

America has always been willing to sacrifice to win its wars. She still is. But she must be asked by leaders who are willing to speak candidly about what is at stake and what it will take to win. She must be asked by those with faith in the essential generosity of the American people and who will not tell us that we can have our cake and eat it too. Our prosperity and that of our children may depend on it.

Mr. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) for their remarks this evening.

I think we have heard for just about the last hour, Madam Speaker, some really good advice about what we need to be looking at in the future and what we need to do as a country. We can always choose the easy path; or we can try to do what is right by our children, by our grandchildren, and for our country. Doing what is right may sometimes be harder, but it has its own rewards.

I think we need to look at fiscal responsibility and a plan back to fiscal discipline for the future of our great country.

THE BUDGET; AND THE LAYOUT OF THE EASTERN UNITED STATES VERSUS THE WESTERN UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, before I start on my night-side chat, so to speak, to cover some issues that are very important in regards to the layout of the United States, the eastern United States and the western United States, and how the lands are situated, I do want to bring up a couple of points that were discussed by some of the previous speakers.

Specifically, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). The gentleman from the State of Texas says that Americans, speaking of the war in Afghanistan, and I am quoting him fairly accurately I think, he says that Americans are taking a pass on this. I am not sure that that is what the gentleman intended. In fact, many of the remarks I heard previously are remarks I agree with. But nobody is taking a pass on what happened on September 11 in this country, the least of which would be the American people.

Because of the fact that we have to go into debt to finance this war effort does not mean the American people are taking a pass on it. Our situation on September 10 was a whole lot different than our situation on September 11. We

did not anticipate on September 10 having to spend the kind of money that we realized on September 11 and days that followed were necessary. No American is taking a pass on this. Every American is contributing to this. We have a lot of Americans that are working in this country, and their tax dollars are going into this.

So I do not think the gentleman really intended his remarks to be quite as stinging as at least I took them.

□ 2200

Madam Speaker, let me mention a couple of other things that I think were brought out in the gentleman's remarks. Not speaking specifically to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), but some of the people that share his ideas, they speak courageously about the fact that we need to have a balanced budget and vote no, but there are some who speak very bravely on one hand, but when it comes on votes which impact your State, you vote the other direction; you vote to continually increase the budget.

You talk about how fiscally conservative you are and how we need to keep the budget in balance and how the other party is trying to spend our children's future into oblivion, and I do not know how many times I hear the term Social Security. Show me one Congressman who wants to eliminate Social Security. Well, the war in Afghanistan, the spending on the war in Afghanistan, we threaten Social Security. If we do not win that war, everything is threatened.

Madam Speaker, I would be very interested in seeing where some of my colleagues that have just spoken, for example, where their votes were on the farm bill. The farm bill has a great impact on the State of Texas. That farm bill has gone up dramatically. That is a tough vote to take. That is one of the votes that they speak of. Maybe it is not the popular thing to do, but it is the right thing to do. The right thing to do. Let us check a specific legislator or Congressman who speaks about how we are going into debt and how the budget continues to increase; and if they are from a farm State, let us see how they vote on the farm bill or the highway bill, the bill that benefits their State with specific projects.

On one hand they say that they voted for new highways, and then they go to the conservative sections of their State and say I want a balanced budget. We cannot have our cake and eat it too; but at the microphone there is an obligation to say that Americans are not getting a pass. We are all contributing. It has to be a bipartisan debate.

I should say, and I notice one of my colleagues from the State of Texas is standing here, the gentleman's comments were pretty much in line. I do not disagree with what the gentleman from Texas said. I think it is very important that we have a balanced budget and we need to keep a handle on the debt. The management of that debt was

a whole lot different on September 10 than it was on September 11, or 2 years ago when our economy was booming than it is today when our revenues have decreased.

The management of the debt was so important 3 years ago, but now take a look at what that debt is today and take a look at the small businesses that are going out of business today. They need some tax relief. This is not the time to increase taxes on small businesses.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, concerning what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) was saying a moment ago, was also characterized in my own comments, is in agreement with the gentleman's statements concerning September 11, 2001. That is the point that we are making tonight and we have been trying to make, is that things did change. Therefore, we do not necessarily believe that the budget that was put in place last year before 9-11 should be arbitrarily sent forward without adjusting not only for the expenditures, but also for the fact that we are going borrowing the Social Security trust funds in order to meet current operating expenses.

We would welcome the opportunity to work together with the other side in the same spirit that the gentleman began his remarks tonight. Things have changed; and, therefore, we believe that we need to change our economic game plan to bring us back into balance, and we look forward to working with the gentleman.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not disagree with the gentleman. My sensitivity arose when I heard one of my colleagues talk about how Americans are taking a pass on the war in Afghanistan. We have disputes here regarding our budget, and we have disputes on which programs ought to be funded and which ought not to be funded; but I can tell my colleagues, there are some who stand up on one hand and say we need a balanced budget. On the other hand, when a huge bill like a farm bill or highway bill comes which has an impact on your district, you vote for those projects. That is where you get into problems here. I am just saying if you are going to preach the good word, you ought to follow the good word. That is all I am saying.

Let me move on to the issue that I came here primarily to address this evening. I find myself continually taking the microphone on the House floor to try and talk and have a conversation about those of us who live in the West, our issues in the West compared with those issues that you deal with in the East. Instead of taking on a whole gamut of issues, I have tried to narrow it down to two specific issues I want to

cover in the next few weeks, issues of which there are distinct geographical lines between the eastern United States and the western United States.

Those two issues are, number one, water; number two, public lands. Tonight I intend spending most of my time on public lands, but I think it is important to cover first of all the water issue. The eastern United States has suffered from a drought this year, including the Rocky Mountains. Colorado, where I come from, we have not had the kind of snowfall we are accustomed to.

But on an average year in the East, one of your big problems is getting rid of the water. Our problem is storing the water. Unfortunately, when the good Lord made our country, the good Lord did not equally divide the water resources with the population. The good Lord did not spread the water equally across the country.

In fact, if Members look at the map of the United States, and if I drew a line that went from here, that came down probably about like this, and then up about here, this section of the country to my left would have 73 percent of the water. So this section would have 73 percent of the water in the country.

If you went over here in the Northeast and took a little box like this and came down here, so you intersect at this point right here, that section of the country would have about 13 percent of the water. Then the balance of the country, this huge portion right here, the portion where I live, has 14 percent of the water, although it has over half the land mass of the Nation.

So water is a huge difference between the West and East. The State of Colorado, our lowest elevation is about 3,500 or 3,400 feet. Colorado is the highest State in the Nation. It is the highest area of the continent, the Rocky Mountains. Colorado is the only State in the Union that has no incoming water for its use. All of the water in the State of Colorado flows out for other people's use.

The Colorado River, for example, when we compare it to the Mississippi, it is not as big as compared to the Mississippi, but it is critical in the West. The Colorado River supplies water for 23 States, 24 million people, probably more now because that statistic is a couple of years old; 24 million people depend on that water for their drinking water. The Colorado River is one of five rivers that have their headwaters in the State of Colorado. We have the Rio Grande, the Platte, the Arkansas, the Colorado, et cetera. That is why they call Colorado the Mother of Rivers. But water is something that I urge my eastern colleagues, when we have issues that come up and we hear about our dam storage projects or Lake Powell or Lake Mead, do not summarily agree with some of the more radical movements in our country that say those dams ought to be taken down. These dams are critical for our existence in the West.

In the West from a State like Colorado, for a period of about 60 to 90 days we have all of the water we could possibly use. When does that period of time fall? That period of time falls starting about right now. It is called the spring runoff. In Colorado we have over 300 days of sunshine a year, but that does not mean that it is warm enough to melt the snow. This time of year we get temperatures close to 70 degrees and drop down to 20 degrees at night. The spring is starting. Those massive amounts of snow that have accumulated in the mountains will begin this runoff.

For this 60- to 90-day period of time, water is plentiful; and that usually does not coincide with the time of need for agriculture. Most of the water across our country is used for agriculture. It is not used for direct human consumption, although obviously going into agriculture, it ends up in human consumption. It is that period of time after the 60 to 90 days that we are concerned. We have to have the ability to store the water.

If we take a look back at the Native Americans and the first people that occupied the West to the best of our knowledge, you will find that they stored water. Why? Because you cannot exist in that country without the storage of water. We do not have enough water on a continual basis that comes down for us to be able to exist year round. That is why we have those storage projects; and, unfortunately, we cannot ever really time what days are going to be the warmest days. Some years the sun in Colorado, which is almost always out during the day, the sun in Colorado sometimes heats up faster than we thought. Days in March, for example, which we thought would be around 40 or 50 degrees may jump up to 70 degrees. So the water may run off sooner than expected.

There are a lot of factors of nature we have to deal with; and, yes, we have to alter nature, not alter nature where there is permanent damage, but to provide for mankind. We cannot just ignore the use of the water. We have to divert and grow our crops. I ask for understanding because I know that in some of these upcoming bills, including the farm bill, there are I think people with good behavior, colleagues with good intent, who are inserting water language in things like the farm bill that do not impact people in the East because they do not deal with the issue. The water law in the West is different than the water law in the East, but the ramifications to the people of the West on some of the water language that is being inserted in some of these bills is huge. It has very significant impacts, and rarely does an Eastern Congressman insert into a bill language dealing with water that has a beneficial or a positive meaning for water in the West.

We constantly find ourselves in the West, because we have the smallest population in the country, we con-

stantly find ourselves under siege when it comes to issues of water. I am asking for more understanding from my colleagues of the East because a lot of people depend on that water that comes out of the West. A lot of my colleagues that are from the East do not really know. I bet some did not know until tonight that our water law is significantly different than the water law in the East. Take a look at what the water laws are for the State of Massachusetts or the State of Kentucky, and compare it to the water laws of the State of Colorado or the State of Utah. We have two entirely different systems, water systems, and the law recognizes that.

That is why we have two distinct sets of water laws for those States. But it is unfair for one State to impose obligations or to impose some kind of commitment on another State's water system when that State does not have a clear understanding of the water law of the other State. Or, unfortunately, in some cases they do have a clear understanding of the damage that that language will do to water in the West, and they intentionally insert it in.

□ 2215

That is why we in the West constantly feel we have to be on guard, especially when it comes to our water issues.

We could talk about water for the rest of the evening, but I want to cover that in more detail later on. I want to talk about now the other distinct difference between the East and the West, and that is our lands. Public lands.

Public lands are just exactly how it sounds, lands owned by the public, lands owned by the government. In the East, there are very few lands that are owned by the government. In the East, when we first settled this country, of course, our population came in the East. Our primary population was on the East Coast. The idea, when our country was first settled, that the government would own the land was only an idea of temporary duration. People were trying to get away from the British throne where the government controlled you. They wanted independence. They wanted the ability to cultivate their own lands. They wanted the ability to own land, to have the right of private property.

And so when our country was first settled, any lands that were owned by the government or conquered by the government or purchased by the government were very quickly turned over to private ownership. People got to enjoy that right of private property.

But soon what happened is, they began to settle the West. You began to see a vast accumulation. If you look over here on this chart, the color on this chart reflects government lands. Look at the East. Where is the white part of the chart? It is in the eastern United States. Your public lands, your massive amounts of public lands are not in the East; they are in the West.

They are not spread evenly around the country. The public lands are concentrated in one portion of our country and that is the western United States.

Needless to say, there are big differences between somebody who lives on land that is not surrounded by public lands, where the government owns very little of your neighbor's land, or is not your neighbor, versus somebody who has the Federal Government as a neighbor, who is completely surrounded by government ownership.

My district is a good example. In my district, there are approximately 120 communities; 119 of those 120 communities are completely surrounded by Federal lands. If you take a look at my district, we have four national parks. We have any number of national monuments. We have BLM lands. If you take a look at this, just make that comparison, I will point out, if you look to my left, my district is right here, this colored area of the map. Compare that even to eastern Colorado or compare that to some of these other States, Illinois or even back here in Kentucky, Virginia, some of these States over here on the East Coast. You do not see that public land.

And so we in the West, just like our water, feel like we have to take even a more aggressive or progressive step toward trying to work with our colleagues in the East to say, look, we are dealing with something that you never deal with. We are dealing with something of which our life is entirely dependent upon and you do not have to worry about that dependency. In the East you are not dependent on Federal lands or public lands for your well-being. In the West, we are completely surrounded by them.

What do I mean by dependence on public lands? Think about it. Pick a town that many of you would know right off the top, Aspen, Colorado. I was just in Aspen yesterday. Aspen is a community completely surrounded by public lands. You cannot drive to Aspen without crossing public lands. You cannot fly to Aspen without flying over public lands. You cannot recreate near Aspen without recreating on public lands. You cannot have any water in Aspen without getting it either coming across public lands, stored upon Federal lands or originating on Federal lands. You cannot have a cellular tower without it being on public lands. You cannot have power come in your community without it coming across public lands. These are issues that for the most part my good colleagues in the East do not have to deal with. And we have to deal with it.

And so my purpose here this evening is to just kind of give you an idea of the vastness of the public lands and the concentration of those public lands in the western United States.

If you take a look at the forest, we often hear about the forests in the West. Here is an interesting factor for you. Do you know that the forests in the eastern United States, the forests

over in this area as compared to the forests in the western United States are about equal? That is kind of surprising. In other words, the forest land in the East is about equal to the forest land in the West. So what is the difference? The difference is that the forests in the East are privately owned. The forests in the West are government-owned.

Here is another interesting thing for you. More than 80 percent, if you take a look at the lands here, 80 percent of your public lands are in the West. Take a look at your national parks. There are at least 375 to 400 national parks. Let us say it is 375. Of the 375 national parks, 114 of those parks are in the West. So roughly a third to almost a fourth. A little over a third of the national parks are in the West. But 87 percent of the national parklands are in the West.

So your national parks in the East, you may have a national park, but your land mass is very small. Why? Because it is primarily private property. But when you come to the West, we only have about one-fourth, a little over one-third of the parks, yet we have over 87 percent of the land that is located in the West.

Before I take this map off, let me just reemphasize. The color on this map depicts government lands. Let me give a little history, very briefly, before I take this map off. Primarily the reason that you have got these massive amounts of Federal lands, in the early days it was fully expected that the citizens of this country would have private property, the right to have private property. They were trying to escape the throne, so the government was not going to own that land. Then as the country began to expand, our leaders in Washington said, how do we encourage people to leave the comfort of the East Coast and to go west to conquer the land, so to speak?

Back then a deed did not mean anything. If John and Susan had a deed to a piece of property, it did not mean much like it does today. Today a deed protects your interest and protects your rights. You do not have to possess the land, to be on it, to own it. But in the old days, you had to be on the land probably with a six-shooter strapped to your side. You could not just have a deed. It did not mean much. You needed to get out there and sit on it.

And so what we saw happen was a policy begin to become developed that, look, we have got to give some kind of incentive to these people to go to the West. We cannot let this land go unoccupied or some other foreign country will take the land from us. We need to get our people onto these lands. How do we do it? And somebody came up with the idea, let's do the same thing that we did in the Revolutionary War. What we did in the Revolutionary War is, we tried to bribe the British soldiers to join the American forces, and in exchange for them deserting the British forces, we would give them land, land

that they could own, land that they could have of their own, land grants.

That is what our leaders in Washington, D.C., decided to do, give land grants to the settlers that go to the West. If they go out there, we will give them 160 acres if they till the land, cultivate the land, live on the land, and they use the land as if it were their own. We will give them 160 acres or 320 acres. As you can see, as depicted on this map, that worked pretty well until they hit this area.

What is this area? A good part of that area is the Rocky Mountains. What happens when you hit the mountains, when you hit 3,000 feet in elevation? That is the lowest elevation in the State of Colorado. Where I live is at about 5,000. The average elevation in the State of Colorado is 6,000 feet and this area of Colorado represents the highest place on the continent. When you get into the Rocky Mountains, all of a sudden instead of taking 160 acres to support a family, it may take 500 acres or 1,000 acres or 2,000 acres to support a family. You can feed a lot of cattle on 160 acres in the East. Sometimes you cannot even feed one cow on 160 acres in the West.

So they came running back to Washington, D.C., and said, look, the people are not settling in the mountains, they are going around. They are going to the valleys in California. They cannot support themselves with just 160 acres.

So a very conscious decision was made, not a decision to keep the land in the West in the government's hands so no generation could ever utilize that; in fact, just the opposite. The decision was made, look, because we have given so much land to the railroads and we are under a lot of political heat for doing that, we cannot really give out the 3,000 acres or 2,000 acres or whatever would be the working equivalent of 160 acres in the East, so let us go ahead and keep these lands in the government's name and let the people go out there and use the land as if it were their own. There are certain responsibilities that they would have to carry out, and as time goes by and we understand more of the issues of land use, of environmental use, of water and so on, we put more and more guidance in place of how to utilize those lands, but we have always protected the concept called multiple use, a land of many uses.

When I grew up, the government lands, as you entered government lands, especially as you entered national forests, there was always a sign there that said, for example, "You are entering the White River National Forest, a land of many uses."

That is how the land in the West was developed, the land of many uses, whether it is recreational uses, whether it is to cultivate a field, whether it is to build a home, whether it is to use the water, whether it is to protect and enjoy the environment in those areas, it is a blend of those uses. Oftentimes, here, we are challenged with very, I

guess, targeted groups, very special interest groups who live in the East and who enjoy the comfort of the East and who are not threatened by public lands. Their special interest is to eliminate our way of life in the West by eliminating the concept of multiple use.

We have right now, for example, dealing with public lands, some wealthy individuals who have moved into several of our States, including the State of Colorado, and are filing across-the-board blanket objections to every grazing permit, not grazing permits where they think they can prove somebody was bad, a bad operator on the land, and if we have got a bad operator on the land, get rid of them; we do not object to that.

But what they are doing is, they are taking their big money out of the East, they are taking the money in their pockets and they are putting it out and they are trying to eliminate all grazing, all use of the public lands for our farmers and ranchers. Remember, if you are talking about some State out here that does not have public lands, that is not a big issue to you. But if you are talking about the State of Colorado or Wyoming or Idaho or Utah or Montana, big parts of California, you are talking about our livelihood.

Talking about it: The elimination of our farmers and our ranchers to be able to utilize the land in a responsible fashion through a permit process that is monitored during the period of time that they utilize that, this group of wealthy individuals are filing legal actions and other types of actions to eliminate that use of public lands.

It is their goal, over time, to eliminate multiple use. They think the toughest people out there to take down will be the farmers and the ranchers, because there is still a feeling of romance about farming and ranching in our country. So they figure if they can take out the big ones first, then they can go after the other things that we depend upon.

For example, our usage of water. As I said earlier, keep in mind that in these vast areas of the West, almost all our water comes across Federal lands, is stored upon Federal lands or originates on Federal lands. So the next thing they will go after is any kind of use of water that flows across Federal lands or originates on Federal lands. And we have already seen some effort in that way.

Obviously, they are going to try to take out ski areas, eliminate the use of being able to ski. They will go after the recreational use. They have pretty well eliminated in many of these States timbering and things like that. So we have a big challenge out there facing these public lands.

To take a comparison, I want to show the U.S. holdings, the government holdings as they are in the United States. This is, I think, a very helpful chart. I will direct you to the chart to my left of major U.S. land holdings.

The Federal Government owns more than 31 percent of all the lands in the

United States. By the way, in my comments here, I am talking about the continental United States. In Alaska, I think 98 percent of that State is owned by the Federal Government. If you want to see what kind of impact it has on the Native Americans up there, of all the people that are in those lands, ask the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), for example.

□ 2230

Its impact is dramatic. State-owned, 197 million acres. The Federal Government owns about 700 million acres. These are interesting breakdowns. The BLM owns 268 million acres; the Forest Service, 231 million acres. Now, remember what I said. The forests in the East are about equal to the forests in the West, but the big difference between the forests located in the East and the forests located in the West is the forests in the East are privately owned. The forests in the West are owned by the Federal Government.

Other Federal, about 130 million acres. The Park Service has 75 million acres. Recognize my comment there earlier. We have about 375 national parks; 114 of those 375 are in the West. Although we only have 114 national parks, those national parks take in 87 percent, 87 percent of the Federal park land in this country.

Tribal lands. Now, look at this. The Bureau of Land Management, we really have two agencies out there that manage the land for the people. One of them is the United States Forest Service. That is right here. The Forest Service manages an area of the West larger than the size of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York all combined. That is Forest Service responsibilities.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for a land mass larger than California and Oregon combined, mostly the drier rangeland used for grazing, mineral and energy exploration, as well as recreation. Those two agencies manage, are the primary management agencies, for us, the people, for the Federal Government out in the West.

What I am asking my colleagues to do, and why we often find ourselves at battle, not Republican and Democrat, but a lot of times East to West, where we find those differences, the origin of a lot of those differences is the fact that we in the West are concerned that some of our colleagues in the East do not understand the differences in life-style that come about as a direct result of whether or not your land is owned by the government or the land you own is surrounded by the government.

Let me show another chart. Keep in mind what I said earlier about the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the State of Alaska, that 96 or 98 percent of that State is owned by the Federal Government. So you can see a difference.

I have prepared a chart that gives you some States in the West and the

amount of government ownership of land compared to States in the East. By the way, the population here is in States in the East. The majority of your population is on the East Coast and the State of California.

Let us look at these western States. First of all, this box: 88 percent, 88 percent of the Nation's Federal public lands outside of Alaska lie in 11 Western States. That is where I am from. That is the message; that is the story we are trying to tell tonight.

In one of my subsequent conversations with my colleagues here, I am going to bring some letters. I am going to tell you about some of the families in the West, about how the West was won, so to speak, about survival out there. It is tough. What you hear about are the Aspens and the areas like that, all in my district, which I am very proud of. But you need to hear about the little towns like Meker, Colorado, or Craig, Colorado, or Lander, Wyoming, or some these areas, and take a look at the good lifestyle that these people provide for their families.

But let me go on. Eleven contiguous western States, Nevada, 82, 83 percent roughly of that State is owned by the Federal Government. Compare it with Connecticut, less than 1 percent.

The State of Utah, 63 percent of the State of Utah is owned by the government; Rhode Island, about one-third of one percent.

Idaho, 61 percent owned by the government; New York, about three-fourths of one percent.

Oregon, 52 percent; Maine, just a little under 1 percent.

The State of Wyoming, almost half the State is owned by the government, compared to the State of Massachusetts, 1.3 percent of that State.

Arizona, 47 percent; Ohio, 1.3 percent.

California, almost half the State of California; Indiana, less than 2 percent.

Colorado, 36 percent; Pennsylvania, 2 percent.

New Mexico, 33 percent; Delaware, 2 percent.

Washington, 28 percent; Maryland, 2 percent.

Montana, 28 percent; New Jersey, 3 percent.

Where we see a difference, where we see a rift, so to speak, or see what we perceive as a lack of understanding, is from some of our colleagues in these States and the people of these States; and that is why I am standing here in front of you this evening.

When you take a look at the differences, what you have and what we have, and the differences it makes in your life style, whether it is whether you get water, whether it is your transportation, whether it is your recreation, whether it is your environment, this is where we see a lot of problems originate between the States, because we in the West oftentimes feel that our good friends and our fellow citizens in the East do not understand the need for us to have the concept of multiple use.

My guess is that in most of these States, go up to Rhode Island and stop

100 people on the street. Ask how many of them know what is the concept of multiple use, what does multiple use mean. Give them a hint: it applies to the Western United States. What does multiple use mean?

My guess is out of 100, 99 cannot tell you. I am not saying they are ignorant or being critical of them; I am just saying it is not in their environment. They are entirely removed from the concept of multiple use. They are entirely removed from the ramifications of public lands.

But you go to a State like Alaska, for example, which is 98 percent owned by the government, or Nevada, and stop 100 people in Nevada and say what is the concept of multiple use? What is the concept of public lands? You are going to get an entirely different viewpoint, because those people experience it.

My purpose here this evening with my colleagues is to tell you that as we talk about some of these land-use decisions, as we talk about the Endangered Species Act, as we talk about our national parks, as we talk about our Bureau of Land Management, as we talk about the U.S. Forest Service, as we talk about people that recreate, whether it is on a mountain bike or kayaking, or as we talk about water in the West, understand, please understand, there is a clear distinction between how and what the ramifications are of those issues here in the East versus those in the West.

I have often heard people say, well, now, just a minute, SCOTT. This land belongs to all of the people, and that we people in the East, you should pay more attention to us, because this land in the West, that should be preserved.

I do not disagree with that comment at all, and we do a darn good job of it. We do a darn good job, because, you know what, we depend on that land. If we abuse the land, we suffer first.

But what kind of gets under our hide, gets under our saddle back there in the West, is when we have people who say to us, look, go ahead and kick the people in the West off their lands; but since we privately own it in the East, it will not have any impact on us.

What we are saying to our colleagues in the East is, look, understand what the concept is. Before you draw a position down, before you take a vote, try and determine or take a look or educate yourself on the concept of multiple use.

You know, when you hear from somebody, for example, the National Sierra Club, I do not think the National Sierra Club, which carries a lot of heavy weight here in the United States Congress, I do not think they have ever supported a water storage project in the history of that organization. Now, a lot of the things that that organization may do might be good; but before you sign on in opposition to water projects in the West, before you sign on to some of the ridiculous things that have come out, like, for example, take

down the dam at Lake Powell and let the water go, understand what water in the West means; understand what multiple use in the West means.

The public lands in this country, as I have said over and over in my comments this evening, are not evenly spread across the 50 States. In fact, they are concentrated in about 11 States. That is where the majority of your holdings are. Eighty-some percent of those government lands are in those 11 States. The consequences to those 11 States are a whole lot different than the consequences to the other 39 States, some of whose public lands, really, are just the local courthouse.

So in conclusion and as a summary of these remarks tonight, I am just asking that my colleagues in the East begin to have a better understanding of what we face in the West. We are here in the West and we speak loudly from the West because, one, we are small in number because of population; but we also have the clearer understanding of what it is like to live with the government at your back doorstep, at your front doorstep and your side windows. Everywhere you look you have got government around you.

I would ask my colleagues from the East, work with us in the West. Help us protect that concept of multiple use. Help us continue our balanced use of the lands out there. Help us provide for future generations by using a balanced approach and by not automatically saying no water storage, not automatically saying no grazing, not automatically saying no utilization, not automatically saying take the recreation off those forests lands or take the recreation from those BLM lands.

We are totally and completely dependent upon these lands. We could not live in those States, nobody, nobody could live out there in those States in the West without this multiple use concept of Federal lands.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 107-380) on the resolution (H. Res. 372) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3924, FREEDOM TO TELECOMMUTE ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-381) on the resolution (H. Res. 373) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3924) to authorize telecommuting for Federal contractors, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. SHOWS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and March 20 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SHAYS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 20 and 21.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.