

last resort. If you are doing the right thing, you should not be afraid of that. But when you do have people that are not physicians making the decisions whether you should see a specialist or not, then you need to be liable. I think it is important that the decision is based on money.

What we found in Texas that has the same rights as we want to establish here, we have not seen the lawsuits. We have not seen the abuse. Where we have seen the abuse is where they feel they can do and undo as they please because of the fact that you cannot do anything about it. It reminds me of that story, of that person who finds themselves having to fight both the disease and the system.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me here tonight. We have a few more that have come over, a young lady that has also talked about coming and talking, so we will continue to do that. I do not know if she wanted to make any other comments.

Ms. SANCHEZ. That is fine. I know you have a couple of more over here to talk about their feelings and what people in their districts are feeling with respect to the Patients' Bill of Rights. We really need to do something about righting this situation. People should have choices. They should be comfortable that they have choices, and they should feel that they have been dealt a fair hand in dealing with the insurance coverage that they have. I thank the gentleman for doing this Special Order.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) for joining us.

We are pleased to be joined by several other Members. I want to ask them to go to the mikes as they get comfortable, and then later on we will be dialoguing as they come in. I want to ask both of them to join us as we bring closure to the comments of tonight. I thank them for coming out here tonight as we talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights and the impact and the importance of having access to the doctors of our choice, making sure that if the physician says that we need a specialist, that we do have a specialist. I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank the gentleman for sharing these few moments with me. I will be very short. I was watching the gentleman on C-Span. I thought of one of my constituents that I wanted to come over and share with him. Tonight in Hillsboro, Ohio, in Highland County, Ohio, there is a constituent of mine who is 31 years old. Her name is Patsy Haines, she is a wife and a mother, and she has chronic leukemia. This Saturday we are going to have an auction. We are going to auction off items that neighbors and friends have contributed to get money to try to help Patsy Haines and her family afford the medical care she needs.

I would like to explain something else briefly. Patsy Haines worked for a

particular company that had a self-insured policy, insurance plan. She worked there for 5 years, until she became too ill to work. Her husband has worked at that company for 7 years. Patsy Haines has a brother who provides a perfect match for a bone marrow transplant. Her doctor says if Patsy Haines receives this transplant, the chances are she will be cured and live a long life and rear her child and be a wife to her husband.

This is the problem: the insurance company refuses to pay for the transplant, saying that it is experimental. I went to the James Cancer Hospital in Columbus, Ohio, where some of the world's leading cancer experts work. I talked to the transplant team there. I talked to a young, very inspirational physician, degrees from Stanford and Harvard and a leading expert in bone marrow transplant.

□ 2030

He confirmed that this is exactly what Patsy Haines needs. He said it is the standard treatment.

I went to the Ohio Department of Insurance and I shared Patsy Haines' story with them and they were sympathetic but they said we really have no jurisdiction over this situation.

So we find ourselves in the United States of America, in the year 2001, where a young woman, a wife, a mother, is facing a situation where she may lose her life. It is shameful. All of us in this Chamber should be ashamed that we have not passed a Patients' Bill of Rights long ago. It is beyond belief almost that we would actually stand in these Chambers and debate whether or not an American citizen should have the right to go into a court of law to have their rights defended when they are denied necessary and needed medical care.

I thank the gentleman for this special order. The American people need to know what is going on. If they do know, I believe we will be forced to do the right thing even if we choose not to. So I thank the gentleman for this special order and for this time that has been given to me, and I hope that we can move together in the days and the weeks to come to accomplish this good thing for the American people.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman very much for sharing that story. As we see, each Congressman that has come has shared a story from their constituents; and I want to thank them for that.

As we start bringing closure, I want to make sure I recognize my fellow Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), who is joining us tonight.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I came in at the tail end of this; and I certainly want to add my two cents. I have been in the labor market, so to speak, over 50 years. It may seem kind of crazy, but I have been. In those years, I have seen the different types of coverage that employees have had be-

cause during my work period I can remember when an employee would have an illness or a need to have surgery. There was never any question about the services to be rendered to that individual by the coverage the company afforded them. There never was a question about whether or not it was legitimate or not. It was assumed that if the employee was determined to have a need, that need would be filled by the provider.

Well, things have changed. And through the years, we see that the companies have put in place deterrents for people to get the type of care that they are entitled to, because the insurance company provides it for them and they determine that they are the ones who are going to determine whether or not it is going to be treatable.

Well, that affects us all. I have had numerous phone calls from constituents just recently, a gentleman, a business owner no less, who has been in business many years, diabetic, had a foot infection. He was waiting for the provider to tell him whether or not he could get services in a hospital to take care of an infection. That is a very serious thing for a diabetic to have a toe infection. So I asked him to go to the top and make his wishes known. He was a businessman that should have been able to reach somebody besides an accountant telling him, well, wait until the decision is made.

We have many people whose lives hang by a thread and the more that they are made to wait the chances for their survival diminish. I think it is important for the people to understand that we want to have the ability to pass such legislation so they should also be aware that as we go through this session that we would like to have their input so that we can then be more cognizant of what we need to do.

We already have all kinds of information. However, it is not happening; and I think it is time that we move forward and get through Congress this year an effective bill of rights that allows any individual, legitimately needing a service, to be able to obtain it.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for her comments. The Ganske-Dingell piece of legislation allows this opportunity. By the way, this particular bill has been passed by the House and we will have an opportunity to pass it again and hopefully pass it through both Houses and be able to make it through.

Once again, I want to thank all the Members that have come out today to provide their testimony of the importance of the Patients' Bill of Rights and the importance of passing this to be able to see the doctor of one's choice.

WE ARE ALL FOR A PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3,

2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the comments of the previous speakers. This evening, I want to really focus the majority of my comments on differences between the East and the West in the United States, differences between the East and the West in the State of Colorado and really talk a little about natural resources and water and so on, but I cannot help but have listened to the comments, the preceding comments.

I would point out that I think, for example, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) who cites an example of a constituent of his who needs a bone marrow transplant, I think those stories are very appropriate. I think it helps us focus in on the debate. What I question and what I intend to challenge, and my colleagues understand this, what I intend to challenge are some of the stories that I am beginning to hear.

This evening I heard from one of the preceding speakers that a young man apparently fell on a nail, was taken to an emergency room. The emergency room refused to treat him even though he apparently was, quote, in dire straits, because he did not have the right insurance and that as a result of that young man being refused in an emergency room because he did not have the right insurance, he was transported to another hospital and as a result of the transportation resulted in the amputation of his leg.

If this is true, it is a pretty remarkable story, very sad story. What I think tends to happen, what I think tends to happen when we get in a very emotional debate, is that some of these stories get exaggerated. Now I have often heard people say, well, someone is refused because they did not have insurance, they were dying, they were hauled to the emergency room from a car accident and the emergency room doctor said, sorry, you do not have insurance and we are not going to treat you. That is not true.

If it is, let me know about the particular case, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, who by the way is from Texas, I hope he provides me with the details and the names of those people because I would like to investigate the case. If we have emergency rooms in this country who truly reject someone who necessarily needs emergency treatment, number one, it is against a Federal law if they accept any Federal funds at all, and there are very few hospitals in the country that do not accept Federal funds, so if they are doing that they are violating the Federal law.

Number two, my bet is that once we hear the other side of the story, that many of the stories we are about to hear as this Patients' Bill of Rights begins to pick up momentum, let me put it this way: I think we, on this floor, have an obligation to be accurate in our statements, especially when we are

dealing with human life and especially when we are dealing with human suffering and especially when we are attacking, for example, some hospital who theoretically rejected a young man who was in, quote, dire straits and as a result the young man got his leg amputated. That is pretty serious allegations.

Maybe it is true. As I said, I kind of question it, but I would like to look into it.

Furthermore, I know that Patients' Bill of Rights sounds good. I would just urge my colleagues, remember that saying, the devil is in the fine print. You stand up, you go out on any street in America and say, hey, do you agree with a Patients' Bill of Rights? And they are going to say well, sure what is wrong with that. Sounds good.

It does sound good, but before you sign, Mr. Speaker, the American people to this contract you better take a look at what the fine details say. I can say to my colleagues, it is a bunch of hogwash for them to believe for one moment that this Patients' Bill of Rights is not going to result in lots of lawsuits. America is a country of litigation.

America is a country of intense legal wrangling. Give the trial lawyers an opportunity to prosecute cases, they are going to go after it like a kid goes after cookies. Let us be up front. Now I am not saying that there are not cases where there should not be lawsuits but let us be up front when we talk about this. Do not pretend more lawsuits are not going to result. Of course more lawsuits are going to result. Let us debate whether they are justified or not justified. At least let us be open on the front end and say this Patients' Bill of Rights will result in trial lawyers filing lots of lawsuits in this country.

If these lawsuits are not justified, it is the consumer who will pay for them. Let us take a look, as we have, and I want patients to have rights, all of us do, but do not pull the wool over their eyes by saying here is a bill of rights that in the end costs them more money and as a result more money to get insurance and as a result less people get insurance because insurances become more costly because my colleagues, on this House floor, decided they are going to ride in on their white horse and save the American patient from, as described earlier, gross abuse. There are unique cases of abuse and those should be addressed, but be very careful about what you are going to sign on to. Do not let the emotional thrill or the emotional warmth or the cuddliness of the word of a bill entice you into believing that this is the answer for our medical crisis in this country.

There are a lot of good doctors in this country. We happen to have a pretty darn good medical delivery system in this country. Sure, we need improvement. Sure, we would like to figure out how to get more people insurance. Sure, we would like to figure out the

prescription costs in this country. But do not take that little bit of bad and throw out all the good. Do not, in an attempt to fix the bad, end up making its spread worse and actually doing damage to the good things that our medical health delivery system in this country does for us.

WHEN THE WEST MEETS THE EAST

Mr. MCINNIS. Let me move on from there. I had an interesting talk in Massachusetts not too long ago. Of course, as my colleagues know, my district is the Rocky Mountains of the State of Colorado. It is the highest district in the Nation elevation-wise. It is a district with great beauty, huge mountains. We have 54 mountains over 14,000 feet, by far more than any other district in the country. It is a district that many, many people visit, Aspen, Telluride, Beaver Creek, Steamboat Springs, Durango, Glenwood Springs down in the San Luis Valley, Rocky Mountain National Park, Great Sand Dunes, Colorado National Monument, the Black Canyon National Park. Most of my colleagues have all been probably at one point or another been into my district for a vacation.

Going back to my point, I was in Massachusetts. I was talking to a wonderful couple named Tony and Cathy Frasso and their son David. We were talking about public land. We were talking about some of the differences between the State of Massachusetts and the lands in Massachusetts versus the lands in the West. There is a dramatic difference between the lands and the way the lands are governed, for example, between the way decisions are made on lands in the East and lands in the West. That is really where I want to start my comments and focus my comments on natural resources this evening.

Let us take a look at just what I mean by that. Obviously, we have here a map of the United States. We will see in this map that the color over here represents government lands. So on this map, what this map depicts, is wherever color is seen on the map that says that that is owned by the government, that land is owned by the government. If we will notice, my district, by the way, is right here in the State of Colorado, right along this border. That district geographically, that land mass right there, is larger than the entire State of Florida. We will notice how interesting it is that in our country primarily in the East, in other words from my eastern border on the third district in Colorado to the Atlantic Ocean, and from Canada to Mexico, there is very little government land in these areas. Look at some of these States. They have little dots of public lands. Some of these States hardly have any government lands at all and yet when we take a look at this eastern border and come West to the Pacific Ocean or again go from Canada down to Mexico, we see massive amounts of government land.

□ 2045

Well, there are a couple of questions about that. Number one, from a historical point of view, why the difference? Why does the government own big chunks of land in the West and, relatively speaking, very little land in the East? What kind of impact does it have on decision making? And what is it like to live when you are completely surrounded?

You see in these colored areas, there are communities, millions of people live out on these lands, or they are surrounded by these government lands. The public "public lands" is not an often spoken word out in some of these States. In my district, it is spoken about all the time.

Let us talk and give an answer to the first question I asked, what is the historical basis for this massive amount of government land in the West, and yet very little government land in the East? It is really pretty simple, and it goes back to the frontier days of our country.

When our country was being settled, we were making acquisitions of land. It was our dream in this country to expand our boundaries, to go out and go west. Remember, going west was just a little ways west of Washington, D.C. back then. But the dream was to go out into the new frontier and claim new land for this new country that we had, to make our country great, by growing it in size.

But in order to do that back in those days, you did not just get a deed. For example, when we purchased Louisiana, made the Louisiana Purchase, simply having a deed to the property did not mean a whole lot. In fact, in those days, possession, as the old saying goes, possession is nine-tenths of the law. You really needed to be on the property, in possession of the property, with a six-shooter on your side. That is a lot, the law of how the land in the West was settled.

So, what happened, the government had to figure out, they had to occupy this land. Your elected leaders in Washington, D.C. had to figure out how do we get people to go west? How do we get people to possess this land? How do we get people to till the land and to put the land to good use so that we continue to build this fine country of ours?

The answer came up that most people will leave the comfort of their home, or at least a good number of people will leave the comfort of their home, if you promise them what every American dreams of, owning their own piece of land, having a piece of property that is in their name.

So the government decided the way to bring the people off the East Coast here and bring them west was to promise them land. They called that the Homestead Act, I think about 1862. And the government said to the American people, go out into this frontier, find a piece of property, put your stakes in the ground, and, if you farm it for a pe-

riod of time, generally 3 to 5 years, we will let you take title to maybe 160 acres or 320 acres.

You see, back then, in Kansas, for example, or up there in Nebraska, or over in Iowa or Mississippi or Missouri or some of those areas, 160 acres was adequate. A family could live off 160 acres of farmland.

But the problem was when they hit the West, when these settlers came out, they started getting into the West, where 160 acres does not even feed a cow.

The people came back to Washington, D.C. and said we have a problem. Our idea of encouraging people to move west and settling the frontier through our Homestead Act is working in this part of the Nation. But when we come to the West, where the land is much more arid, for example, much more rugged terrain, where those mountain peaks in the Third District of Colorado go beyond 14,000 feet, at that point people are not stopping. They are not tilling the land. In fact, 160 acres will not even feed a cow in this new land we are in.

So they gave some thought to it in Washington, and somebody came up with the idea, well, what we should do, if we give 160 acres, say, in Kansas or Nebraska, maybe what we ought to do is give like 3,000 acres out in the Rocky Mountains, so that they can have a comparable amount of acreage that will feed a like number of cows or a like number of livestock.

But the problem was, they said look, realistically and politically we are not going to be able to give away large amounts of land in the West. Somebody else then said I have got the answer. What we should do in the West, just for formality, let us go ahead, the government, and keep title to the land. Let us go ahead and own the land in the West, and we will let the people use it. A land of many uses. It is called multiple use. That is where the concept of "multiple use" came from, a land of many uses.

This land, the reason it is in government hands, is not, contrary to what some of your radical environmental groups like Earth First may want you to believe, that this land was acquired for all future generations, and we should have hands off, and that for some reason, if you are out here in the East and happen to get there first, you are entitled to utilize and live off the land, but when you come to the West, you are not entitled to those kind of privileges.

The government did not intend this as one huge national wilderness area, for example. The only reason the government retained the ownership of this property was because, realistically and politically, they could not give that much land away to one person. But if you look back historically you will see very clearly that the government intended for the people to still continue to come to this area and they would be able to use the land in many different ways.

Today we have lots of different uses for this land. Obviously, we use our land just the same as you do in Kansas or Nebraska or Florida or Missouri or Vermont. We use our land very similar to that. But we also have lots of different uses. We have National Parks, just like others. We have open space, environments and critical forests.

Our water is very important, and our water in the West, remember, water in the West, which I am going to get into in some detail, the West is an arid area. In the West, we sue. We fight. Water is like blood in the West. In the East, in a lot of places, you have to fight to get rid of the water. Shove it over on your neighbor's land. In the West, you try and grab it on your land. So there are some differences there.

This points out for you what we face in the western United States, and that is that oftentimes in our land use policies, on our really everyday life out in the West, whether it is our highways that come over Federal lands, whether it is our power lines, whether it is our water, whether it is our tourism industry, our ski areas, our river rafting, mountain bikes, hiking, our kayaking, all of this, we all of a sudden have a landlord who is in a little tiny town here on the Potomac, Washington, D.C.

Very few of these States in the East, when they decide what they want to have for hiking, or where the mountain bikes are going to go, or, obviously most States do not have ski areas, but what other kind of recreational things they are going to do, they do not have to go to Washington, D.C. for permission. A lot of what we do in the West, we have to come east to the population area of Washington, D.C. to get permission to do it.

So my purpose tonight in kind of explaining the difference between the western United States and the eastern United States is to tell you that when you hear those of us in the West talk about public lands and talk about the impact of, say, wilderness areas, or logging, you listen to us, that you will give us a little time to tell our side of the story.

Over the years, we have gotten pretty good managers of this land, both from an environmental point of view, both from what we have learned from a technical point of view, both of what we have learned on how to manage our resources. And I think it is safe to say that there are a lot more people in the West that know about the land in the West than there probably are in the East, but sometimes in the West it is felt that they are being dictated to by people who have never experienced the West, or by people that do not feel the pain because they do not live on public lands.

In my district, for example, I think with the exception of one or two communities, every community in my district is completely surrounded by government lands. We have to get government permission for highways, we have

to get government permission for recreational uses, we have to get government permission for open space, for endangered species, for water usage, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So there is a difference.

Let us move on and kind of focus in from a national picture. Actually, before we move to the State of Colorado, this is probably a good chart to take a look at, a comparison of some western and eastern States by the percentage of land, public land usage.

In 11 western States, and we picked 11 eastern States to compare side-by-side, so that those of you in the States of New York, for example, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Vermont, et cetera, we are kind of doing a side-by-side comparison in the West. So you have an idea of how public lands impact us much greater, to a much, much greater degree in the West than it does you in the East.

Again, the primary reason that we are impacted in the West and you escape the impact in the East is that historical knowledge that the only way they could encourage people to go in and use large amounts of land in the West was for the government to retain ownership.

Let us take a look. The State of Nevada, 82.9 percent, almost 83 percent of the State of Nevada is public lands, 83 percent. Connecticut, less than one-tenth of 1 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent is public lands. Rhode Island, about three-tenths of 1 percent. New York, seven-tenths of 1 percent.

So colleagues from Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Maine, Massachusetts, 1.3 percent. And this is where my friends, the Frassoos, Tony and Kathy and Dave, live, and I told them, 1.3 percent of your lands are public lands.

Take a look at what Colorado has. Thirty-six percent of Colorado is public lands. By the way, most of that 36 percent is in my Congressional District, the Third District of Colorado.

Look at the State of Utah. Sixty-four percent of the State of Utah belongs to the government. Those are public lands. Idaho, 61 percent. Oregon, the government owns over half that State. Wyoming, the government owns almost half that State. Arizona, almost half of the State of Arizona. Just under half of the State of California. Again, I just mentioned Colorado.

Let us go back over here. In the State of Ohio, a very large State, less than 1.3 percent of your State is owned by the government. So, for my colleagues here from the State of Ohio, you need to listen when somebody like our colleagues from the State of Nevada, who have 83 percent of their State owned by the government, come to speak to you about public lands. Listen to them. I know most of my colleagues do. But we need to have a better understanding of the difficulties that we face in the West, because they are unique to the West. Our everyday lives, the things that impact us be-

cause of government lands are unique to the West versus the East, I think this chart pretty well indicates some of that.

Now, let us go ahead and take a brief look at who some of the major government agencies that have these holdings are, major U.S. landholdings. The Federal Government owns more than 31 percent of all the lands in the United States. So if you take all the lands of this country, the government owns just under one-third of them.

State-owned, for all purposes, 197 million acres. Federally-owned, 704 million acres in this country are owned by the Federal Government. The BLM owns about 260 million acres, the Forest Service owns 231 million acres, and other Federal agencies own about 130 million acres. The Park Service has 75 million acres. The Native American tribes have about 45 million acres.

That is a lot of land. Most of us, when we talk about buying a new home, we think you are doing pretty well if you have a home that sits on a one-acre piece. Imagine, 704 million acres owned by the government, and the majority of that acreage, by far, the strong majority of that acreage, is in the West, where we live.

Now let us focus down on the State of Colorado. A very similar analogy applies to the State of Colorado between eastern Colorado and western Colorado. Now, they are very similar in that eastern Colorado is rural and western Colorado is rural. But if you go down the line, which basically is the Third Congressional District, you will see out here, go back here, in the colored areas, brown, green, blue and so on, those are government lands.

Take a look at western Colorado, right here, versus eastern Colorado. Eastern Colorado, there are very few public lands. In fact, the public lands really literally in some of these counties are the courthouse.

□ 2100

Down here you have some grasslands. You got national grassland up here, in an area over there; but primarily, most of the western slope of Colorado, most of it is owned by the government. That means that the people that live out in this area have to adapt to living and cooperating and working alongside the owners of the property, which is the government. And that has some huge impacts.

You can see why people in the West get a little defensive when somebody from the East starts dictating to them how the land in the West should be handled, especially when the people from the East speak of little experience, especially when the person from the East has never lived this.

For example, I always used to get aggravated when Clinton and Gore, when they spoke to us, they spoke to us about the West; and they would go out and make these grand announcements or by executive orders take large blocks of land and, in essence, put them off limits.

Why was I was upset? Not necessarily because of the fact that some of these moves were not good moves. In fact, some areas did deserve that, the executive order, not many, but some of them did. What bothered me the most is that the President and the Vice President outside of a vacation day or outside of a campaign had never spent a night in the West.

They did not know what our life was like. They did not know what the experience was like having to get government permission, for example, for the water you own, to use that water that you own. It goes on and on and on.

So I think at this point what I want to do is break down and go from our comments about the public lands and what impact the public lands have on the West to talk about a specific asset that we have got in the West, and it is very unique to the West, as far as the law is concerned, as far as the amount of it and the recycling of it and that is the subject of water.

Water is very unique. Water is one of the few resources we have in this country that is renewable. Remember that you often hear people talk, look, let us have conservation on water. Remember water is the one resource, it is the one resource out there that one person's waste of water could very easily be another person's water.

Let me give you an example. Years ago they came out with the idea, well, let us go and let us line all the farmers; ditches with concrete. And that way we will save water from being seeped into the ground. What some did not realize is that the water that leaked out of the one ditch may very well have been the water that popped up as a spring in a piece of property miles away.

Water, we do not understand today but we have a pretty good idea; but 20 years or 30 years from now, we will be able to actually track-specific water and see all the millions of veins that it goes in underneath our earth's surface, and how it benefits one party and yet hurts another party, et cetera, et cetera.

But in the meantime, let us talk a little more about it. It is the only natural resource with automatic renewal. After falling from clouds as rain and snow, it may run into streams, lakes, or soaking into the ground. Eventually, it will evaporate and continues the cycle forever.

Now, here is some interesting statistics. If you take a look at all of the water in the world, all the water on the earth, 97 percent of that water, 97 percent of that water is salt water, and 75 percent of the remainder, so if you take the 3 percent of the earth's water that is not salt water, 75 percent of that 3 percent is actually water that is contained in the polar ice regions as ice caps.

As we put here, only .05 percent, only .05 percent is fresh water in streams and lakes. So when you take a look at the earth's surface under today's technology, the majority of water is salt

water; or it is tied up in the polar ice caps. So that makes water a pretty precious resource.

Here is another interesting number. Seventy-three percent of the stream flow, so almost three-fourths of the stream flow in this country, is claimed by States that are east of a line drawn north to south along the Kansas-Missouri border. In other words, in the eastern United States, remember where I explained the differences here, in the eastern United States, 73 percent of the water in the streams in this entire country, three-fourths of the water is over in this area of the country, over in the eastern part of the country.

This is an arid part of the Nation, these government lands, the western States. Twelve percent is claimed by the Pacific Northwest. This leaves 14 percent of the total stream flow to be shared by 14 States which are over half the land area.

What I am saying here is that 14 percent, 14 percent of the stream flow of water resources in this entire Nation, 14 percent of it has to be shared by over half of the Nation in the western States. So geographically over half the physical size, over half the size of the country only gets 14 percent of the stream flow.

So that shows you why water has become such a precious resource in the West. One of the interesting things about water, and I know to some of you, the subject of discussing water gets pretty boring. In fact, I am going to have a sip of it right now, because we all expect water to be there when we turn on the tap.

It is kind of a boring subject until water no longer comes out of the faucet, then it becomes somewhat more of an issue. And as we begin to make huge advancements in water quality, as we begin to make huge advancements in aquatic life in our water, in better ways to utilize our water, in more efficient ways to utilize water, water becomes more of an important subject.

But I have some very interesting facts which I thought I would present this evening to my colleagues so that you have kind of an idea of how much water is required in our everyday lives, not water just for drinking, but water for our clothes, water for our food, water for our vegetation, et cetera, et cetera.

I think one of the best charts I have seen is this one on water usage. This is the per-person drinking and cooking every day. Every person in America uses about 2 gallons of water to drink and to cook with. Flushing the toilet takes 5 gallons to 7 gallons.

Now interestingly enough, the Europeans, and I am not a big fan necessarily of some of the Europeans' technology, but some of the technology, especially when it comes to toilets they now have a dual flush toilet, a flush when you go one way, a flush when you go another way. That is a pretty smart idea. It helps conserve water. They use excess water to complete the job, so to speak.

The washing machine uses 20 gallons when you turn on your washing machine. A dishwasher to wash your dishes takes 25 gallons; taking a shower, 9 gallons.

Now, take a look at this. I find this part of the chart fascinating, take a look at how much water it takes, for example, for one loaf of bread, for one loaf of bread that you buy off the grocery store shelf, it takes 150 gallons of water to bring that seed up, to process the wheat, to bring the flour, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. It takes 150 gallons of water to produce one loaf of bread.

Take a look at one egg. This is unbelievable, one egg, to have one egg produced, you go through about 120 gallons of water. Thank goodness water is recyclable. Thank goodness it is a commodity that is rechargeable.

One quart of milk, to get 1 quart of milk, you need 223 gallons; or to get 1 gallon of milk, you need 1,000 gallons of water, a thousand gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of milk.

These are numbers that most people never heard of before. A pound of tomatoes, it is 125 gallons of water. A pound of oranges is 47 gallons. A pound of potatoes takes 23 gallons of water.

Now, what happens? This gives you a pretty good idea in the use of our country where the primary use of water is, water that is consumed for human consumption. What happens to 50 glasses of water?

If we have 50 glasses of water in our country that we were going to use for human consumption purposes, this is not water left in the stream or et cetera, this is water for human consumption, 44 of those 50 glasses of water are necessary for agriculture.

That points out to you just how important water is for our agricultural base in this country, three glasses of it is used by industry, two glasses are used by the cities and a half a glass is used out in the country for the people that live out in the country.

Pretty interesting statistics. Well, let me move from the charts that we have here and talk just a little bit more about the State of Colorado and the rivers that we have in Colorado.

First of all, I thought it would be appropriate in our capitol in Denver, Colorado. By the way, it is a beautiful building if you have an opportunity. If you are in Denver, stop by the State capitol. I have many good friends that work out of the State capitol. I served there myself.

One of the best sayings you will find in the capitol is by Thomas Hornsby Ferril: "Here is a land where life is written in water. The West is where water was and is father and son of old mother and daughter following rivers up immensities of range and desert thirsting the sundown ever crossing a hill to climb still drier naming tonight a city by some river a different name from last night's camping fire. Look to the green within the mountain cup. Look to the prairie parched for water lack. Look to the sun that pulls the

oceans up. Look to the cloud that gives the oceans back. Look to your heart and may your wisdom grow to the power of lightning and peace of snow."

I think that poetic piece says it pretty well. In the West, water is like blood. In the West, our entire life is dependent on this resource. We need to understand it. We need to take care of our water resources. We need to keep people from preventing us from using water in a balanced fashion.

We need to be smart enough to keep our water clean and to figure out how to put our water to the best possible use. We need to be fair in our usage of water.

Take a look. In Colorado history, the first dam. Now, you hear lots of criticisms about dams, especially by organizations that generally are way off the spectrum, as far as balance is concerned. In the West, we are very dependent upon dams. In the West, we do not have lots of rainfall.

In fact, I think in Colorado I can tell you exactly in Colorado. In Colorado I think we average about 16 inches of precipitation a year, 16 inches a year. Take a look at what happened in Houston last week.

Now, I know that was a freak storm; but what did they have, 40 inches in a storm, 3 days or 4 days? We do not have 16 inches in an entire year.

The critical thing about water in the West, because we do not have a continual flow, because we do not have lots of rain in the West, we have to store the water that we have, primarily in the Rocky Mountains. We are dependent on our snowfall, the heavy snowfall that we get in the winter time; and then it is that spring runoff that comes off the mountains. A lot of times the runoff may come too early or the runoff may come in too great a surge, so we have to have the capability to store that water, to help us with flood control, to help us so that we have those resources in the months that we do not have any snow, in the months that we do not have spring runoff, in the months that we do not have much rainfall.

So storage of water is critical for life in the West. Now, that is not to say that we should store it at any cost. It is to say that we can store water in a smart and balanced fashion. It is interesting to hear that, that, for example, the National Sierra Club, their number one goal, or at least their number one goal last year was to take down the massive water projects in the West, Lake Powell, which is also one of our largest hydroproducers. Give me a break.

The West could not survive without reservoirs like that. In the West, we need to store that water. Understand, in the East, in many cases, you need to get rid of it. In the West, we need to store it. And our first dam actually in Colorado, our first storage was by the Mesa Verde Indians, and it was that ancient irrigation system.

They actually discovered that around 1,000 A.D. that the Indian groups there

stored water, the Native Americans at Mesa Verde, they figured out that they had arid months. In fact, it is often thought that the extinction of that tribe down in that part of the State was a result of a drought, was a result of the fact that they could not store enough water to get themselves all the way through.

So there is a lot of history to the Rocky Mountains, and there is a lot of history to our water use in the Rocky Mountains. We have what they call Colorado the Mother of Rivers, that is what they call the State, because we have four major river basins in the State of Colorado. The first river basin is called the South Platte; the second, the Arkansas; the third, the Rio Grande; and the fourth, the Colorado River.

I am going to really focus on the Colorado River basin this evening with the time that I have left. Remember, rivers east of the Continental Divide, most of the Continental Divide is in my congressional district. We have all heard, colleagues, of the Continental Divide.

Rivers east of the Divide flow into the Gulf of Mexico. Rivers west of the Divide, like the Colorado River, drain into the Gulf of California and the Pacific Ocean. The Colorado River is a pretty unique river. First of all, the Colorado River is 1,440 miles long. It provides water for 25 million people. The Colorado River provides water for 25 million people, and that river which drains and provides millions of acres of agricultural water, it also provides clean hydropower. And in Colorado, we put in about 75 percent of the water resources for the Colorado River, although actually only about 25 percent of it is allowed to stay.

□ 2115

So the reason that water is so critical for us, aside from the fact that we have to store it, aside from the fact that we do not have much precipitation in our State, is that our water from our agriculture, our water for our recreation, we do everything, from our wild and scenic streams for tourism to our kayaking to our rafting to our snow making, we are very, very dependent on a very limited supply of water in the West. And so I thought that it would be good this evening to talk about water in the West.

I started this evening's comments by talking about the vast amounts of government land that sits in the West, and then transitioned into water in the West, which is one of the key ingredients. I intend in future comments to talk in a little more detail about the public lands, about the need for wilderness areas, about the need for grazing areas and the need for public interest areas, about the need for national parks and State parks, and about the need for open space. So my discussions this evening about water are just one segment in an educational series of how life in the West really is different than the East.

Now, my comments are not meant to put a divide between the East and the West. It simply is to explain the divide that already exists as a result primarily because of geographical differences, and that is where we have that. So this is my purpose. Water is our subject this evening.

I want to give a couple of other comments about water that I think are pretty interesting. First of all, as many of my colleagues may know, we have wonderful trout streams in Colorado. In fact, in the State of Colorado we have over 9,000 miles of streams; 9,000 miles coming off those great big mountains, those high mountains of the Colorado Rockies. We also have about 2,000 lakes and reservoirs. We are not like Minnesota or Michigan with those massive lakes, but considering the height, the elevation of the Rocky Mountains, Colorado is a really fairly unique State.

We have a lot of fun things in Colorado. For example, we have 13 different streams, called Clear Creek. But the key is that while there are differences in the United States between the east and the west, those differences also exist in the State of Colorado between eastern Colorado, primarily the cities, and western Colorado. My congressional district, for example, the third district of the State of Colorado, that district has 80 percent of the water resources in Colorado, yet 80 percent of the population resides outside that district. So within our own boundaries even in the State of Colorado there is a constant balancing requirement that is necessary. How much water should be diverted from the western slope to the eastern slope? What amount of water do we need to keep in the streams to preserve our aquatic life or the quality of the water? These are issues we deal with every day in the West.

My purpose in being here this evening, especially to my colleagues east of Colorado, to the Atlantic Ocean, is to request of them that when they hear about or have an opportunity to vote on water issues facing the West, ask some of us in the West about it, because the implications in the West on water in many, many cases are dramatically different than the implications on a water vote when we are discussing water in the East.

Now, tomorrow evening, or later this week, I hope to talk a little about energy. Because energy, of course, involves all of us. It is very important. I also want to talk about public lands in some more detail, the different uses of public lands, the different ways the government manages public lands.

We have lots of different management tools with public lands. When our government said, as I mentioned earlier in my comments, that in the East we would let the people own the land, but in the West the government would keep the title for the land simply to avoid the political embarrassment of giving away too much land, when the government did that, they decided that

they were going to retain and manage this land. And over the time, through technological management, through better land management, through more knowledge, we have developed a vast array of tools, and we can use any one of these tools or a combination of these tools to help us manage these public lands.

Many of my colleagues are aware of some of these tools, the names of these tools, such as national parks, for example, national monuments, special interest areas, conservation areas, et cetera, et cetera. Well, what we need to do to properly manage these massive Federal lands is not to make a rule that one shoe fits all, because one shoe does not fit all in the West. What we need to do is custom manage these public lands, but we cannot custom manage public lands unless we talk to the people who live there. We cannot custom manage public lands unless we talk to the people who are directly impacted by it.

Now, it is true, and I hear this argument constantly from my colleagues here on the floor that land belongs to all the people in the West, so those of us in decision-making authority here in the East have every right to make decisions on how people in the West live and how they use that land. That is not how we get a balanced approach for the management of public lands in the West. The way to do it is to go to the local communities.

For example, today in front of the subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, we had a Native American who spoke about the years of history of his family and the traditions regarding the uses of the forest and the uses of government lands. We had an expert on forest that talked about the health of different public lands. Both of these people stressed in their comments the importance of having local input, the importance of bringing in the people who are impacted by these public lands.

So tomorrow night I will go into a lot more detail. I will talk about probably the most extreme use, the strongest tool we have, called wilderness designation. And by the way, I have probably put more land in wilderness than anybody currently seated in the House of Representatives. And then I will go clear to the other extreme, where the land is not properly managed, where the land is kind of a free-for-all, which is as much a disservice as an extreme on the other end.

There are lots of different tools and lots of ways that we can preserve these lands for future generations while at the same time having the right to live on them and enjoy them in this generation. This generation is not under an obligation to save everything for the future. There are a lot of things that we can use. And if we use them smartly, we not only mitigate our impact to the environment, in many cases we can enhance the environment. And that is where our obligation is, to help enhance our environment. I will talk a

little more about that tomorrow evening.

For my final few minutes, even though I will address it later in the week, I want to talk a little about energy. We have talked this evening about a number of different things. First of all, we started with a few comments on the Patients' Bill of Rights, and I want to restress to my colleagues that it is important that patients have rights in this country. It is important that we do not have gross mismanagement of our medical services in this country. It is important that we have a balance out there.

And when we hear in the press and we see documents that say the Patients' Bill of Rights, we should take a look at the details. It may work out to be just what we are looking for. It may be an answer for some of the problems. But we need to read the details before signing on to the document. We need to read the details before casting our votes, because we have an obligation in these Chambers to be aware of the impact that these bills will have and to take a look at what might be the unintended consequences of actions that we might take.

So we have spent a few minutes talking about the Patient's Bill of Rights, and then, of course, I moved on and talked about public lands and water resources. Now, colleagues, I know that that is kind of a boring subject. I know this evening's walk through the differences between the East and the West in the United States, where in the West we have massive amounts of Federal Government land ownership and in the East we have very little government land ownership, and the differences that can even be pared down to the State, where we talk about differences in water and differences in government-owned lands and public lands, but while it is boring, it is very important. Life in the West is also important for those in the East, because we are totally dependent upon an understanding so that we can help preserve and utilize in a proper fashion these resources.

Finally, now, I want to visit for a couple of minutes in my remaining time about energy and the need for energy. First of all, I am a strong believer in conservation. I think there are a lot of things that the American public can do to help conserve. I was at a town meeting yesterday in Frisco, Colorado, when somebody brought up the fact that they were in Europe recently, and mentioned that when they went into a room, in order to keep the lights on, they, naturally could turn them on, but in order for them to stay on, they had to take a card and put the card in a slot. Now, I had been in Europe, too, and I remembered that as he said that. When leaving the house, once you pulled the card out to leave the house, the lights shut off. It is a tremendous energy saver and it is of no pain.

We do not have to have our lives inconvenienced at all. One switch shuts

them all off. Now, of course, I imagine that if you need a security light and so on, that can be worked out. But there are little ideas like this, like changing our oil every 6,000 miles on our cars instead of every 3,000. There are lots of simple conservation ideas that we, the American people, can employ today. For example, as we prepare to retire this evening, make sure we do not have on the bathroom light, the closet light, and the bedroom light. When we are in the kitchen getting ready to have a drink of water before going to bed, shut off lights. We can turn down our heaters, if we do not need them. We can keep the air conditioner turned up if we do not need it that cold in rooms.

One of the things that helps us do this, that helps us conserve, is the marketplace. Now, I have heard a lot of talk about, well, we need to artificially support these prices. But the thing that has driven more conservation in the last couple of months has not been some action by the government, it has been high prices in the marketplace. If we were to freeze the price of energy, which some of my colleagues recommend we do, i.e. price caps, that does several things. One, it encourages people to use more of the product because they know that the price will not go up on them. Two, it discourages innovation. What drives innovation is that when prices go up and demand stays the same or goes up, people look for more efficient ways to do things. So energy and conservation are very important.

I agree very strongly with people like the Vice President, who I think, although it may not be politically correct in some audiences in our country, makes it very clear that conservation alone will not answer our shortage of energy in this country; that conservation alone will not lessen the dependency we have on foreign oil; that conservation alone, while it is a very, very important factor, it is not the sole answer. We have got to figure out ways to use and to gather more resources for energy for future generations. Energy is a big issue for us.

I actually think that the energy shortage that we are in really is kind of a wake-up call for us. It is not a crisis for the entire country where the economy has collapsed, but it is a wake-up call. It is the alarm going off saying time to wake up, time to take a look at what kind of dependency we have on foreign oil, what kind of conservation we are employing or deploying in our country. So I think from that aspect it has done us some good.

Let me kind of conclude these remarks, because I intend to go into more detail about energy, by asking my colleagues not to let people convince them that the needs of this country can be met simply by conservation. On the other hand, do not let anybody convince you that conservation does not have an important role to play. We can conserve. And a lot of people throughout the world, but more par-

ticularly in this country, can conserve without pain. In fact, a lot of the ways we conserve actually save us money, like shutting the lights off when we are not using them.

□ 2130

Change your oil less frequently, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. You actually save money as a result of that, colleagues. So conservation and exploration are necessary elements for this country to meet the demands that the people of this country have come to expect. And I think we have an obligation to do that. A lot depends on energy. Our lives are dependent on energy, whether it is energy from hydropower, to drive our vehicles, to air conditioning, refrigeration, et cetera, et cetera.

Energy is an important policy. What this wake-up call has also done, we have had more energy debates and comments on this House floor in the last 6 weeks than we have had in the last 6 years. The Clinton administration had absolutely no energy policy. What President Bush has done, what the Bush administration has done, is said we have to have an energy policy. Let us put everything on the table. When you put some things on the table, people squeal like a stuck pig. We do not have to accept it, but we ought to debate it and think it out and determine what ought to stay on the table and come off the table. That is how you develop policy. It is debate on this House floor that helps form policy.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Bush administration that this country needs an energy policy. We, the American people, colleagues, the people that we represent, deserve to have an energy policy. That means a policy that has thoroughly investigated the resources, including conservation, the resources out there for us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that I have been able to share with my colleagues this evening. I look forward to sharing further and having further discussion about public lands and talking more about energy.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the House has concluded its activities for the day, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for taking time to update us on the important issues that he finds not only in his tutelage as a Member of Congress from Colorado, but also as an important Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk about something that is very important. It is called the Patients' Bill of Rights. It is an important issue that the House of Representatives and the other body will be taking up. The issue