

discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. Even Alan Greenspan and the Concord Coalition agree that steps must be taken to answer these questions in such a way that we balance the budget. Chairman Greenspan stated, and I quote, "Failing to preserve (budget enforcement rules) would be a grave mistake . . ." The Concord Coalition warned that allowing budget enforcement rules to expire is "an open invitation to fiscal chaos."

Finally, we must work together to develop a bipartisan proposal to finish the 13 appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, our fiscal year ends in about 2 weeks. Over the past few years, when Congress and the President have not been able to finish the 13 appropriations bills, spending has far exceeded the levels that were recommended in the budget resolution earlier in the year. This year, we have not sent one of the 13, not one of the 13 appropriations bills to the President for his signature. As a matter of fact, the House, the House of Representatives has passed only three of the 13 regular appropriations bills off of the House floor; and again, the fiscal year ends in 2 weeks. There have been none that have been voted on on this House floor, or none scheduled since Labor Day, since we returned to our work from the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital, if we are going to put the budget back on the path to a balanced budget, that we work together to control the discretionary spending on these 13 bills. Working together in a bipartisan basis, we can balance the budget, just like we did in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. This is why I urge and call upon the President and the Republican congressional leadership to work with us to develop bipartisan proposals that will ensure that we have a fiscally responsible government.

#### SUPPORT H.R. 3612, THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY-BASED ATTENDANT SERVICES AND SUPPORTS ACT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to request support for H.R. 3612, the Medicaid Community-based Attendant Services and Supports Act, also known as MiCASSA. This bill will enable our older Americans and citizens with disabilities who qualify for long-term care services under the Medicaid program to receive the non-institutional community support service options they are entitled to under the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The Americans With Disabilities Act, signed into law by President Bush in 1990, ushered in a new era of promise for a segment of our population whose talents and rights as American citizens have been too long ignored. It promised

a new social compact to end the paternalistic patterns of the past that took away our rights if we become disabled. It says that people with disabilities have the right to be active participants integrated into the everyday life of society. This premise, however, cannot become a reality until we roll up our sleeves and do the work necessary to eliminate the barriers that still hinder its full implementation.

In its 1999 Olmstead ruling, the Supreme Court said that States violate the Americans With Disabilities Act when they unnecessarily put people with disabilities in institutions. The problem is that our Federal-State Medicaid program has not been updated and has a built-in bias that results in the unnecessary isolation and segregation of many of our senior citizens and younger adults in institutions.

Too often, decisions relating to the provision of long-term services and supports are influenced by what is reimbursable under Federal and State Medicaid policy rather than by what individuals need and deserve. Research has revealed a significant bias in the Medicaid program towards reimbursing services provided in institutions over services provided in home and community settings. The only option currently guaranteed by Federal law in every State is nursing home care. Other options have existed for decades, but their spread has been fiscally choked off by the fact that 75 percent of our long-term care dollars go into institutional settings, in spite of the fact that studies show that many people do better in home and community settings.

Only 27 States have adopted the benefit option of providing personal care services under the Medicaid program. Although every State has chosen to provide certain services under home and community-based waivers, these services are unevenly distributed, have long waiting lists, and reach just a small percentage of eligible individuals.

Governor Howard Dean is a physician and Vermont's Chief Executive. He recently testified on Capitol Hill on behalf of the National Governors Association and asked Congress to give the States the tools they need to grow home and community-based service. In his testimony he said, "We can provide a higher quality of life by avoiding institutional services whenever possible. Some people insist we will need more nursing homes. They are wrong. Baby boomers today are looking for alternatives for their parents. We can't afford to protect the status quo. We need to listen to people and act boldly to develop those services they want and are, in fact, affordable."

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, all Members of this honorable body to be in support of services for individuals in home-based settings so that they too can realize the assurance of living as they choose and as they see fit. Support MiCASSA.

#### DOMESTIC POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE). 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, there are two subjects that I want to address this evening, and both are of critical importance to us. One involves domestic policy, and one of them involves international policy. Obviously, we can guess what the international policy would be: dealing with Iraq, dealing with our war on terror, dealing with the United Nations resolutions. But before I get into the international discussion that I want to have this evening with my colleagues, I want to discuss the domestic situation involving a subject a long ways away from the al Qaeda or from Afghanistan or from Iraq or from the United Nations resolutions. I want to talk for a few minutes about the national forests, especially the national forests on public lands.

Now, public lands are lands that are owned by the government. It could be a local government, it could be a State government, or it could be Federal Government. The largest owner of land in the United States obviously is the United States Federal Government. They own millions and millions and millions of acres of land in this country.

Now, when this country was first developed, our population was primarily on the east coast, and the government wanted to grow our big country. As our country began to make land acquisitions, for example, the Louisiana Purchase and things like that, they knew that in order to expand the country, we not only had to buy the land, but we had to occupy the land. We had to put people on the land.

□ 1945

We had to have the people willing to protect the land. The best way to do that was not to give them a deed that said, Here is some land out in the West. Obviously, to grow our country we needed to move it west. We needed to move the population west. West in the early days was West Virginia. People did not have to go very far west to find out that they were in wilderness areas.

To do this, the Federal Government knew that they could not just give a piece of paper that said someone owned a piece of property out in the State of Kansas or Missouri or up in the Colorado mountains. They knew they could not do just that.

Today, it is a little different. Today, one can actually have a piece of property in Colorado, and one can live in Florida, and their rights as a private property owner are respected. They do not have to worry about squatters or about people taking over their land when they were not there.

But in the early days of the country, that was not true. That is not what the

situation was. In the early days, one had to possess or be on the property; and frankly, they had to have a six-shooter strapped to their sides. That, in fact, is where the saying "possession is nine-tenths of the law," that is where that saying came from; that is, that to hold that land, they needed to go out there and be on it.

The government wanted to expand. They had to figure out, how do we encourage people to leave the comforts of the East Coast? How do we encourage our population on the East Coast to move inward, to move west? How do we do this?

They came up with an idea. In the Revolutionary War, our government bribed the soldiers, the British soldiers. We bribed the soldiers in such a way that we offered them free land, free land if they would defect from the British troops and join the American troops in our efforts against the Brits.

So they decided to follow the same type of philosophy or the same strategy. That strategy is to offer free land to people if they would go out and settle on the new land that the government had acquired. If they would agree to do that, the government would give them land. That is where we had the act like the Homestead Act take place, where the government would give people, if they would go out and work the land for a period of time, 3 to 5 years, they would give 160 acres or 320 acres.

People bought into that concept. It really did begin the movement of taking this country to the West, the opportunity of free land. Then we combine that with other things that we began to do in the mid-1860s, for example, the continental railroad, the completion of the continental railroad; and the ability for a merchant to be able to ship merchandise from one store that he or she owned to another store he or she owned; and time zones in the country. There were a lot of things that were changing with the Industrial Revolution. We saw this huge movement to the West. We were able to possess the lands that the United States as a government purchased; so we had that possession. That possession is nine-tenths of the law. We were able to accomplish that.

But what happened was when these settlers hit the Rocky Mountains, when they hit the western part of the United States, which is different than the eastern part of the United States geographically and in water measurements, because, for example, in the East in a typical year, and this is not a typical year, but in a typical year when our Nation is not suffering from a drought, we have lots of water in the East. In fact, the situation in the East usually is, how do we get rid of the water, or shove it over on our neighbor's property?

In the West, it is a very arid region. It is the arid region of the country. In fact, almost half the country has about 14 percent of the water. That is the West: the Rocky Mountains, the Utahs,

the Nevadas, the Californias; and Montana, Wyoming, States like that. This is a very arid place.

What happened when our country was attempting to get people to possess that land? They would not do it, because 160 acres was not enough. See, even in eastern Colorado, and, now, my district consists of the mountains of western Colorado, but in eastern Colorado, with 160 acres in a typical year one could support a family in those early days. But once one hits the mountains of Colorado or hit western Colorado, or the Rocky Mountains in Montana, or the mountain ranges in New Mexico or places like that, 160 acres would not even feed a cow; would not even feed a cow. So they had to come up with something different.

What was happening was people were moving to the West, going to the West; but as soon as they hit those Rocky Mountain regions, as soon as they hit the arid areas, they went around them. They went around to the fertile valleys in the State of California, or they went to other places; or settled out in Nebraska or Kansas or Missouri or Arkansas, places like that where the land was much more fertile, the water was much more plentiful.

So word got back to Washington: Look, this strategy of ours, this strategy of giving land for people to possess so we have people on the land to grow our Nation, our great Nation, is working fine except when we hit the arid States of the West.

Somebody said, well, what shall we do? Shall we give them a proportionate amount of land, like 3,000 acres, which would be the equivalent of, say, 160 acres as far as what one could grow on it? It is proportionate to what one could grow on it. The answer was, Wow, we have gotten a lot of political heat here in Washington, D.C. simply because we gave so much land to the railroads.

As we know, there were a lot of robber barons. It sounds kind of familiar with some of the times we are facing right now. There was a lot of political heat because of the robber barons and the railroads, so the decision was very consciously made: Do not give them ownership of the land, these people, but let them use the land, to avoid the political heat. Let us go ahead and keep the property in the government's name, although originally all along it was intended to go to private hands; but to avoid the political heat, let us go ahead and keep the title to the land, and let the people use the land.

That was the birth of a concept called multiple use, many uses. That is where the concept of multiple use on Federal lands was conceived. When I grew up, for example, and I guess this is the best way to define multiple use, when I grew up and people went to the Federal lands, which in my district, there are probably 120 communities in my district, and actually, geographically, my district is larger than the State of Florida, but in my district,

the Federal lands encircle every community except one. So of the approximately 120 communities in my district, 119 of them are completely circled by this land owned by the government.

Now, up until about the 1970s it was not a problem, because the land, under this concept of multiple use, was utilized and best described by a sign when one entered the forest that said, for example, "Welcome to the White River National Forest, a land of many uses." It was a land of many uses.

Well, it was not long before we had people in the East, while they were the beneficiaries of private land, and if we take a look at a map of the United States of America, we will find it very interesting. I know it is hard to see my pen here, but let me see if I can demonstrate quickly the differences between private ownership and government ownership as it relates to the United States and the geography of our country.

Now, obviously, Mr. Speaker, I am not an artist, so I am not trying to be an artist. I will just do a basic form, give or take, of the United States. My pen, unfortunately, is not working very well. Here is the eastern United States. Here is New York, Florida, places like that.

Basically, where my point is right here, right where I cross right here on the chart, to my left here, in the western United States, there are vast amounts of public land. That is where the majority, the great majority of the public land in the United States is located, in the western part of this country.

In the eastern part of the country we have a couple of large holdings, not huge, but large holdings of Federal land. We have the Everglades down in Florida, we have the Appalachians, and we have a little up here in the Northeast. Other than that, if we were to apply the color red to this poster board I have here, and this were the western United States, it would be almost all red. On the eastern side we would see little blotches of red, but very, very little of red in proportion to the West.

So the problem that happens is that we have a lot of people in the eastern United States that have very little experience with public lands. Their lands are owned by their neighbors, or they own the lands; they are not owned by the Federal Government. If we go to Pennsylvania or out to Missouri or some of these States, or even eastern Colorado, and when we have a planning and zoning meeting, that planning and zoning meeting is held at the local county courthouse or the local city hall. When we go to the West where the land is still owned by the government, those meetings are held in Washington, D.C. That is who does the planning and zoning out there for those Federal lands.

So it has always been a little pet peeve with those of us in the West that people in the East, with all due respect, have very little experience with public

lands. They do not have the water issues that we do in the West, but they like to tell us in the West what is best for us in the West.

That is what happened many years ago in regard to our forests. Keep in mind that the majority of the forests in the eastern United States are privately owned. Whether we go down to the Carolinas, if we go to Florida, places like that, Minnesota, these forests are owned privately, the big majority of them.

In the West, our forests are primarily on public lands; so what we see, what we tend to see, is private forests usually produce better, and private forests generally are managed better. Why is that? Because in the West we have many, many different hands and fingers in the management of it because it is public lands.

Now, I think with public lands we have a pretty high fiduciary duty to manage those public lands, and we have to take care of those lands, because they do belong to all of us; although I think some precedent should be given to people who have to survive and live on those lands, that are completely surrounded by those lands, that depend for their water from those lands, that depend on their highways being able to come across those lands, that depend upon the power lines and the cellular phone towers. I could go on and on about how dependent in the West we are on public lands, a dependency not recognized nor necessitated in the East.

What happened? In the West we began to suffer, and actually not just in the West but throughout this country we have suffered massive forest fires. In the 1930s, society did not really accept fires as a natural course of a forest collapsing itself, so we decided that because the fires were such a threat to the human population and to wildlife populations and to watersheds and so on, that we would begin a very aggressive effort to fight the forest fires. Instead of letting them burn, we would fight them.

In the early days, around the turn of the century, we would have between 40 and 50 million acres a year on fire, 40 to 50 million acres a year that were on fire. What happened as a result of very effective work, frankly, by the American people and the Forest Service and the different fire agencies, we were able to restrain or restrict those fires from 30 or 40 or 50 million acres a year to 2 or 3 million acres a year, maybe 4 million acres a year, because we became very efficient with public relations: Smokey, the bear: Be careful, put your campfire out completely, pour water on it, et cetera, et cetera.

What happened through the evolution of time, a very short evolution of time, through the last 3 or 4 decades or so, man became very good at controlling fire. Unfortunately, we begin to see these forests, forests that would have, say, 20 trees per acre, all of a sudden begin to get 30 trees per acre,

which was not the natural course of that acreage; then, pretty soon, 30 or 40 or 50 trees per acre.

Now, many of those acres out there that nature had always had by economics and balances, as nature does it, instead of having maybe 20 or 30 or 40 trees per acre, we now have 600 or 700 or 800 trees per acre. It has become a tinderbox. It has become gunpowder.

What has happened is that we had some terrible abuses by lumber companies in the '30s and '40s and '50s and '60s. These lumber companies would go in and they would use the concept of clear-cutting, where they cut everything in sight. They would leave a mess behind. They did not take into consideration the watersheds.

Frankly, there were a lot of scientific things that they did not know at that time that we know today that did a lot of harm back then when they carried out those policies of cutting lumber in those forests.

So thank goodness we begin to recognize some of that. We begin to get a tighter control, especially on public forests; because, after all, those do belong to the people. We begin to get a tighter grip on what was going on out there. We begin to apply more science to our forests. We had some very wholesome environmental movements to help us protect those forests.

□ 2000

But as is typical in our country, we wait for something to get to a crisis, which is exactly what happened on many of our forests, one, through our own forest management policies, and, two, through really unmonitored forest timbering, taking the lumber out of the forest, unmonitored. That is the extreme.

We realize and we see the damage that has happened. And as is a typical government response, it overresponds. So we come over here and at first solid environmental organizations came forward and conscientious conservatives came in and said, We need to conserve. We need to have more conservation in this area. We need to use better policies, and we were in hopes that we could bring that into balance.

But what has happened over the last 15 years in large part is as a result of radical environmental organizations, and not all environmental organizations are radical and I am not professing that up here. But I am telling you the Earth First, the Wilderness Society, the National Sierra Club, they operate on the Earth First strategy, and that is take the radical approach. And the approach that they have used in these public forests, primarily in the West, is preventing us, preventing us from going in and doing carefully monitored thinning and treating of these forests. You have got to manage these forests and we are not being allowed to do it. Lawsuit after lawsuit after lawsuit. Litigation for 3, 4, 5, 6 years into the future in order for you to go in and treat under a carefully monitored pro-

gram, under the direction of the forest scientists, under the science of the forest, to go in and treat this forest.

What happens? Well, over time these forests get more and more trees per acre, and pretty soon some of those trees begin the national evolution. They die off and they fall on the forest floor. And pretty soon the forest floor begins to build up what we call fuel, dead leaves, dead trees. They are not being cleaned out. They are not being cleaned naturally as they were 100 years ago by fire. Instead, they are being controlled by, one, by controlled fire. We are learning more about that as we go on. And, two, we have organizations out there that would like to, every time you talk about going and treating a forest, they like to spin it, they like to spin it into lumber. You are helping some big lumber company. You will clear-cut. You will cut all of the big trees out of there.

It is a bunch of hype. It is a bunch of spin. And, unfortunately, they are so good with public relations, they spend so much money on advertising and commercials on TV, it is easy for them to convince the public that you should have hands-off on the forest or that the only place you should go and look at the forests is where it abuts up against the home.

They completely ignore watersheds. What are watersheds? In the mountains, for example, the water for a community usually is many, many miles away from that community; and it is up on the top of the mountain or side of the mountain and it is called the watershed, where the waters accumulate from the high snows.

My district is the highest elevation on the continent. So up at high altitudes of 10, 12, 13, 14,000 feet we have accumulation of water, watersheds, and those watersheds make their way down the mountains into the communities. We need to manage these forests. We need to protect those watersheds. And what has happened is over the years, in part, not totally, because the drought was a major contributing factor to the major forest fires we had this year; but in part we had people whose sole intent was to obstruct the process of the science of the forest. And once again today we are seeing it happen over again.

This summer has been a devastating summer in regards to forest fires. Take a look at the State of Oregon. How many hundreds of thousands of acres in the largest fire in that State's history. Take a look at the State of Arizona, hundreds of thousands of acres on fire in the largest fire in the history of that State. Take a look at my own home State, the State of Colorado, the Haymen fire, hundreds of thousands of acres in that State, in the State of Colorado, the largest fire in its history.

We have had massive fires this year. You cannot allow a forest, whether it is right next to what is called the urban interface, which means right next to the communities, whether it is

right next to the communities or whether it is deep into the forests, you cannot allow those forests to accumulate the kind of growth that they have accumulated. You have got to manage those forests. And just by common sense we cannot let fire run wild. We still have to control fire. Controlled fires are one of the tools that we can help to treat and thin forests, but it is by no means the only tool, and it is by no means a major tool. Because, frankly, one out of every 20 controlled fires we have we lose control of them. That is what happened down in Mexico. That is what happened in the great Yellowstone fire a few years ago. We lost control of a controlled burn.

We have to go in there and manage these forests. The best people to manage those forests are not the public relations or political strategists for Earth First, the Wilderness Society and the National Sierra Club. Those are not the people that should be managing our forests. Nor should the Congressmen be managing our forests.

The people that ought to manage our forests are the people who are educated about forest science from some of the best universities in the country. Colorado State University, for example. From the people who have their hands in the forest soil every day of the week. From the experts on forest policy, on trees, how to grow trees, what is the proper amount of balance in that ecosystem that we have out there. Those are the people whose opinions should primarily drive forest fire policy and forest health policy in this country.

Now, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, and that committee has oversight responsibility on all the forests in the Nation. And I am telling you, under my direction on that committee, our committee is determined to try and get management of the forests back to the scientists of the forests. But it is no easy task. I can tell you that the Wilderness Society, the National Sierra Club and their cohorts, the Earth First and some of these other organizations, they do not want to give up that territory. They have enjoyed the power of being able to control the management of America's forests through emotional arguments, through political, strategized, public relations campaigns; and you can pick up and see advertisements about it; and what has happened, I will tell you that some of the people in some of these organizations are well intended. But what we are running into right now is obstructionism. The radical organizations are trying to litigate, paralysis by analysis, and every time that you talk about the necessity to go into a forest and help thin it out for the forest's health, to help prevent fires, and whether there is a fire or not, just for the health of the forest in general because the scientists say that is the thing to do, do you know what happens? Right away we get some of the

radical organizations, many of which do not even live near that forest, start filing actions and appeals in the courtroom. Our litigation today runs 3 to 5 to 10 years on some of these treatment projects.

Now, I have proposed a bill and it is a bill with bipartisan support. It is a bill that we have bipartisan working groups on. It is the most promising bill we have in the U.S. House of Representatives for a bipartisan compromise to help us go in and treat these forests. And guess what happens? We have not even got off first base. We have just come up with the idea, hey, let us stay within the environmental laws but let us stop this paralysis by analysis. Let us stop these organizations, from Earth First, for example, or the Wilderness Society from being able to litigate this from here as far as time can see, from one court to the next court to the next court. Let us put aside the spin that every time we want to clean out a forest that there must be some under-the-table deal with some lumber company out there.

What we are attempting to do with our bill to keep the environmental regulations that we have, keep public input, this is the forest of the public and the input of the public is absolutely crucial; but the public input should not go on and on and on. At some point you must make a decision. At some point we need to move on these forests.

Right now we have 175 million acres of forest property; 175 million acres that has not been treated; 75 million acres of that property is ready to explode, especially when we have a summer like the summer we just got through with serious droughts in many of these States and we saw what happened. Just a simple cigarette in Durango, Colorado, a simple cigarette that was thrown out a window blew up a fire that burned tens and tens and tens of thousands of acres, destroyed homes. And after it destroyed the homes, it brings the mudslides that destroy more homes.

Some of this can be prevented through proper management of our forests; and not only just the fires, our wildlife needs proper management in the forests. Good wildlife habitat has meadows in it. You have better wildlife habitat on an average piece of land, let us say an average acre of land, you have better wildlife habitat, better plant habitat, better habitat for the entire ecosystem all around if you just have 20 or 30 trees per acre instead of 4, 5, 600 trees per acre, where the sun cannot get in; where if there is a fire it goes from canopy to canopy; where it burns so intense that it sterilizes the soil.

We are not just talking about forest fires. We are talking about wildlife. We are talking about forest fires. We are talking about the plants and the other things that are important for the whole system to balance out there. But we are having a very difficult time

being able to let the scientists come back in and manage the forests. And in large part it is because of a very aggressive political campaign which involves buying advertising in newspaper, radio ads and so on by different organizations. I think Earth First is in there. The Wilderness Society is in there. Of course, the National Sierra Club is in there. Greenpeace, some of these organizations, they are doing everything they can to make sure that we do not bring science into the forests.

That is not what has happened here on the House floor. That is not what is happening here with my colleagues.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have finally said, Look, enough is enough. We have got to do something about the management of this forest. I have got people like the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), a very driven, very focused and very recognized environmentalist in the United States Congress. I have got the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). He and I have clashed from the entire time I have been up here. He is very ardent on his issues on the environment, a very strong proponent of the environment. I have the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), from the logging areas up in Oregon, who is a very strong proponent of the environment. Lumber is an important industry up in his district. He understands it. I have got myself. I have got other Members, Democrat and Republican, who have come together to try and structure a bill that keeps us within the environmental laws, that gives us the protection of environmental laws, that gives us public input, but allows this process to go forward. It stops paralysis by analysis. It does not allow these decisions to be made simply because you are able to stall it out through litigation, because some wealthy organization can file lawsuit after lawsuit after lawsuit.

And many of the mechanical treatment projects, about half the mechanical treatment projects we had lately, half of them were appealed. Half of them get into this paralysis by analysis. Now, not all of them were appealed by environmental organizations, and that is to their credit. And not all environmental organizations are being obstructionists in regards to what we are trying to do. We have some moderate, good, level-headed people out there that want something done with the forests.

So when I address the group, I am really addressing the most radical segment of an environmental community. And I am begging that segment, we have called them on the phone. We have begged them to come to the table; not to come to the table to fight, not to come to the table carrying protest signs, not to come to the table threatening more litigation; to come to the table just like we did with the Great Sand Dunes in my bill in Colorado; like

we did with the Spanish Peaks, my bill in Colorado; like we did with the Black Canyon Park, the Campbell bill in Colorado. We were able to get local people, local environmental communities together and we were able to customize. And that is what this bill does.

This allows our local environmental communities to come together with our local timber industries' representatives, for example, or the people that recreate or the wildlife experts. The wildlife people have a big opinion here because, as I said earlier, a healthy forest is very, very important for good healthy wildlife.

□ 2015

This bill will allow decisions to be made with public input, with judicial input. We just do not allow it to go on forever and ever and ever. This bill has been endorsed by newspapers as a reasonable approach.

What are we seeing? We are seeing the national organizations, primarily located in Washington, D.C., or primarily located outside the public lands, pooling large sums of money to run commercials. That is how threatened they are by the fact that science might come back to the forest, to run commercials by full-page newspaper advertising, talking about how bad this bill is; and they have never even seen the bill, to the best of my knowledge.

My point here tonight is we have got forests that are in real trouble. We have got wildlife out there that is in real trouble. We have an environment out there that is in real trouble, and a lot of it is because of the fact that we are not allowing the people who know best, our forest scientists, our wildlife experts, our water and aquatic life experts, we are not allowing them to manage the forest based on science. Instead, we are seeing the forests managed by litigation that stalls and stalls and stalls and by radical environmental organizations that fund political campaigns as if they are running somebody for office, running public relation campaigns which, by the way, they cannot put as newspaper articles because newspaper articles have to be at least a little bit factually correct. Their newspaper advertisements do not have to be. So they run it as paid advertisements throughout the public lands area.

Our young people, it is amazing, in our schools are not being given the education they need to understand that the science of the forest is a very complicated issue; and we need to let the scientists do it, not the elected office people, although they should set the policy, with input from the people that elect them, with input from the public, and we should not let these forests be run by Earth First.

I do not think Earth First or Greenpeace or the Wilderness Society or the National Sierra Club, and the National Sierra Club up until this summer's firefighting and the same with the Wilderness Society were not pro-

ponents of going in and treating a forest and thinning out. Now all of the sudden they have changed their leaf, and they are in favor of it, but only as it faces the city, as if none of these problems with wildlife, too many trees per acre, too much foliage or other problems occur anywhere but on the front of the forest. It does not occur in the middle of the forest, on our watersheds and so on, according to some of these people.

My committee is bound and determined to come up with a fair, common-sense policy. It is not our intent to shortcut anybody from public input. It is not the intent to do anything except allow the forest service experts, the wildlife experts and so on to get their opportunity to come in and manage the forests as they ought to be managed.

These forests are absolutely critical for the health of this country; and they are absolutely, they are eminently important for those of us who live out in the forests, who are completely surrounded by the forests, who are completely surrounded by public lands. We want good public land policy; and we want the people who live in those public lands, regardless of what side of the issue they are on, we want people who live within the borders of those public lands to have input as to what goes on with those public lands.

It is my intent to continue to pursue on a bipartisan basis, which I think is very important, and I intend to pursue in good faith discussions with people such as the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), and a number of others out here, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), to pursue good sound forest health policies. That is our goal and it is our target.

Let me shift gears very quickly and spend my remaining time talking about an issue far afield from forest health and forest management. I want to speak this evening about the situation with President Bush and Iraq.

I have a couple of posters I would like to start the conversation out with. This is a quote to my left here, and I would like my colleagues to read along with me. This is from President Bill Clinton. This quote is 4 or 5 years ago. This is what Bill Clinton said about Saddam Hussein. What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply, they are talking about inspections, and the disarmament, to disarm the weapons that we know Saddam Hussein is building, has or soon will be in the possession of, so what if Saddam Hussein fails to comply, and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route?

Keep in mind what the former President is saying here, if we fail to act or if we take an ambiguous third route. What he means by "ambiguous third route" is that Saddam Hussein comes out and puts some type of condition on inspections or tries to come up with some type of alternative other than in-

spection that would allow him to hide the weapons or would allow him to develop the weapons, without intrusion by the rest of the world or if we take some ambiguous third route, which gives him yet more opportunities to develop his program of weapons of mass destruction, and continue to press for the release of the sanctions and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made. Solemn commitments that he, Saddam Hussein, made and I am going to go through those commitments with my colleagues. Well, he, speaking about Saddam Hussein, will conclude that the international community has lost its will.

He will then conclude, here in the red, he will then conclude that he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction.

Let us take a look. As my colleagues remember, Iraq is the country that invaded, without cause, without cause, without retribution, invaded a smaller country, the country of Kuwait in the early 1990s. In the process of that invasion, they caused massive, massive human fatalities. They killed thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of Kuwaitis, men, women and children. They killed without discrimination.

It was only because of the United States of America and the coalition that it built with its European partners, and their partners throughout the world which also included, frankly, some cooperation from Russia and cooperation from China on the U.N. Security Council and so on. The rest of the world decided through a coalition led by the United States that they would not allow this to stand, that Saddam Hussein would not be allowed to ravage and savagely go into a small country, devastate its population, destroy its economy and occupy its lands. So we did Desert Storm. We led the fight.

We bent back and we liberated Kuwait. Iraq, by the way, their famous Right Guard or whatever, their fighting force, their supreme fighting force, they ran. This huge powerful war machine of Iraq collapsed within days to the fire power and to the strength of the United States of America and to the world coalition that followed.

Iraq made certain promises. Specifically, Iraq through Saddam Hussein, he made them, he made commitments to the United Nations. He made commitments to the rest of the world, and he promised to live with those commitments as long as his country existed. He has broken the commitments that he made, and the commitments that he made he broke 16 times, at least 16 times.

He kicked out the inspectors and then he went out and solicited by saying that his people were starving to death. By the way, he diverted money, instead of going to the people, his people, he put the money into his palaces. He has 14 massive palaces, like 14 Pepsi centers. That is how big these palaces are. They are great big stadium-types

of homes. He put the money into that and the military, and he allowed his people to starve, and he tried to put a guilt feeling, a guilt complex on the rest of the world, saying that he picked on me and how soon some of the world forgot how savagely he killed those people in Kuwait, as savagely as Hitler killed people in his invasions.

Do not make any mistake about it. This man is crazy. Crazy is almost a complimentary word. He is a sick, destructive killer. He killed in Kuwait. He even attempted to assassinate our President, George Bush, Senior, our former President, George Bush, Senior. He went and gased his own people and some of the Kurds. He gased entire villages, and there is no doubt about that. There is no question. He admitted to it. He took some pride in it.

The United Nations came up with some resolutions; and they said we will stop the invasion of Iraq, the coalition invasion of Iraq if you comply. Will you comply? And Saddam Hussein says, yes, I will comply. He signed the documents. He swore to the documents, and over the last 9 years, he swore to the documents. Year after year he swore to the documents. Year after year he swore to the documents. Year after year he swore to the documents. Year after year he said I do not have weapons of mass destruction; bring in the inspectors. Time after time after time after time he blocked the inspections in his country.

We can actually realize a great victory. President Bush, despite the diplomatic pressure that has been put against him by some in the world, despite some of the pressure, and unfortunately by some of our Democratic leadership within this Congress, despite the pressure that his approach was the wrong approach, he has at least cornered Saddam Hussein; and thanks to President Bush, Saddam Hussein, at least at this point, has come back and said he will allow inspections, unconditional inspections in his country. That was not Saddam Hussein's position when President Clinton was there, and I am not trying to be partisan. I am just telling my colleagues this is a position of noninspection that he has been locked in for some time.

President Bush has forced Saddam to play his hand, and his hand right now is to allow inspections; and the President and the administration and this Congress ought to take him up on that offer, and we ought to send inspectors in there by the plane-load, and we ought to inspect everything. We ought to look at every palace. We ought to look in every closet. We ought to look under every street. We ought to look at their nuclear facilities, their power plants; and when we find weapons, we should demand that they be disarmed, and if they are not disarmed, the coalition should go in there and disarm them. This man has a history of lying and deception. Let me give my colleagues an example.

U.N. Security Resolution 678, Iraq must comply with the resolution in regards to the illegal invasion of Kuwait. They broke it.

U.N. Resolution 688, Iraq must release prisoners detained during the civil war. They broke it. Same, 688, Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War. They did not do it.

U.N. Resolution 687, April 3, 1991, Iraq must not use, develop, construct or acquire any weapons of mass destruction. They have. They have defied this, but they have acquired the weapons they are not supposed to acquire. Iraq must not commit or support terrorism or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. They allow terrorist organizations in Iraq; and by the way, these are the kind of organizations that we are speaking about in Iraq.

Take a look at this poster. If this does not give my colleagues a sobering moment, I do not know what will. Follow me to the left by looking at the poster: "We are emerging stronger and will hit America's shopping malls, stadiums and kindergartens. This is our promise." The al Qaeda. This quote is from last week. This quote to my left, look at that, kindergartens. They fully intend to kill every man, woman and child in America they can get their hands on. Iraq is not supposed to have anything to do with these kind of organizations; but they do, in violation of the U.N. resolutions.

U.N. Resolution 707, Iraq must cease attempts to conceal and move weapons of mass destruction and related materials. They broke it. Iraq must make a full and final and complete disclosure of its weapons of mass destruction. They broke that commitment.

U.N. Resolution 715, October 1991, Iraq must fully cooperate with the United Nations and the inspectors. They broke it.

U.N. Resolution 949, October 15, 1994, Iraq must not utilize its military and other forces in a hostile manner. They fire at the United States and British and coalition aircraft every day of the week we are in the air. They broke it.

□ 2030

Iraq must fully cooperate with the inspectors. They broke it.

U.N. Resolution 1051, Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and allow immediate, unconditional, unrestricted access. They broke it.

U.N. Resolution 1060, they must cooperate with the weapons inspectors and allow requested access. They broke it.

U.N. Resolution 1115, June 21, they must give further requirements in regards to inspections. They broke that one.

U.N. Resolution 1134, they must give unrestricted access, another access issue. They broke that.

U.N. Resolution 1137 condemns the continued violations of Iraq of previous resolutions, reaffirms their responsibility, reaffirms the responsibility of

Iraq to carry out their commitments. They broke it.

They broke 1194, 1204, 1205, and 1284. Resolution after resolution after resolution after resolution, the Iraqi leadership has lied, been deceitful, and broken resolutions one after another.

In fact, I am not sure there is one United Nations resolution out there where Iraq has kept its word, that relates to their invasion of Kuwait or access to their weapons of mass destruction, or that relates to their helping train terrorists.

My congratulations to President Bush. President Bush and his team, Mr. Powell, Mr. Rumsfeld and Ms. Rice, have forced Saddam to at least say he will allow inspections again. And for his own good health, I think it would be beneficial for him this time, instead of lying about it, that he follow through with exactly what he was supposed to do for the last 10 years, and that is to allow full, complete inspections of the facilities anywhere in his country those inspectors intend to visit.

This President has done something that no other government in the world has been able to do with Iraq. In a period of 2 or 3 months, by directly making it clear that Iraq will not continue to flagrantly violate the conditions of the United Nations agreements that they agreed to and they knew about and we agreed to and we knew about, this President has drawn the line in the sand.

Guess what got results? We only get results out of countries like Iraq by forcing it. We have got to use a force play. There is no negotiating with this guy. There is no loving and hugging and telling him let us have some soft talk, some warm, fuzzy discussions, and promise us that you are going to comply and not poison your people any more, not kill innocent men, women and children any more, and have some type of freedom in your country, have some kind of respect for rights of women in your country.

The only way to get it is to force it, and this President has forced. This is just the opening stage, the first step in bringing Iraq back in with the world community, in bringing Iraq back in line with what we hope would be a contribution to peace in this world.

President Bush is exactly where he needs to be. He is right on track. He has, without the firing of a single shot, forced the world's madman to open his country to inspections.

Now, if this madman fails to do that, I think President Bush will successfully put a coalition through United Nations resolution to fire a shot if necessary to force Iraq to come back in with the world community and to stop building weapons of mass destruction, weapons that would make September 11 look small in proportion to the type of devastation that they could do.

President Bush, since September 11, has found a more focused purpose and has exercised good leadership. I have to



tell Members, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the Democrat leadership have stalled. They have criticized the President. Look at what has happened in the last few days. The President is accomplishing what we want to accomplish. So in a bipartisan effort, we should pass a resolution in this House supporting the President. We should pass a resolution supporting the President in a way that he continues down the path that he is headed, and that is a path that so far just in the past couple of weeks, his strong movements, his very directed comments as to what was going to happen and his directed action, has forced Iraq to play their first hand. They threw down their hand, and they are allowing inspections.

It may not work, but you better not mess around with this country and with the U.N. coalition. This country, under the direction of President Bush, is not going through this exercise in futility. President Bush does not consider this an exercise. He considers this, and this Nation considers this, and the United Nations Security Council should consider this and do consider it, a very serious matter which will be followed through with.

We intend to follow through and disarm Iraq from weapons of mass destruction. We will accomplish that goal, and we will accomplish that goal under the leadership of President Bush. To this point we have done pretty well so far. It is just the beginning. But so far the President has had tremendous success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Democratic leadership, I am begging the Democratic leadership, put aside your partisanship and your objections on the Sunday talk shows and help our President help our effort here. Just in the opening stage, we are going to be able to get inspectors into Iraq. If the going gets tough, stick with us. It is time.

I have to say, Members, a lot of Democrats not in leadership are supporting this and are supporting the President. But the leadership needs to quit playing politics and come on board with us. This matter is much too serious for partisanship. I invite them on the team. The President has done a good job so far, and so has his team.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT FOR SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, and it is certainly not the first time, I am coming to the floor to talk about the need for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, and also to deal with the rising costs for prescription drugs. I think this Congress has an obligation before we adjourn in another month or so to address both

issues because the bottom line is that not only more senior, more Americans are facing rising prescription drug costs, and I think it is primarily due to the fact that the brand name drug industry is trying to control prices in a way to make sure they receive maximum profits and influence the United States Congress both in terms of political contributions, influence the public with TV ads, all of which make it very difficult to address the issue and the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and some sort of effort to control prices or at least bring prices down because of the impact that it is having on our health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to tell any American about the rising cost of prescription drugs. As the cost goes up, more and more Americans are not able to afford their medicine. That has an impact because, as we know, certainly in the last 20 years, certainly in the last generation, prescription drug medications have become a preventive measure. In other words, if you are able to take certain prescription drugs, you do not need to be hospitalized or go to a nursing home or have some sort of radical medical procedures. Prescription drugs essentially are a form of prevention, a more serious interference in terms of medical care.

I just think that it is very unfortunate that we do not address the problem of rising cost and what it means for the average American, particularly for the average senior.

I wanted to start out this evening by giving some information about the level of price increases. This is an analysis that was done by Families U.S.A. just a couple of months ago in June of this year. It says that the prices of the 50 most prescribed drugs rose on average by nearly 3 times the rate of inflation last year.

The study analyzed price increases for the 50 most commonly prescribed drugs for seniors for the last year, and that is January 2001 through January 2002, and then for the past 5 years and before that the last 10 years. The report found that nearly three-quarters, 36 out of 50, of these drugs rose at least 1.5 times the rate of inflation, while one-third, 8 out of 50, rose 3 more times the rate of inflation.

The drugs that experienced the largest price increases were the following, and I am not going to get into all of the details, but it gives some incredible examples. Demadex and Premarin rose nearly 7 times the rate of inflation. Plavix rose more than 6 times the rate of inflation. Zestril, Lipitor, and Combivent rose more than 5 times the rate of inflation.

The interesting thing about it is that if we compare price increases of generic versions of these same brand name drugs, and this is what the report did, the report showed that the brand name drugs rose 4.5 times faster than the rate of price increases for generic drugs, 8.1 percent versus 1.8 percent, and 10 of the 50 most prescribed drugs

for seniors are generic, and the average annual price for those drugs was \$375. Nine of these 10 drugs did not increase in price at all.

The point that that makes, and I think it is particularly important in light of the Democrats making a push in the next few days to try to get a bill brought up in committee that seeks to encourage more generic drugs, is that the brand name drug prices were increasing rapidly, whereas generic drugs were not.

When we talk about generic drugs, a lot of people are familiar with generics and understand what it means, but a lot of people are not. What we have found repeatedly is that if we can bring a generic drug to market, in other words, if the patent for the brand name drug expires and you can have a number of companies selling a generic drug in lieu of the patent drug, that will significantly bring down costs. Generics are one way of bringing down costs, and that also needs to be addressed by this Congress.

What are the Republicans and the Democrats doing about this problem? We know we have a problem of price increases with prescription drugs. We know that Medicare right now does not include any kind of prescription drug benefit unless you happen to be in an HMO, and many of the HMOs have dropped seniors in the last couple of years.

So what is the Congress doing about it? Well, the Democrats have really come up with a very simple solution. The Democrats have proposed basically expanding Medicare to provide a prescription drug benefit. Those Members who are familiar with Medicare know that under part B of Medicare, which takes care of the doctors' bills, basically what seniors do, and 99 percent of the seniors do this when they participate in Medicare, they pay a monthly premium, so much a month. It is usually \$45-50 a month, and they pay a deductible of \$100 for their first doctor bill. But after that, 80 percent of the doctors' bills are paid for by the Federal Government under Medicare, and they pay 20 percent up to a certain amount when the government pays 100 percent.

The Democrats proposed and we have legislation that would accomplish the same goal and do it in the same way, provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare that was guaranteed, that was universal, that all seniors and everyone eligible for Medicare would take advantage of, and essentially you would pay \$25 a month premium, you would have a deductible of \$100, and after that 80 percent of your prescription drug costs would be paid for by Medicare by the Federal Government. There would be a 20 percent copay.

□ 2045

And after someone had shelled out \$2,500 out of pocket, if that were the case in paying the 20 percent, then all of their prescription drug bills would