

has a \$10 billion military infrastructure. It is the only place where American forces can operate with complete freedom and mobility without having to consult local authorities or foreign countries. It is the place which demonstrates and which continues to demonstrate that America is a Pacific power and an Asian power.

As we contemplate what we are going to do in the 21st Century, and as we determine what is going to be our strategy on strategic vision in the 21st Century, and it would be, I think, simplistic to simply say that China has somehow replaced the Soviet Union, but we certainly need to consider what the challenge of China means to us as we consider all of those elements and all of the areas that could go wrong, that could provide serious involvement of American forces, whether it is things going wrong in Southeast Asia, as we look at what is going on in Indonesia, and the problems with the rebels in the Philippines and the disputes over the Spratlys or the issues that are pertaining to Taiwan and China, or the possibility of a Korean conflict on the Korean Peninsula, which hopefully will dissipate over time; all of that has Quam as a very important part of it.

Even in a more peaceful scenario in the Pacific, if we pull out of Quam, we are really going to pull out of the eastern hemisphere. We are really going to have to pull back all the way to Hawaii, and that would basically mean that the United States is no longer an Asian power.

In the early part of the 1990s, there was a lot of knee-jerking, I believe, in the military that tended to deemphasize the importance of Quam. The military until recently not only dramatically reduced their presence on Quam, but closed down a ship repair facility, forced thousands of loyal civil service workers to leave the island through very ill-advised commercial outsourcing studies. In order to balance this, we are happy to see that there is a new emphasis on East Asia.

We on Quam recognize that we live in a very important neighborhood where global stability and economic growth will hinge upon the delicate regional interplay of security, trade and the peaceful resolution of grievances.

The Pentagon's reexamination of the role of Quam within this is refreshing and prudent and necessary. What remains to be seen, however, is whether this renewed look will result in renewed commitment, and that is through budgetary support and concrete action. In any case, the people of Quam stand ready to join the military in a renewed partnership.

July 21, the end of this week, will mark the 56th anniversary of the Liberation of Quam. In Quam, this is the single biggest holiday. Its recognition of the unique nature of the history of the island, commemorating not just the fact that the Marines and the soldiers conducted themselves in a heroic

way to defeat what was ultimately a brutal, oppressive enemy, but it is also a commemoration of the fact that the Chamorro people were tested severely; they not only survived, but they proved that they could thrive under the most difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in that interplay between the Chamorro capacity to survive and the Chamorro capacity to deal with adversity and the fact that the Americans did come back and the fact that the Chamorro people were themselves Americans, it is in that interplay that makes this particular commemoration, I think, unique amongst all the other commemorations of World War II and why it continues to have a very powerful hold upon the people of Quam.

If one can understand the scene of Quam as in Washington, D.C. or anyplace else here, it is seen as a very isolated community, a very insulated community. All of my days as a child, I looked forward to Liberation Day. We had a great parade. We would see lots of recreations of the war experience. We would see a lot of military people parade up and down. We would see a lot of community floats, and there would just be a lot of spirit of contentment and commemoration mixed with happiness and laughing and also some serious reflection upon this.

We also had at that time the Island's only successful carnival, islandwide carnival. It would be what would be seen here as a county fair atmosphere. All of those things together really cemented our understanding of what it means to be American.

I have to say this with a very strong sense of pride in my people and the people that have brought me here to Washington, D.C. to represent them that they did something that is remarkable, is historical and stands as a great testimony to their potential, their loyalty, their devotion to duty and their commitment and their capacity to survive. As we deal with legislation here in the House, or as we deal with what sometimes appears to be very mundane matters, when compared to the kinds of sacrifices and tribulations that we pay homage to, at a time when we reflect upon great conflagrations like World War II, it really is with a sense of awe and a sense of deep satisfaction that I am able to represent them.

Later on this week, ironically, there will be a time to review the World War II memorial, which will be built here on the Mall. There is some level of controversy as to whether to build a memorial to World War II. There is some people who are saying that it is an intrusion on the Mall between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, and that somehow or another this will somehow change the nature of that.

It is hard to believe and it is hard to imagine that there will be people actually opposed to a World War II memorial, only someone who is totally out of

touch with historical reality would fail to understand what World War II means to the lives of everyone alive today in the world.

I do want to point out that there was a particular dimension of the memorial, which was envisioned when the very first memorial was proposed for World War II, it had 50 pillars. I inquired of the people that were building the memorial. I said what did the 50 pillars stand for? They said they stand for each of the 50 States, and this is how we are going to commemorate World War II. I said where is the pillar for Quam? They said that is not a State. It is not part of the thinking that went into it.

I was incredulous, because given just the remarkable story that I have told about the unique circumstance of the battle for Quam and the occupation and then the return of the Americans to Quam and all the unique Americans liberating, in effect, other Americans, that that story for this memorial was now not going to be included. So there proceeded a series of discussions over time.

I pointed out to them your memorial is historically inaccurate. There were only 48 States at the time of World War II. So what does that mean for Alaska and Hawaii? You said you are not honoring territories, but Alaska and Hawaii were territories at the time.

So after a series of discussions, we have now settled on 56 pillars. I am very happy to report that at least we had a little bit of a victory in getting people to understand the true impact of World War II and the true dimension of all the contributions of all of those people who live under the flag and who participated in a very direct way in World War II.

□

□ 2115

COLORADO AND ITS NATIONAL PARKS

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, tonight I want to talk about a number of subjects but before I do, first of all, I want to address the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD). I thought his comments were excellent.

I would like to note that my father, who now lives in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, fought off Guam when he was 18 or 19 years old, and we are proud of him for that. Three times a week, I guess, they would fly off to bomb Japan. He is one who I wish I would have known the gentleman was making his comments this evening. I would have had my father tune in. He would have enjoyed the gentleman's comments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Guam.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, I have met the gentleman's father, and it is with a great source of pride that I continue to meet many people that were touched by the battle for Guam, and on behalf of the people of Guam I want to acknowledge the gentleman's father's efforts and thank him very much for participating in the history of Guam.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the comments of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) were excellent. I appreciate that.

I also this evening wish to pass on my condolences to the people of the State of Georgia and to the people throughout this country who knew Senator COVERDELL who passed away earlier today. It is a sad moment back at the U.S. Capitol when there is a person who is really a gentleman and a scholar and a dignitary within his own ranks pass away. I know that the Senator has gone on to a finer life, as we all dream of, but his acknowledgments and his achievements while he was a United States Senator, while I had the opportunity to work with him as a House Member, are tremendous. He will not be forgotten. He will be long remembered in these chambers, and in his own chambers over on the Senate side.

So for the Members and citizens of the State of Georgia and for all citizens of the United States, Georgia, your loss was our loss and we pass on our deepest sympathies.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk again a little bit about Colorado. I want to talk about how a community has come together. A community of ranchers, a community of environmental people, a community of business leaders, a community of regular citizens, a community of water experts have come together as a team and tomorrow we are about to pass out of the Committee on Resources one of the most significant bills to come out for the State of Colorado in many years called the Colorado Canyons Bill.

In order to set you up this evening so that you can properly follow me through this bill, which I think by the way is very interesting, I do not think you will be bored at all this evening, I first of all would like to just give a little preamble, as you might say, or some basic facts for you to consider.

First of all, the bill covers an area in the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That is the district that I represent here in the House of Representatives. The Third Congressional District of Colorado is well-known throughout the United States. It contains all or most all of the ski resorts in Colorado and has many communities known throughout the United States, communities like Aspen, Colorado, some of the world class skiing; communities like Telluride, Colorado, with some of the most beautiful mountain terrain you can find; Beaver Creek, Colorado; Vale, Colorado;

Steamboat Springs, Colorado; Glenwood Springs, Colorado; Durango, Colorado; Grand Junction, Colorado, numerous ski areas and many of the constituents of my colleagues have probably rafted on the Colorado River, the Rhine Fork River, up in the Green River or on the White River or on the Blue River or in the Arkansas River. All of these rivers have something to do or originate, many of them originate, and certainly they all flow through, the Third Congressional District of Colorado.

There is something else very unique about the State of Colorado and the Third Congressional District in that the eastern border, and I will show this on a map later on if we have an opportunity to get into multiple use, but on a map that I will show you later on from the eastern border, which simplified as a description, is basically a highway called the I-25 interstate from Wyoming to New Mexico. The Third District, by the way, is larger geographically than the State of Florida, but on that eastern border, clear to the Atlantic Ocean, there is very little Federal land ownership, but from the eastern border of this Third Congressional District to the Pacific Ocean there are huge amounts of Federal land ownership.

As a result, when we deal with land issues in the West, we deal with much, much more with what is called public lands. In the East, you do not deal with the public lands near, not even close to the extent that we do in the West. It is simply because you do not have a lot of them in the East. So the circumstances in the East when it comes to public lands are different.

In my opinion, a lot of understanding of the people in the East, and this is not, by the way, a criticism of the people of the East, it is simply kind of an educational basis to let you know that we have to spend a lot of time in the West trying to educate our colleagues in the East. There is something that you have to know about public lands, and public lands, if it has one positive, really positive thing about it, is any time action is taken it really requires much more of a team effort than if you are dealing just with private properties.

Now in the Third Congressional District, it is unique in the State of Colorado as well because of its water resources. In the Third Congressional District of Colorado, we have 80 percent of the State's water resources. Outside the borders of the Third Congressional District in the State of Colorado, we have 80 percent of the population. So you can see that water is a constant, a constant asset that needs to be managed, a constant item of debate. Not only that, the Third Congressional District supplies water not only for the rest of the State of Colorado, but it also is a supplier of water for many, many States in the union and it also includes the country of Mexico.

Now, water is important. Out in the West, it has been often said that the

people in the East sometimes think it rains in the West like it does in the East. It does not. In the West, we are a very arid State. In the West, we really have, for the most part, as much water as we can possibly use for about 60 to 90 days. That is called the spring run-off, but after that run-off, in the West, if we do not have the capability to store the water we do not get the water. So water storage is a critical element of survival in the West, and water storage with Federal facilities or water storage on public lands is necessary, not because we randomly decided that we wanted to put it on government lands but because we have no choice.

Most of the lands out there are owned by the Federal Government or the State government or the local government. For example, in the East, if you want to go and have a pipeline built or a highway built or you want to put a fence up, you go to your local city council for your planning and zoning or you go to your county or you go to your state. Most of the time, though, it is a local authority that you go to.

In the West, in many, many cases, when we have to do something like that, we end up going to the Bureau of Land Management, to the U.S. Forest Service, to Washington, D.C. It is here many, many miles away that planning is done for the lands of which we live on out in the West. So it does require a team effort, and the Colorado Canyons Bill is a result of a concentrated good faith effort by many, many different people.

So tonight my first subject is to kind of walk us all through the Colorado Canyons legislation, legislation which, as I mentioned previously, will be up in committee tomorrow; I am confident will pass with strong bipartisan, strong bipartisan support, and I would hope would be able to pass these chambers next week on suspension so that we can take it to the Senate where Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL has agreed to carry the bill throughout the Senate, and I think we will meet with the same type of success. So let us talk and begin our adventure with Colorado Canyons.

Grand Junction, Colorado, located in the western part of the State of Colorado, a community of about 90,000, has a magnificent national monument adjacent to it. If you are a resident of Grand Junction, Colorado, you can actually access the national monument from anywhere in Grand Junction at the most in 15 minutes. For many people, you can access the national monument in less than 5 minutes.

The painting that I have displayed to my left is a water color painting that hangs in my office that demonstrates just exactly what the Colorado National Monument looks like. It is magnificent, and if you have an opportunity to go to Colorado it is worth the trip to go to Grand Junction just to see the Colorado National Monument.

Let me say, by the way, as kind of a little plug for the State of Colorado

and the Third Congressional District, we have many national parks; the Colorado Rocky Mountain National Park. We have national monuments, the Great Sand Dunes National Monument; the Mesa Verde National Park down in the southwestern corner; the Black Canyon National Park, a new national park over near Gunnison, Colorado.

If you really want to see some beauty, go to Colorado, but on your way go see the Colorado National Monument. This is a good demonstration. The rock structures that you see in the national monument, I would guess that rock structure there is probably 300, 400 feet high, and the echoes that you can hear through the canyons and up on top appears an area that we call the Glade Park area. It is beautiful. Believe it or not, it looks like kind of a desert setting down here amongst these rocks, but as you get up on top on the mesa it is very, very heavily wooded with aspen trees and lots of water. It is beautiful up on top of the Glade Park.

The Grand Mesa, by the way, is another area just opposite of it that you would also want to visit if you go to Grand Junction.

Well, our key is that this national monument we in our local community take great pride in that national monument. We also have excellent community relationships with the Park Service who runs the national monument. We also have excellent community relationships with the Bureau of Land Management which manages the Federal land outside the boundaries of the park, and in some areas the U.S. Forest Service, of which we also have excellent community relationships with, in the West when the government, when the Federal Government, is on these public lands they find that most cooperation is reached, the highest level of cooperation is reached, when you take the time to sit down with the local people and listen to them and talk with them and live in their communities and live the kind of life they live.

As you know throughout the history of this Nation, ever since the Homestead Act and the days of the early pioneers in those mountains, we have found that there is a high level of cooperation that can be reached. Generally when that cooperation begins to fall apart is when an outsider comes in and thinks they know best. Now in some cases some outsiders can come in and they have a positive contribution to make to our effort, and they want to participate and they are entitled to participate, but it is when we get somebody in there who thinks they know better, who does not understand the nature of living on public lands, who does not understand the impact of what public lands does to a community, both the positive impacts and the negative impacts. Well, the Colorado Canyons bill really began as a result of some people who wanted to take the Colorado National Monument, and I

will put a poster up with that. This will give us a little better idea of the geography that we are talking about. Right here this would be Grand Junction, Colorado. Over in this area right here is the Colorado National Monument. Well, what had happened is that for some reason, and I am not sure why, but a group of people or one individual or a few individuals decided that what should happen is that the Secretary of Interior should expand the boundaries of the Colorado National Monument to take in, we are not sure exactly what the exact borders were but pretty much this entire area and expand the national monument.

Now some of the justification for this theory of expansion was the fact that it would be better under Park management. This is all Federal land right in here. The white, by the way, is privately-held land. That to expand the monument into this area was necessary because the Bureau of Land Management perhaps was not capable of managing the land the way that it should be managed.

Frankly, that was a bunch of hogwash. Some people say, well, the BLM and the Park Service they do not get along out there. We ought to put it all under Park Service oversight. That, too, was a bunch of hogwash. In fact, the border between the Colorado National Monument and the area in the yellow, in other words this area in purple and the area in the yellow here, that is perhaps the friendliest border between the Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management that exists in the country. We have great people out there with BLM and with Park Service and they have good cooperation.

□ 2130

It is not necessary to expand that monument in my opinion. But not long ago, several months ago, the Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, came to Grand Junction and announced that he would like to see the Colorado National Monument expanded. I felt that the Secretary listened to what people in the community had to say, he had an open forum, he was very receptive, to the best of my knowledge. Let me say that many of my colleagues know that my relationship with the Secretary of the Interior is, at times, rocky, but nonetheless I respect the fact that he came in person to Grand Junction, I respect the fact that he had a forum where people in the community could ask him, why do you want to expand this monument? What is broken out there that needs to be fixed? I appreciate the fact that the Secretary, in meetings with myself, in meetings with local people, community leaders, people that were just interested in the community, expressed a period of time that he would allow to go by before he actually implemented an expansion of that monument.

In other words, what the Secretary said was, if you as a community can

put together a better proposal than expansion of the monument, I will give you an opportunity to do that. You sell me on the proposal. You convince me that this proposal is better than what I am doing, and I do not have pride of authorship, the Secretary says. He says, I am willing to look at what you have to offer. That was a challenge that we accepted wholeheartedly. But we had a number of different issues to deal with, and let us go through a few of those issues.

First of all, let me explain the geography. We already know from my earlier comments that the City of Grand Junction is here. We know that we have the Colorado National Monument up in this area. Let us start down here in these white areas. This is the Mesa of which I spoke. By the way, we have wonderful herds of elk up there, lots and lots and thousands of acres of Aspen trees. I mean it is a very lush type of setting. Very green, heavy snow in the winter, a wonderful place. But these white spots, this is the private property.

Mr. Speaker, what is critical up here is that the majority of this property is owned currently by a handful of ranchers. These ranchers are not the kind of ranchers who we would call gentleman or gentlewoman ranchers who really are not ranchers, they just own the property and fly in on a private jet every once in a while to see the property; these are people who have worked those ranches, in some cases like the Gore family or the King family, who have been up there for generations. But the viability of their ranches as a result of the fluctuating cattle market is in question.

The only way that these ranches can continue to operate as ranches, thus reserving the open space that all of us enjoy, that we want to preserve up on that Mesa; we do not want that to go into a housing subdivision or into a commercial retail shopping center. But in order to preserve it, these ranches have to continue to be viable as ranching operations. If they cannot continue their viability as ranching operations, the only logical option remaining is for them to subdivide the ranch into 35-acre ranchettes.

By the way, it would be nice to own some land up in this area. It would be beautiful. A lot of people, they would not have any trouble, those ranchers would not have any trouble; in fact, they would probably have to put an auction up or have people draw out names of a hat to see who got to buy one of the 35-acre parcels up there on top of the Mesa.

So when we entered the Colorado Canyon proposal, when we began to put this together, one of our primary goals was to protect the ranching community. Some of the people who are activists in the environmental community agreed with this. They understood our goal here is one, to preserve the character of the ranch; and two, to avoid putting in subdivisions and, instead, holding open space.

But as we began to study the problem with the Warren Gore family, and Warren himself was very dedicated to this, he spent a lot of time with us, and I thank Warren when I see him back in Grand Junction on a regular basis. But I say to my colleagues, what we found when we began to study what was going on up here and how we keep these ranches viable, we discovered that a couple of the ranches have grazing permits in this wilderness study area, what we call the Black Ridge Canyon Wilderness Study Area.

Now, what is a wilderness study area? A wilderness study area is an area that for all practical purposes is treated as if it is a wilderness, and a wilderness is the most restrictive designation that a government can give a piece of property.

Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, let us talk about designations that the government can give to property. The government is a landowner. Imagine the government as the largest ranch owner in the United States and they have a fiduciary duty to manage that land, just like my colleagues would manage their own land as a rancher or as a homeowner, or if one owned any kind of property, they manage it. The government, obviously, wants to have a number of different options, a number of different management tools under which to manage this land, and they have many, many, many, many, many tools. They have national parks, national monument areas, special areas, wilderness and national conservation areas. There is area after area that allows flexibility, various elements of flexibility, allows various elements or input from the local community, allows various types of activities.

For example, Lake Powell is managed much differently than a lake on top of the Flattop wilderness area. All of this range of management tools spans a spectrum. At this end of the spectrum, which thank goodness we do not have much of anymore, is just kind of a free-for-all, let anybody can go in and homestead or do anything they want on Federal land. Those days are long gone. But at this end of the spectrum, the one tool that is the most restrictive tool that should be used only with extreme caution is called the Wilderness.

Wilderness designation, after it is put in place, no longer allows local input, takes no State input, takes no congressional input, with the one exception that Congress can overturn the wilderness area, which politically, obviously, would never happen, so it is the one tool out there that locks itself out of flexibility. It is locked forever politically and, in reality, it is locked in forever. Now, that is okay under appropriate circumstances.

But while we study whether or not, because it is such a dramatic step to put land into this Wilderness designation, we study the area first, to make sure that we are making the right deci-

sion, because every one of my colleagues on this floor understands that once we put it into Wilderness, we will never take it out of Wilderness. So before we do it, we need to be sure we know what we are doing. It is kind of a fundamental, basic requirement.

So what we do is we put it into what we call a study area. Let us study it. Let us look at all of the environmental factors, the ecosystems, what are the roads, et cetera, et cetera, before we put it into Wilderness. That is exactly what this area is right here, it is a Wilderness Study Area. In that Wilderness Study Area, now going back to my point about keeping these ranches viable so that we can keep this wide space as open space, which is what we desire to do in our community, in order to continue to allow these ranches to be viable, our group came to the conclusion that we have to protect these grazing permits.

Now, many of us have heard through propaganda, frankly, that grazing is bad, and every cattle rancher out there is bad. That is about the most irresponsible statement I have ever heard. There are a lot of responsible ranching families and they have been there for a heck of a long time out there in Colorado, in Wyoming, in Utah and in the west, and there is a lot here in the east, farming and ranching families. I will tell my colleagues, 99 out of 100 times we will find that they are quality people. Frankly, they live the kind of life many of us dream of living. They are good, solid people and they have every right to exist.

These grazing permits, these are permits that have been handled very responsibly. These are grazing permits of which the Bureau of Land Management, which oversees the management of these permits, has no complaint. The relationship between the Bureau of Land Management and the Warren Gore family, or the Doug King family, or some of these other families, is an excellent relationship. In other words, we do not have anything broken up there.

So the first thing that our community decided was, as a community, we can support the continuation of grazing in this Wilderness Study Area. So as a community, we want that as an element of the Colorado Canyon bill.

Now, the next issue that we looked at, and again, taking a look here, what we have, this mark right here is the I-70 Interstate. This is the Utah-Colorado border. This is going to be very important, because as we can see, our Wilderness Study Area down here comes into Utah. So the other thing that the group wanted to decide was look, we need to correspond with our good neighbors to the west, the State of Utah. By the way, Utah is a great State, the second-best State I guess in the union, but I will say all kidding aside, we have an excellent delegation representing the State of Utah.

So our community felt that we should communicate and work with the

delegation out of Utah to see what we could do with this Wilderness Study Area. I will tell my colleagues, the cooperation from the Utah delegation has been excellent. And they have said, hey, we have an idea. We think we can incorporate this area into the Colorado Canyon bill, and they have done exactly that, with an alternative.

So, once again, our community is able to seek and accept cooperation. This time, we cross State boundaries. Here, we cross the traditional boundary of private and public lands. Here we cross the boundary of State borders. Now, we go up here. This highway right here is Interstate 70. It is the highway which goes across the State of Colorado, now, remember, right here, against the Utah border.

On this side of I-70 we have an area called Rabbit Valley. Once again, we need to focus on what is happening in Rabbit Valley. Rabbit Valley is not in the Wilderness Study Area, but Rabbit Valley has quickly become a very, very popular attraction for mountain bikers, for horseback riders, for people who want to go down to the river and fish, for people who want to hike, for people who want to observe wildlife, for people who just want to go out and have a picnic with their families. It has become a recreational area of many uses. I can tell my colleagues that most of the people out there, by far, have used the area responsibly. We have not had great abuses out here in the Rabbit Valley. However, we have had increased activity, and the activity is reaching the capacity, it has reached the point where we need some management. We need to coordinate the activity so that we do not overuse the land, so that we do not overcapacitate the land.

Now, some people would say to us, the best way to do it is kick the users off the land. No more horseback rides, forget the mountain bike riding, which is probably the most popular use out here in Rabbit Valley; tell the hikers they cannot hike anymore; tell the families that want to have picnics not to come and have picnics anymore. These are public lands and we want them off the public lands. That is not a viable answer.

The people in our community which, by the way, again included the environmental community, the business community, the chamber community, our county commissioners of Mesa County who have done an excellent job, our city council of the City of Grand Junction, our 2 elected State representatives, our State Senator, all of these people in the community have come together to make this thing work, and we have decided as a group, hey, let us protect these uses. How do we begin to manage the land? How do we make sure we have not overcapacitated?

So we decided, let us put in what is called a National Conservation Area, which allows us to protect the land, but at the same time preserves the multiple use concept, the right for

multiple uses, many uses on the land. By the way, in Colorado and in the west, whenever one enters a forest or Federal lands in the west, when I grew up, for example, you are now entering the White River National Forest, a land of many uses. So by community cooperation, by the designation of a National Conservation Area in our Colorado Canyon bill, we were able to preserve or put this as a National Conservation Area, so it would include all of this area, not just north of I-70, but south of it as well, to the river.

The river. Let us talk about Colorado water. The district, the third congressional district, as I mentioned, 80 percent of the State's water comes out of there. This is an area, this district, that part of the Colorado, that district is an area of immense water resources.

Mr. Speaker, water is very sensitive. It has been said that the lifeblood in Colorado is not blood, it is water, and there have been many battles fought over water in Colorado and in the west.

□ 2145

And here water is a critical element because this is the last few miles of the Colorado River, called the Mighty River, before it crosses the State boundary. It is a critical water resource for the people of the State of Colorado.

Colorado, by the way, just for my colleagues' interest, is the only State in the Continental United States where all of our water flows out. We have no free-flowing water that comes into Colorado for our use. So water is a high sensitivity of which we must observe. So, of course, with the committee, we decide what should we do about the water.

Now, water is a critical resource, and as far as I was concerned, when we put this Colorado Canyons bill together, the water was simply nonnegotiable. It is my duty, as a representative of the State of Colorado, to stand, as long as I stand, on behalf of water in Colorado. Water is a critical element, as I said earlier. It all goes out. We have no water that comes in. And, frankly, a lot of the States where my colleagues reside would like to get their hands on that Colorado water. It is a wonderful resource. So we have an obligation to protect that water.

But here we have the Colorado River going right to the center, so to speak, right through the center of the area that we want to encompass in the Colorado Canyons bill. What do we do about it? We brought the community together. We brought in experts. We called people like my good friend, and one of the leading experts of water in Colorado, Chris Treese of the Colorado Water Conservancy District; we called Greg Walcher, the former head of Club 20, who now heads the Department of Natural Resources for the State of Colorado; we called Tim Pollard of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources; and we asked the governor of the State of Colorado, Governor Bill

Owens, who has long been a strong supporter of water in Colorado and a strong supporter of the western slope, to come in and as a team give us water expertise.

Because, frankly, what we had was, we had some people in the environmental community who wanted to include the Colorado River in either the wilderness area or in the national conservation area. And, on the other hand, we had myself, and I said, no, the water is simply nonnegotiable. We will not allow this Colorado River to go into a wilderness area and be overlapped by a wilderness area or be overlapped by a national conservation area for one simple reason: We do not understand what the unintended consequences of putting this river, especially the last 15 miles before it crosses the State border, we do not understand what the future consequences of that will be. And when we deal with water in Colorado, we do not put some kind of imposition on water or some kind of legislation dealing with water unless we have a pretty darn clear understanding of what the consequences of that designation will be, because water is too valuable.

So we brought in the experts. I sat down with the Secretary of Interior, and he was very good. We had good sessions. We had good negotiations with the Department of the Interior. And the result was just like the result that we had with the grazing permits up here on top and the ranchers; just like the result we had with the users of the Rabbit Valley. We were able to reach a consensus and we kept the Colorado River out.

Now, the Department of the Interior did not have any intention of trying to secure through some covert action water rights. I took them on their word. But what they did not want is they did not want development along the river shores. They did not want a coal mine down here, for example. They did not want somebody setting up some kind of an excavation gravel pit here on the river for some reason. And we agreed with them on that. It is not my intent to have any kind of use like that on those river banks.

For those of my colleagues who will ever get the opportunity, and it is really not just an opportunity, it is a privilege, to go down that river on a raft, they will see why it is certainly not an appropriate spot for any kind of development like that.

So we were able to come together. We met my fundamental requirement, and that is that the Colorado River was nonnegotiable; that the Colorado water belonged to the people of the State of Colorado, and that the Colorado water should be preserved in the future for the people of the State of Colorado. We met that requirement and at the same time we met the Interior Department and Bruce Babbitt's requirement or desire that we not have mining exploration or any type of development along that line on the river banks. So we were able to come to a resolution on the river.

What was happening was the package was coming together, and this was in a very short period of time. We also had a number of other people; Stan Broome, with Club 20, who came in and helped us put it together at the end. We had, of course, the city councils. As I mentioned, the city councils of Grand Junction and Fruita came in. Fruita has their reservoir over here. Fruita has a pipeline that brings out water up here off the Glade Park area down to their community. Fruita would be about right over here in this area. And they came together and cooperated with us. Palisade; Clifton. We had a very unified effort out there in Colorado. We had the Auberts, the Albert ranch out here, they came in and helped us with some of the other issues.

This negotiation went back and forth with the Department of the Interior. And I can tell my colleagues that we also had lots of cooperation from not only just the Utah delegation but also the Colorado delegation. And when this bill went for its first hearing in front of the Natural Resources Committee, we had the chairman, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), who bent over backwards to help us out. And the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), whose district borders, who said why not go ahead and amend it so we can put together something on the Utah side. They care about that area on the Utah side. That delegation wanted the kind of protection that we could do.

So what do we do now with this wilderness study area? That is the final segment. How do we put this bill together by addressing the wilderness study area? Once again, we bring our community together. Once again we brought people like Jeff Widen out of Durango, Colorado, who I think is one of the most balanced, level-headed environmental activists in the State, and we sat down and said how can we do this. What conclusion did we come to? We came to a conclusion that said let us put it into wilderness. We have studied this area; we know this area has many of the characteristics of wilderness, so let us go ahead and put it into wilderness.

And not only that, the State of Utah, the delegation from Utah, who on many occasions unfairly, just like us in Colorado, are unfairly attacked by some people who claim to own the entire environmental agenda, these people are the ones who stepped forward and said let us go ahead, this probably would make sense, let us convert this wilderness study area right here in Utah and let us keep it molded together and let us convert this to a wilderness area.

We have a package. We have got a package. We have got a package that makes sense, and that package will be heard tomorrow, and that package will pass the U.S. House of Representatives and it will pass with bipartisan support. It will pass with strong support from the Colorado delegation. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) is

a sponsor on the bill. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), Democrat on the other side, has worked with us. He and his staff have worked with my staff. And by the way, my staff has done yeomen's work on this bill. They have worked together to make this thing come together. Other colleagues in the delegation, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), have all come together to put this together, to mold it and to have a bill that is going to work. And it will pass the Senate as well.

I want my colleagues to know that this is how in the west, when we have public lands, this is how we ought to work as a team. This is how a community ought to be able to offer some input.

We have had a couple of colleagues on the House floor here, for example, who have gone out and asked for a wilderness corridor all the way from Canada to Mexico. And with due respect to my colleagues, I am not sure they have ever been up there. I am not sure they understand the consequences.

We have another group of people out in Colorado who went out, the National Wildlife Federation, they had secret meetings and they went out and decided, well let us take the northwestern part of the third Congressional District of Colorado, and let us go ahead and go to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Babbitt, and let us have him expand the monument up there. Who cares about community input; we do not need community input. And they did not seek any community input.

And, guess what. The proposal they have come up with is faulty. Why? Because they did not do what our community in western Colorado did. They did not build their bill based on a community coalition, on community effort, on community input. We brought in the wildlife experts. And, by the way, the division of wildlife helped us a great deal out here in this area right here, the light purple area there. We brought in our county commissioners. We brought in our elected officials. We brought in our leading citizens in our community. We brought in regular citizens who did not hold offices. We brought in our ranchers. We brought in our rafters, and our mountain bikers, our horseback riders, and we brought in our hikers and families. And it works.

So my message tonight really is two-fold: Number one, let the local communities out in the west work on solving these problems. Listen to the input of the people who live the life of the west. Listen to them when making decisions back here in Washington, D.C. regarding public lands. They have something to say. Listen to them. Let people in the west be a major part of the decision of how we manage lands in the west.

And, number two, for those groups that decide that they know better, for

those people who think they should avoid community involvement, for those people who want to make an end run around and put designations on the people of the west without input, without guidance from people in the west, they are making a big mistake and they are making a mistake that, even dealing in good faith, has consequences which they cannot imagine. We cannot allow that to happen.

This is the way, in my opinion, to proceed in the west. Just like the Colorado Canyons bill, this is how we succeed. This is how we build a bipartisan effort. And this will succeed.

Now, on the subject of the Colorado Canyons bill, for those of my colleagues that are interested, we are going to have it in committee tomorrow. I have talked with our majority leader, who also has been very cooperative, obviously the leader of the House has, about putting it on suspension. We should have it next week on the House floor. So for those of my colleagues who are interested, they are welcome to attend the committee meeting.

In my final few minutes, leaving the Colorado Canyons bill and leaving the area and the subject of the designations in the northwestern part of the State, let me talk and kind of go into a little more detail about some points I referenced earlier, and that is the difference between the western United States and the eastern United States. And the best way to do that is to show my colleagues that there is a dramatic difference, as demonstrated by this map.

Take a close look at this map of the United States. We can see that there is a distinct difference out here. This is all colored in the west. And right here, as I point out, this is the State of Colorado, at the end of the pointer. This is the line, roughly the line of the third Congressional District. That is the district I represent, which, as I mentioned earlier, geographically is larger than the entire State of Florida.

□ 2200

And you will note from our eastern boundary clear to the Atlantic Ocean, all of this land out here, very little Federal ownership. You can see it is represented here. We have a little heavier in the Appalachians. We have the Everglades down here, some up here in the northeast. But, basically, some of these States are very, very sparse as far as any government lands.

But now look at the border and come West and you will see the huge amounts of government land. Most of the public lands in this country are not diversified around the country. In fact, they are a conglomerate in the Western States. And so, when people in the East talk about public lands, we in the West urge them to take a very careful look at what the life is like.

Many of our communities, if you have ever been to Aspen, if you have ever been to Vale, if you have ever been to Grand Junction, if you have been to

Salt Lake, if you have ever been to Wyoming, you are surrounded by public land.

Now, how did that happen? What is the history of public lands? It is really quite simple. In the early days of the country when we were trying to settle, remember, our country basically existed over here on the eastern coast in those colonial days and early days of the 1800s up to about 1840, that is primarily right in there. And then our country began to make land acquisitions. But back then, in the early days, having a deed to a piece of property did not matter much.

What really mattered was possession of the property. That is where, for example, the saying "possession is ninetenths of the law" that is where that saying came from. We needed to possess this property and somehow our leaders in Washington, D.C., needed to encourage the people who lived in relative comfort here on the eastern coast, they needed to encourage these citizens to help us settle the West to help us get possession of these States.

And what is the best way to encourage people to move out of the comfort of their homes into the West, where, by the way, your average life span was probably 30 years or so, to give them land. The American dream is to own your own piece of property. Every American dreams of owning a home.

Americans back then, 98 percent of our population was in the farming or agricultural community. They dreamed of having a ranch or a farm of their own. And so the Government said, hey, the way to get people to move from the eastern coast into these new lands that we have so we possess them so another country does not take them from us is to give them land, called the Homestead Act, called homesteading.

What was that all about? They go out and they work the land and they get 160 acres. But guess what happened? Once they hit this area right here where you see the big blocks, they discovered out here in Kansas or even in eastern Colorado or Ohio or Mississippi or Missouri or Louisiana, some of these other States, 160 acres can support a family. But when they hit the Rocky Mountains, they found out 160 acres does not even feed a cow.

So they went back to their think tank in Washington, D.C., and said, hey, our attempt to settle the West works very or pretty well until we get out here. What to we do?

Somebody came up with the idea, well, instead of giving them a homestead of 160 acres or 320, let us give them the equivalent of, say, 3,000 acres. The people thought about it and they said, that is too much politically. We cannot give 3,000 acres to every citizen that goes out in the Rocky Mountains.

So then came up the idea, hey, as a formality, why do we not, the Government in Washington, D.C., instead of having to give away so much land to support just one family, why do we not

as a formality just continue to hold the title to the land and allow the people to use the land.

That is where the birth of what is called multiple use came. Multiple use means it is a land of many uses. And our lands out here have many uses. We have uses on environment, we have uses of ranching, farming. All of our highways come under federal lands. Our waters is stored upon, it comes across or originates on federal lands.

As I said, our cellular telephones, the towers, most of those are located on public lands. When we go through the mountains and you see those lights up on the top of the mountain, the radio tower, that is how we get our communication. All of our trucks, our traffic, our cattle, We use the public lands. We have a responsibility to use them in a responsible fashion. It is a duty of ours. And I think overall we have exercised it pretty well.

Now, there is a heavy propaganda effect by people who feel no pain, they feel no pain if they do not live in the public lands to kick us off the public lands or to restrict the multiple use or to convince the people out here who are not acquainted with the federal lands that those of us who live in the federal lands are abusing the federal lands, that we are clear-cutting all the forests, that we are putting up coal mines, that our ski areas are abusive, that our mountain bikers have ridden too many trails, that our horses are creating too much disturbance to the wildlife, that our rafters have taken over the rivers and demolished the ecosystem of the rivers. It is not true.

Clearly, we have advanced use. Clearly there are more people who are enjoying the outdoors of the Rocky Mountains than ever before in our history. Obviously, we have to manage it and we have to manage it with the preservation of land in mind. But we also have to manage it without a built-in anti-human bias.

The concept of multiple use is absolutely essential for the survival of the people in the Rocky Mountains in the West. If you take away that concept of multiple use in the West, you will devastate, and that is not an overestimation, I am not exaggerating here, you take away the concept of multiple use, you do what some of these more radical environmental organizations want to do, for example, the National Sierra Club wants to drain Lake Powell, which has more shoreline than the entire Pacific West Coast, now they have announced they want to drain Flaming Gorge, you allow some of these organizations, which, ironically, are all located up here in the East, you allow them to pursue their aggressive agenda of eliminating and pushing people off these public lands and look at what you are doing to about half of the country.

It is easy if you do not live in these public lands, if you live out here somewhere, it is easy for you to say because you feel no pain, it is easy, my col-

leagues, for you to agree with policies that, for example, have broad sweeps of taking people off the lands and designating areas that are not allowed or have a built-in anti-human bias to it.

What I urge my colleagues tonight and the reason I bring up multiple use is the same reason I bring up water. In the West it is essential for our survival. In the East you have got to figure out how to get rid of your water. In the West we have got to figure out how to preserve it, how to conserve it, how to store it. Water storage is critical.

Out in the West, if we are not allowed to use the public lands and use them with the responsibility of being diligent in our use, of making sure that we observe the rules of preservation but being able, nonetheless, to still use them is absolutely essentially for our preservation here in the West.

And so, my colleagues, before you cast a vote dealing with issues in the West, try and get a feeling of our pain, try and understand what the consequences, or even more dangerously, what the unintended consequences of your action will be for the people of the West.

Remember, the United States does not start here on the eastern border of the Third Congressional District and run to the Atlantic Ocean. The United States is one country and we have an obligation in the West to understand the problems and the issues of people in the East. And the people in the East we feel have an obligation to understand the issues in the West, which include the water issues, which include the concept of multiple use, which include the concept of involving a community from the very basic level up before you draft legislation expanding a monument like we have done on the Colorado canyons.

As a team, we can move this country continually in a positive direction. And as a team, the East and the West can mold together. But it will only mold together, my colleagues, if those of you in the East have a good understanding of our lives and what are necessary to preserve our lives in the West.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-757) on the resolution (H. Res. 554) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, RUSSIAN-AMERICAN TRUST AND COOPERATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-758) on the resolution (H. Res. 555) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-759) on the resolution (H. Res. 556) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1102, COMPREHENSIVE RETIREMENT SECURITY AND PENSION REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-760) on the resolution (H. Res. 557) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1102) to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor of the House tonight to address the House on the topic of illegal narcotics and drug abuse, the problems that it presents for our whole Nation, the challenge for the United States Congress.