. National battlefields. National historic park. Reserve study areas. National memorials. National recreation areas. National parkway. Coordination areas. National forests. National scenic areas. National byways. National scenic research area. Conservation research programs. National research and experimental areas. National grasslands. National conservation areas. Special management areas. National forest primitive areas. National game refuges. National wildlife preserve areas. National wildlife refuges. National wildlife protection areas.

We have lots of tools in our arsenal to manage these public lands. We should not just go to one tool. We should not put everything in a national park. We should not put everything in a national wilderness.

Mr. President, before you put 40 million acres, 40 million acres, in essence locking people out of it, look at what the consequences are to the people who have preserved it all of these years.

It is very, very important for us to understand a couple other ramifications, not just the soil, not just the land, but right here. With my cold tonight, I have been sipping on water to keep my voice because I feel it very important to talk to you. But that is water.

In Colorado, let me give my colleagues a little quote from the poet Thomas Ferrell. It is in the Colorado State Capital. I saw it when I served in the State legislature. And the quote is, "Here is a land," talking about Colorado, "Here is a land where life is written in water." "Here is a land where life is written in water."

Colorado is a very unique State. In Colorado we must be overly protective of our water rights. Number one, it is something that a lot of other people want. Colorado provides water for probably 18 to 23 other States. Believe it or not, the country of Mexico has water rights in the State of Colorado for some of that water.

Colorado is the only State in the Union, the only State in the Union, where all of our water goes out of the

State. We have no free flowing water that comes into the State for our usage.

In Colorado, we are an arid State, an arid State, meaning we do not get much rain. When you look at those beautiful mountains, you say, wow, it looks pretty rich to us. But we do not have the kind of thick vegetation that a lot of my colleagues do in the East in their district. In the East, their problem is getting rid of water. In the West, our problem is storing water.

We have to store it because since we do not have much rain, the only real opportunity we have for mass volumes of water is for the spring runoff, assuming we get the winter snows. And that spring runoff only lasts for about 65 maybe at the most 90 days. So over the balance of time, we have got to have it, we have got to store it, or we do not get it.

Now, what happens is that the water law in Colorado is unique, as well, and the same for a lot of the western water law. It is different than the East, as I mentioned earlier. It is entirely different. But there are some organizations out there who understand this, and those organizations really have two things in mind.

One, stop any kind of use from the water and that is one way to drive people out of those mountains. And the second thing is, let us take the water for our own use.

I do not know many organizations in the East who have the interests of the people of the State of Colorado or have the interests of the people in the West in mind when they look at our water rights. They look at our water rights like a great big piece of apple pie and they are hungry and they think it ought to be theirs, although they did not bake it or anything else. They think it ought to be theirs. So they put their arm around us and they talk to us friendly and they do all kinds of things, but their goal is to put that apple pie in their mouth and keep it out of our stomach. That is what their goal is.

So what do we do. We have to be protective. And when the President comes out and does as he did today, set aside 40 million acres of public lands to essentially lock them up, when he does that, what are the implications to water in the West?

Well, I can tell my colleagues right now that the National Sierra Club, that Earth First, and some of these kind of organizations, their goal is that every acre he locks up ought to have with it implied water rights. You ought to be able to reach outside that acre. Let us say this is an acre of land right here. This is an acre of land. They would like to have the Government step outside of this acre, up here or over here or over here, to control water rights. These are very, very valuable rights.

And in essence, what the next argument will be is, hey, we realize that President Clinton back in 1999 set aside

40 million acres and certainly what he wanted to do is to also lock up the water necessary for all of those 40 million acres even though we may not be using the water for agriculture or anything. We have certain water rights, like we want the quality, et cetera, et cetera, and they start reaching outside that territory.

It happened in Colorado. We have the Wilderness Act. When the Wilderness Act was enacted by this Congress by the United States House of Representatives and of course the Senate and the President, there was never any kind of discussion of water rights.

In about 1985, Judge Cain out of the Federal District Court said, although there were no water rights for the Federal Government, although the Federal Government does not seem to have any automatic water rights, there must have been an implication for water rights so the Federal Government now has implied water rights for the wilderness areas.

We have been fighting that battle for a long time. Same thing is going to happen here, my colleagues.

Now, for you in the East, my colleagues, so what? We need the water. What do you mean "so what"? That is our lifeblood. Remember my quote? "Here is a land," speaking of Colorado, "Here is a land where life is written in water." "Here is a land where life is written in water." It is a huge difference to us.

What are some of the other things that these 40 million acres can do, the other implications? We do not know. But it could be all of a sudden there are air rights for the Federal Government. All of a sudden the Federal Government could reach out to an adjacent town, say Silt Colorado or Grand Junction, Colorado, or Glenwood Springs, Colorado, which borders the White River National Forest, or Meeker, Colorado, which borders the White River National Forest on the north side, and they could say to those communities, you know something, you have too many cars in your community, you have too many people burning wood fireplaces. And those communities could say, we understand that. We try and do our own. No, no, no. Here is what the Federal Government out of Washington, D.C., is going to tell you communities in the West how you are going to run your communities.

There are lots of implications to the action that the President has taken today. Now, what they will try and give you is an allusion that if we do not follow the President's lead, if we do not listen to the advice of Earth First, if we do not adopt point by point the national policies of the National Sierra Club, that these beautiful mountains that I showed you a picture of will be destroyed, that the water in the West will be polluted, that the trees will be clear-cutted.

Well, let me tell you what happens if we follow their agenda. Write off mountain biking. Forget skiing. Forget river

rafting. Forget the other recreational uses that we have out there, hunting, going throughout in a 4-wheel drive vehicle on marked trails, all of the different kind of things that you can recreate with in Colorado. In the long-run, those could very easily be diminished significantly, maybe never ended completely, because we have some private property.

Although, every ski area, to the best of my knowledge, and I have almost all of them in the Third Congress District, in my district, almost every one of them is on public land. Those are the kind of implications that we are speaking about here.

It sounds warm and fuzzy today. And it is very easy to appeal to the entire country by saying what I have done is to do as Teddy Roosevelt or, as I just heard somebody on TV say, it is the most significant thing we have done for the environment in centuries.

Do you know what the most significant thing we have done for the environment in centuries? We have let the people that live in those mountains help manage those mountains. We let the people who really have their hands in the soil every day.

Now, my hands are not in soil. But take a look at my father-in-law's hands or my mother-in-law or my parents or many, many people out there in Colorado. I could give you name after name after name. What we have done right is let those people who are on the ground there every day, every hour help us manage those lands. We did not kick them off.

Now, once in a while we have had abuse and we get rid of them. And maybe we need to tighten the laws on that. I am up for that. And I am not for saying that we do not have additional areas out there where these kind of restrictions should be placed. But 40 million acres by simply throwing a fishnet over the western United States? That is what has happened. The President got a big fishnet and just threw it as far as he could and out it floated over the western United States. And wherever there is public lands, ha-ha, we will lock it up.

I am not attempting here to be provocative, to try and be derogatory. What I am trying to do here is, one, make us all cognizant of what life in the western mountains is all about; number 2, the fact that we have beautiful, beautiful diamonds out there, meaning the mountains, and we all want to protect those; and three, I want to tell you, do not just write us off. We have too much to lose. We are fellow citizens and we live in a beautiful, large expansive area, but there are not a lot of us out there. So it may be pretty easy for many of my colleagues just simply to write us off. But I am asking you not to do that. Take a look at what it really means, what kind of impact you are going to have.

You are going to hear in the next few days many statements about how bad mountain bikes are I guess. Probably

more realistically, they will take some kind of thing that just on its face they will want to make it sound offensive. Logging, for example.

You know, I have known a lot of small families, these are not the big logging companies, these are small families that are in the logging business. Why do you want to wipe them out? Manage them. Do not wipe them out. Help them. Do not destroy them.

My gosh, Mr. President, I wish that you could go to dinner some night. Go to dinner tonight. What you should have done is made this announcement of this lock-up of this 40 million acres and then gone to dinner with a small family in Colorado somewhere that cuts timber and does it responsibly. How happy do you think they are tonight? It is going to destroy some people out there.

But that will not happen. The people in Washington, D.C., especially down the street, are not going to take time to see what the impact is on people. As my good colleague the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) said earlier, this President committed to put people first, they are not going to go out and see where it puts people.

Instead, it is much easier to be politically warm and fuzzy and say the West is being destroyed and we in the East must step into the West and defend it, defend it against itself.

□ 2115

We have got to protect those people, those families and pioneers out there in the West, those ranchers, those river rafters, those hikers, those skiers, those residents that live out in the West. We have got to protect them from themselves. They are destroying themselves.

That is what the image is here in Washington, D.C. That is exactly what the image is that this President is trying to portray to you people with this sign, with this signature of 40 million acres set aside.

Mr. Speaker, in Colorado most of us that live out there, including myself, my family, my wife's family, we are not wealthy people. We are there because we have a job. I have been fortunate. I have a job representing those people. But all five of my brothers and sisters, all of my nieces and nephews, all of my cousins, there are probably 30 or 40 first cousins, they are all over Colorado. Why are we able to stay in Colorado? Because we have a job. We have a job. That may not sound like a lot. Up here we get paid. We have got an automatic job for 2 years. Back there some of these people depend on their jobs almost day to day.

Let me give my colleagues an example of what kind of jobs we have in Colorado. On the White River National Forest, the White River National Forest has two predominant uses. Two-thirds of the forest, the predominant use in two-thirds of it is recreation. In one-third of the White River National Forest, the predominant use is wilder-

ness. We have locked it up. I voted for that and it was appropriate to do that. But we intentionally left two-thirds open for recreation. Why? Number one, they do it in a responsible fashion. Two, it provides resources that are not available. You cannot put a ski mountain out in Ohio. They do not have a lot of skiing in Kansas. They do not have much skiing in Mississippi or Missouri or Louisiana or Nevada. They have some in the Sierras, but not much. Colorado has got the natural resource for it. What does that do, that White River National Forest, just that forest? Thirty-five thousand jobs. My neighbors in a lot of cases have those jobs. That is how we are able to stay out in Colorado. We are not Johnny-come-lately. We did not just jump out to Colorado all of a sudden to live. Our families, many of our families have lived there for generations. My family and my wife's family have lived there for many, many generations, but we still welcome people to come out to Colorado. Sure we think it has grown too fast, we wish it were not growing so fast, but we do not think we have the right to shut the door because they did not shut the door on us back in the 1870s when my family came in or the 1880s when Lori's family came in, they did not shut the door on us. They said, Come on in, but we only ask you one thing when you come to Colorado or when you come to the Rockies or Utah, Wyoming or Montana: Be responsible, help us make this a good community to live in, help us retain the beauty of this State, help us follow what Teddy Roosevelt said and, that is, there is a right to use the land but there is not a right to destroy the land.

We think we can use the land, the Federal public lands in Colorado or in the Rockies or in the West in a responsible fashion. I happen to think you can build a ski area and manage it in a responsible way. Many of you have skied in Colorado. Many of your constituents have skied in Colorado. You have been there. You have seen that a lot of those areas, they are managed okay. It has been a fun family vacation. It was a nice way to recreate. Then when you take a look at the areas that are cleared for the ski runs, they are just a pinpoint, a pinpoint in the forest. Many of you have had the opportunity to river raft in the State of Colorado, or Utah or Wyoming or Montana. It is a blast. If you have not done it, do it. It is a great time. And it is a great family activity. We have not destroyed the rivers. We have been doing what Teddy Roosevelt said to do: "Use it but don't destroy it."

Some of you may have never heard of Lake Powell but many of you probably have. Do you know what Lake Powell has done for families in this country, how many families are down there instead of having their kids running out to the mall or dad running down to work? They are down together on a little boat on Lake Powell. That lake does a lot. It recreates. "Use it but

don't destroy it." The Roosevelt theory. It is a lot different than the other theories that have come out. When we talk about this, when we talk about where we are going with the future, I have got to tell you, as long as I am in this elected office, I am going to stand as strongly as I can for Colorado and for water rights in the West. I am not just saying that. Because never in my entire career have I felt more of a challenge to the taking of Colorado water than I do today. And never in my career have I felt more of a challenge to those 35,000 jobs on the White River National Forest. Those are not indirect jobs, those are direct jobs. That is not 35,000. In fact, it is 35,000 families live off that forest.

I have never felt a larger threat in my political career to those jobs than the vision coming out of Washington, D.C., the vision that we cannot manage it, the vision that they need to protect us, to protect us from ourselves. How many of you have ever mountain biked out in Colorado? That is a relatively new sport. But if you have, you have really gotten into some of that terrain and you have been able to access it, you did not have to hike for miles, you have been able to ride in there on your bike. Minimal damage to the environment. We managed it well, despite the fact that Washington thinks they need to protect us from ourselves. We followed the Roosevelt theory: "Use it but don't abuse it."

It is the same thing with any other type of activity you can imagine, whether it is kayaking, whether it is hiking, and so on. You get my message, my drift, what I am saying here.

Now, what about some of the other issues? What about some of the other jobs? I do not think it is shameful to have a sporting goods store and sell sporting goods in Colorado. I do not think it is wrong for a small family to try and go out and harvest some timber. By the way, if you harvest timber with correct management, it is healthy for the forest, it is a renewable resource and, by the way, every one of you in this room tonight, every one of your constituents uses wood that is taken out of some forest somewhere at some time. Every chair in here. You look around. You know what I mean. Wood is everywhere. It is a renewable resource. But you have to follow the Roosevelt theory. The Roosevelt theory is: "Use it but don't abuse it."

It saddens me to think that here in Washington, D.C., frankly a lot of the national press is buying this hook, line and sinker, they are biting at it just like that, it troubles me that back here in the East, that even the administration in the West Wing, they do not go to the western United States, they make this decision in the West Wing. They have got some confusion there. It bothers me that they are using a deception upon the American people that this land out there, that we are not taking care of that land. It is public land. It is all of our land. I am telling

you, we have been on it for a long time. We have lived on it for a long time. We have worked it for a long time. We have used it for a long time. And we have not abused it for a long time.

Folks, do not be sold on this. Do not automatically assume that the West is being destroyed because of the fact that we have ski areas. Do not automatically assume that the West is being destroyed because we have mountain bikes. Do not automatically assume that the West is being destroyed because we allow people to river raft and hike and hunt. Do not automatically assume because it is not true. We do follow the Roosevelt theory: "Use it but don't abuse it."

I know that tonight my time is rapidly expiring, but I just want to reiterate a couple of things. Number one, do not forget that the pioneer spirit still exists for a lot of us. We are very proud of our heritage. We are Americans. But we also come from the West. I feel very respectful of the people of the East. But I am not an Easterner. I am a Westerner. I am not out here to destroy the life-style of the East, and I ask you people in the East, do not go out of your way to destroy our life-style in the West. We do not need the eastern United States, the bureaucracies in Washington, D.C. to protect us from ourselves. I think we, much, much better than some of my colleagues and some of the people in the East, understand that land much, much better than you ever will. We have got our hands in the soil. All of us can agree that a common-sense approach is what is reasonable. But that means that these people out here who want to clear-cut every forest, who want to put a ski area on every mountain, who want to build a house on every ridge, who want to put a highway wherever they want to, who want to build townhouses wherever they want, that means these people are going to have to be moved to the middle, and the people out here like Earth First and other hard-core groups out there who think they only have the title to the environment, who think they only have the knowledge to protect that land, who think only they have the historical background to manage that ranch for all of us, that group has also got to be brought to the middle. And here in the middle is not the leader of the United States today, the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. That is not who is here in the middle today. He is over here. What is in the middle today was what was in the middle at the turn of the century and many years ago, and, that is, Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt is who is in the middle.

And remember, and I will conclude with Teddy Roosevelt's comments, and I will paraphrase him: "You have the right to use it but you don't have the right to abuse it or destroy it." Teddy Roosevelt had it right. It should be Teddy Roosevelt's path that we follow. Do not be misguided down the path of

President Clinton. Follow the path of Teddy Roosevelt: "Use it and enjoy it, but don't abuse it and destroy it."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2307

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2684, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. WALSH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2684) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-379)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2684) "making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits,