

loss since Hoover was President of the United States. And here we have the doctors to the economy, they want to do it again when it was so damaging to the economy in the first place. The deficit has skyrocketed. It has gone from a \$5 trillion surplus to deficits of \$300 billion, at least, probably more. And so we want to see this sort of application of this 18th century medicine again when it did not work the first time.

We should not repeat the mistakes, and the reason it was a mistake then, and they are repeating exactly the same failure this time, number one, their plan is too late. It is too late because almost 95 percent of the benefits are in the years after this year when we need the stimulus this year; and, number two, it goes inordinately to people who are not going to put the money right back into the economy. So we are repeating a failure of 2001, as the doctors of the 18th century repeatedly bled people if they did not get better, and they just kept bleeding them. And that is what the Republicans are doing to the Federal budget.

The second point I would make is, this is called a tax cut. But it is really not a tax cut to Americans over the long term. If anything, it is a tax increase. And the reason is that our children are going to have to pay and we are paying today the burden of not balancing the Federal budget. Right now, because we pay interest on the Federal debt, I have some really bad news for Americans. Of every \$100 Americans paid, they paid \$100 on April 15 in taxes, \$14 went to pay interest on the Federal debt. For that \$14, you got no soldiers, no sailors, no police officers, no nothing. It went down a black hole. And now it is going to increase because the Republicans' own numbers, these are not Democratic numbers, the Republicans' own numbers demonstrate another \$1 trillion of indebtedness they will create that American taxpayers are going to have to pay at some point, only now they are going to have to pay interest on top of that.

So this really is not a tax cut. At best, it is a tax transfer. It is a transfer from us baby boomers on to our children's shoulders, which is immoral, number one; and, number two, it is a tax increase by increasing the interest payments we have to pay on the Federal debt. It is an increase on what we call the debt tax. We all pay the debt tax now because we pay interest on the Federal debt. This could be called at worst a tax increase and at best a tax transfer to our children. Both are wrong; it should be rejected. Let us not repeat the failure of 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman addressing this important issue.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

This past January, Democrats presented a fair, fast-acting, and fiscally sound economic plan that would jumpstart the economy, create jobs imme-

diately, and promote long-term economic growth. The President then introduced a highly divisive plan that does not create jobs in the short term and endangers our economy by saddling us with these deficits. Much-needed immediate action on the economy is being thwarted because the Republicans disagree about the President's controversial plan and because the President is still pushing for a \$550 billion package that Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress have soundly rejected.

The past Democratic plans have included \$32 billion in immediate tax relief to small businesses to generate investments. Only \$29 billion of the GOP plan is targeted to small enterprise. Finally, the GOP plan will negatively affect investment in small business and their access to capital because it will increase interest rates and make investment in big business more attractive.

There is no bang, but there certainly are bucks in the GOP plan. At least there are bucks for the wealthy. Economists have estimated that for every dollar spent on the dividend tax cut, only 9 cents in economic growth will be generated. Even the economists that the White House relied on for their job growth numbers "predicted that if the tax cuts were not offset within a few years, interest rates would rise, private investment would be crowded out, and the economy would actually be worse than if there had been no tax changes at all."

There is no focus in the GOP plan, there is no fairness in the GOP plan, and there is no fiscal responsibility. For the sake of our country, our health care and our infrastructure, I call on all Members of Congress to reject the Thomas plan just as you rejected the President's plan.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic plan will create 1 million jobs by the end of the year and is paid for through responsible tax policy that puts money in the hands of people who need it most.

The Democratic plan is focused on job creation and long-term growth. By providing an immediate stimulus, the plan will create jobs. The Democratic plan will not leave States behind—instead it will provide \$18 billion for Medicaid assistance to the States, \$26 billion for infrastructure development, homeland security, education, and other needs jobs will be retained and created, our economy will revive itself. By extending unemployment insurance benefits, money will be put in the hands of those who need it most at the time it is needed most. Recipients of those benefits will be able to buy needed consumer goods, pay their bills, and be able to survive in these tough economic times. The Democratic plan will benefit small businesses by creating credits for businesses who hire the long-term unemployed and increase the expensing limits small businesses are able to claim. Further, it will temporarily increase the bonus depreciation for all businesses, which will in turn enable businesses to retain more capital for expansion and hiring.

The child credit the Democratic plan has will accelerate to \$800 and will directly benefit the

families of 1.75 million children. Over the course of 10 years this will put \$50 billion into taxpayers' hands that will in turn be used for savings and consumption.

Today's New York Times cited the President's plan, the House Republicans' plan, and the Senate Republicans' plan as putting \$400 per child into taxpayers' hands as this year's rebate. This is part of the "carrot" that Republicans are dangling in front of the middle and lower class taxpayers. And while they may in fact get this money this year, Republicans are remaining silent on what they will get next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now. The reason for that silence is because next year, and 5 years from now, and 10 years from now they will not receive anything. Instead, they will be forced to pay more for health care, they will be forced to pay more for education, they will be forced to pay more for infrastructure development, and they will be paying more toward reducing the national debt—a payment that will not yield any tangible, graspable benefit.

□ 1815

PRESIDENTIAL TAX PLAN CREATES JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad I am going to get an opportunity to rebut the gentlewoman from Ohio's (Mrs. JONES) statements. Obviously, there are a number of exaggerated statements in my opinion. I want to go through a few things.

First of all, in regards to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), she talks about the deficit, she talks about the deficit as if she is a leading example of programs and her voting is a leading example of votes that are cast to reduce any of these programs. I would challenge the gentlewoman from Ohio to go ahead and present to her colleagues exactly what programs in discretionary spending, keep in mind the biggest part of that budget is non-discretionary. So if you are going to do the kind of cuts that she talks about, I think that the gentlewoman should accept the challenge and step forward and show exactly which programs she is going to eliminate or which programs she is going to substantially reduce in order to eliminate that deficit in this budget.

The fact is she will not even come close. I know it and you know it. I think it would be interesting, and I intend to do it, pull the gentlewoman's voting record from Ohio and see how many votes she has made to reduce programs. I also am going to pull the bills that the gentlewoman from Ohio has introduced and take a look at what those bills, bills that she is the sponsor of, bills that she is the proponent of, what kind of costs those bills add to the deficit. I think you would find, I have not looked at them but I think it is a pretty good guess that the gentlewoman from Ohio has a number of bills

that she has introduced that add to the deficit, that under her definition of what which ought to be doing in economic sense and accounting and so on would defy her own, the discipline that she is up here preaching about that we have to exercise.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I will be happy to yield in a couple of minutes if the gentlewoman would like to stay around, because I have a number of points that I would be happy to address with you.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. All I want to say is pull my record, sir.

Mr. MCINNIS. If the gentlewoman would stay around I would be happy to yield in a couple of minutes.

But what I want to say is it is okay to say something but your action ought to follow it. This is not a personal attack. This is a professional disagreement. My point is if you are going to stand up and preach fiscal discipline, you ought to practice it yourself.

Now, let us talk about, she says, the Democratic tax cut. Yesterday in the Committee on Ways and Means of which the gentlewoman from Ohio was present, she was there, there was testimony from the Democratic Party that ran the deficit, increased the deficit about \$10 billion and that the Republican tax cut proposal increased the deficit by about \$11 billion. Well, based on the woman's strong statements about fiscal discipline, I would fully expect that the gentlewoman will be voting no against the Democratic tax cut bill. And I would fully expect that the gentlewoman from Ohio will take the same microphone that she has taken for the last hour and preach against the Democratic tax cut which also adds \$10 billion dollars to the deficit. I would venture to say that she will not accept the challenge on either one of those occasions.

I also want to mention here, by the way, a little rhetoric of your colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE) whose statement I thought was pretty interesting, and I understand that she is new to the Congress, but she says that this tax increase is the largest tax increase in the history of the world, in the history of the world. Now, where does that come from? Rhetoric is not what is going to allow us to get this economy back growing again.

I see that the gentlewoman has left. I was more than happy to yield a couple of minutes to her but it is clear that apparently that is not going to happen. Oh, here she comes again.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman ready to yield to me right now?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. I have not yielded yet. A couple of conditions I will yield to you under. One is the time.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I just need a couple of minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield the gentlewoman a few minutes. At such time, if

you are not completed, I will consider yielding more time. I will be happy to hear from you on any of the points I brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Sir, I will give you a tax plan that will be paid for before the week is out. I will give it to you before the week is out.

Mr. MCINNIS. Before the what?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Before the week is out, that will be totally paid for, before the week is out.

Let me also say to you, sir, that on the floor of the House you are entitled to talk about whatever it is you want to talk about as long as you do not get personal with your colleague, and I encourage you to pull my record. I encourage you to pull my voting record. I encourage you to look at the bills that I have introduced, and I encourage you to let the American public know that I am here fighting for the working class people of this country, that I support business, and that I believe that tax cuts would be appropriate if we were not in the situation that we are in right now. And that if we are going to have tax cuts, they must be fair, they must be fiscally responsible, and they must be fast acting.

Now, I must leave. I have been here for an hour. If you had been here while I was speaking for an hour, I would have gladly yielded time to you as well. But I am looking forward to continuing the debate because the people of the United States need to understand that this Congress must do something to stimulate the economy and that what we do must be a stimulus. It must not be a facade. It must not be a charade. It must do what it is supposed to do. And I challenge you to tell the American public how much of the Republican bill that is being presented actually goes to economic stimulus, and how much of the rest of it goes to giving dividend cuts and capital gains cuts to the most wealthy Americans in the country.

I look forward to debating with you, and I look forward to serving in the U.S. Congress with you because I know my constituency knows I am doing their job on their behalf.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would remain around for about 30 more seconds.

I would be happy to engage on a special order, we can make some accommodation in the next few days. You will take a half hour. I will take a half hour. I would engage the entire Democratic Party if they want to engage in a debate. But let me say one thing about personal. Looking at your record is not a personal attack on my colleague. In fact, I am kind of impressed by the energy that my colleague exercises. I think she is persistent. Certainly, I have never questioned your integrity. I think your integrity is above question. But I would point out that if, in fact, you were suggesting a violation of the rules, you probably came the

closest to it. I did not ask to take down your words as I was tempted to do when you made a comment that the President, and I missed the middle word was a shameful untruth. You are not allowed to call the President shamefully untruthful on the House floor.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I did not say he was shamefully untruthful. I said the representation of the tax package was untrue. But write it down. Call me out.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded to the gentlewoman.

I would suggest to the gentlewoman that you and I both know the rules. I think we are both observing the rules and I am more than happy to engage with you in the next week or so on a debate on any subject that you would like. So have your office contact mine. I appreciate the gentlewoman participating.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to talk with the gentleman also. Have a wonderful evening.

Mr. MCINNIS. Reclaiming my time, let us talk a little bit about the program and let us talk about the budget program and the stimulus.

First of all, in regards to the gentlewoman from Georgia's (Ms. MAJETTE) comments, she kept referring to the people, the lowest income people in the country. Remember that the tax cut is targeted at people that pay taxes. If you take a look, the lowest income categories of wage earners in the United States do not pay Federal income taxes. They do pay sales taxes, although they get certain credits, and they pay tax, for example, when they buy gasoline and so on, but under our system we believe that the lowest income earners of this country should not be subject to Federal income taxes. My philosophy is tax cuts should not be given to people that do not pay taxes. That is a welfare program. And I do not object to all welfare programs. Although, I can tell you that every time that you give money to somebody who is not working, you are taking that money from someone who is working. And under certain circumstances most people agree. For example, if you have a wage earner who is incapable of working for some reason, they are physically or mentally disabled and cannot work, gainful employment, I do not know anybody, Republican or Democrat, that objects to assisting those people, to put them on welfare. But, frankly, we have got some people out there who are living off the system.

Now, we did welfare reform several years ago and welfare is to give money, that is not a tax cut. It is a welfare program. If the gentlewoman or any of the other Democrats wants a welfare program to stimulate the economy, they should call it a welfare program. They should not come up and advocate giving a tax cut to people who do not pay the tax.

Now, our economy today, first of all, it is not in dire straights. Certainly we

have people unemployed, and if you are unemployed I can see your interpretation of dire straits; but on an economic, from a historical point of view, on an economic basis, when you take a look at our economy, our economy has some positive things about it. I am optimistic about our economy. We have got to do some jump-starting.

When you jump-start something, it is like when your battery of your car is dead or when the battery of your car is low you do not attach the jumper cables to the bumper of the car. You attach the jumper cables to the battery so you can jump-start the car. That is where the word jump-start came from. You need to target.

Now, the Democrats say, wait a minute. You jump-start all over the car. We are saying, let us jump-start that portion of the car that will give us the biggest buck, that will get the car moving again. We have got a dead battery or a low battery. That is where we need to target it. That is exactly what this tax cut is. It is targeted as a stimulus. And, of course, it has a major impact on the tax structure in the future. You cannot do it any other way.

So my position is on the tax cut and the President's tax cut, first of all, I have got a lot of trust in this President. I have a lot of trust in his administration. He has done a tremendous job, a job that the criticism is minimized, a job of which I hold great honor to him for, and that is leading this country, leading this country after September 11, leading this country through the Afghan war and a victory, leading this country in the Iraqi war. This is a guy who time after time after time proves that his leadership is capable of asking all of us to follow him. We have a pretty good bet going with this President.

This President has said to us, look, this is the kind of tax cut we need to have if we are going to try and jump-start the car. He is the one who has said to us, put the jumper cables on the battery and I think we can get this car jump-started. Why my friends on the other side, outside partisan advantages, in other words, attack the Republicans no matter what they do, why some of my colleagues, by the way, I think our tax cut will pass with bipartisan support, but why some of my colleagues are continuing to put roadblock after roadblock and continuing to insist that we attach the jumper cables to the bumper is beyond me, other than the fact that they want to play partisan politics.

This is not a time for rhetoric. When we put that tax cut, when you take a look at capital gains, for example, sure, not every taxpayer in our country gets the advantage of capital gains because they do not have an asset that has appreciated in value to the extent that it has incurred a capital gains taxation.

But the fact is if you look historically, and I think we need to look at history here, if you look at economic

history, every time, no exceptions, every time we have reduced capital gains taxation, we have seen an immediate uptake in the economy. Every time. No exception. This tax package lowers that from 18 percent to 15 percent, 20 percent in some cases, but would take it down to 15 percent.

Now, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) was very correct in saying that our taxes in this country should be fair taxation. Well, the most unfair taxation is when you are taxed twice, taxed twice. How many of you have out there would be happy going to the grocery store? They ring up a dollar's worth of merchandise and they say, all right, the tax is 7 cents. So you owe me \$1.07. So you pay her the 7 cents in tax; and she says, oh, by the way, we are going to tax you again so give me another 7 cents. You would say, What are you talking about? You do not charge me double taxation at the counter. That is double taxation.

Well, there is one place in our tax structure that we double tax and that is dividends. Just based on fairness alone, and I am in complete agreement with the gentlewoman from Ohio, the Democrat, who says we need to be fair. And following exactly what she preaches, in other words doing what you say, if we do that we will get rid of that double taxation on dividends. It is imperative, I think, that we do it.

The President in our tax package that we passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means, after lots and lots of research, after lots and lots of discussion, that bill is what we need to help stimulate. We want jobs. There are a lot of people in this country who need jobs. You do not create jobs by building the government. You create jobs by letting the private marketplace, by letting small business, and that is what our tax bill does. Our tax bill appeals to the small business people out there. It is a bill that says, small business, you are great at creating jobs. We want you to create more jobs.

□ 1830

Once you create more jobs it has a trickle down effect. Somebody who has a job does use that money, does spend that money or even if they do not spend the money, even if they just put the money in a savings account, that money still circulate through the economy.

The other point I want to make is that the gentlewoman has said to me that she will within the next four working days present me with a tax cut that pays for itself.

The Democratic tax cut, by the way, the proposal that their party has made does not pay for itself. Yesterday, in their own admission in the Committee on Ways and Means, they estimated the cost of the deficit of an increase of \$10 billion. They were pointing out that their plan added \$10 billion to the deficit. The Republican plan added \$11 billion to the deficit. So I am assuming

that the gentlewoman from Ohio will vote no on the Democratic tax plan, as will her colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle who are preaching this fiscal discipline.

So I look forward to receiving her tax cut that pays for itself.

We have a lot of people who stand up here and talk about how terrible the deficit is. I happen to agree that the deficit is something we have to keep our eye on. Clearly, you should not borrow more than you can pay back, but keep in mind that a lot of people that say to you here how much they hate the deficit and how we should not contribute to it, take a look at the bills that they sponsor. Take a look at their voting pattern. Somebody told me once when you come back to your district talk conservative, talk fiscal responsibility; when you are back in Washington vote for spending. I mean that is what goes on here a lot, and I think that it is fair game.

When somebody stands up at this microphone and talks to my colleagues here, their voting record is fair game, and we ought to do a comparison on it because my guess is that you will find most of the people that make those kind of statements, most of the people have a voting record that does not reflect fiscal discipline. They have a record of bill introduction of whose bills do not reflect fiscal discipline. A lot of people talk about fiscal discipline as long as you cut somebody else's budget.

I have people that come in, they may be with transportation, and say we want fiscal discipline but by the way do not cut my highways out. An educator may come in and say, by the way, you have to get this economy going, you need fiscal discipline, but we need more money for education. The Department of Defense will come in and say we agree with fiscal discipline, just do not cut the Department of Defense. It is human nature.

So I am not defying human nature. I am saying we clearly ought to define it right here on the floor when somebody says one thing and does something else.

So that was my intent this evening by the way was not to talk about the tax cut, but for one hour, one hour, the Democrats have assailed, have assaulted the President's tax plan and the plan that went out of the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday from the Congress and I think will pass on a bipartisan plan. So there is a necessity for some rebuttal. There is a necessity for some clarification of what we are intending to do.

In summary, what we are attempting to do with this on a bipartisan effort, what we are attempting to do with this tax reduction is to stimulate an economy that needs some stimulation, and as I said earlier, it is like you do not need to rebuild a whole new car. Our economy is not in a depression. In fact, interest rates are the lowest they have

been in 41 years. There is a lot of positive things out there about our economy, but it is just like the dead battery on a car. You do not need to rebuild the car. The car is in good shape. You have got one part of the car, the battery, that has gone dead on you. We need to jump start.

Common sense is a word often referred to by the other side during the previous hour. Common sense would dictate that you take your jumper cables and attach them to the battery. You do not take your jumper cables and attach them to the door handle. It may be nice. It is not going to get the car started and you can attach them to the bumper. It is not going to push the car anywhere. The fact is you have got to target your tax cut. We are not saying you can jump the car anywhere. If you target it, it will move that car. We think that battery will get started.

If you have got an idea, as I said to the gentlewoman and I have said to most of the liberal side to the left, if you have got a better idea how to jump-start the car without butting the battery cables on the battery, come up with it, but the fact is most of what they are saying unfortunately is rhetoric.

The issue that I wanted to visit with about tonight is I come from the West. The State I represent is the State of Colorado. My colleagues know that. My district is a very large district. In fact, they are voting to change it today so I do not know whether it is larger or smaller than the State of Florida, but it is about the size of the State of Florida. It is a big district.

In the West, because of governmental actions clear back in the 1800s, there is a lot that is different in the West than there is in the East. We live under different regulations in the West than you do here in the east. You say how is that possible? Let me just give you a little history.

What happened in the early days of this country when we wanted to grow our country with the Louisiana Purchase and things like that, back then ownership of property, if you had a deed for a piece of property, it did not mean a lot. In order for you to own property, you needed to get some kind of deed, put a stake in the ground, and frankly, most of the time, you needed to be on the ground with a six shooter strapped to your side.

This country, in its infancy, had its population really isolated in the small sliver on the East Coast, and the leaders of our country decided we want to create a United States. We wanted to create an expansive country. We wanted to go into the frontier. We wanted to go West and make it a part of our country, and going West back then would be going to Ohio or to Virginia. You did not have to go very far to be into new settlements of this country, and in order to do that, the government said to itself how do we give incentive for people to leave this relative safety and comfort of their home on

the east coast and move out West where you get bit by snakes, you have got to go out there by wagon, no industry out there, you are going to have to be settlers and deal with the Native American people that live out there currently right now. You have got harsh weather, altitude, elevation you have never been faced with in your entire life. How do we give people that incentive to go out there to be the frontier people? How do we do it?

Somebody said what every American dreams of, in fact, one of the basic concepts that this country was founded upon, was the concept of owning your own piece of property. I can remember when I was in high school, in fact, I drew it in art class. I was not very talented in art, but in art class, I drew my first home, a picture of what I wanted to own, my own house, and I think that is the American dream, own your own little piece of property, own your own little farm or condominium that is your piece of property, that is yours, and our forefathers realized that is what the Americans wanted. They wanted that ability of owning private property.

So what they did is they said, all right, let us create what we called the Homestead Act. Let us give some land away and actually it was not new. We actually tried to bribe British military people by offering them free land in this new country we are creating if they would defect. That is the first use interestingly of what we now call the Homestead Act. That is the first use of the government giving away land, and that was to try and bribe British soldiers to defect and come over to our side, and we give them land as a reward.

So they decided to do this, to give land to people to give them the incentive to move West. They said, okay, you go out West and you can settle or you settle 160 acres or 320 acres and you live on it for 5 years and you cultivate it and you get to keep that land. You know what? It was a tremendous success. Not a complete success but a tremendous success. Why was it not a complete success? Because when the population got to the Rocky Mountains or to the West, they found out that, hey, in Kansas, even in eastern Colorado, in Ohio and the valleys of Tennessee and the wonderful bluegrass of Kentucky, 160 acres, you can feed a lot of cows on 160 acres. You can feed a lot of pigs and sheep on 160 acres, but when they got to the Rocky Mountains, they discovered, wow, it takes four acres to feed one lamb. In some places it takes over a hundred and some acres to feed one cow. You cannot survive on 160 acres.

So they go back to Washington, and the bureaucracy says, wow, this is working until we hit the Rocky Mountains. People are not going into the Rocky Mountains. What do we do? Someone said, well, let us give them a proportion of the amount of land, not an equal amount in acreage but an

equal amount that a family could subsist on. So if it takes 160 acres in Ohio, it may take 3,000 acres in the Colorado Rockies or the Montana Rockies or New Mexico. It may take 3,000 acres.

Somebody else said, no, no, there is a problem with that. The public is very angry at the government right now because there is a perception out there that the railroad barons, to get our railroad built across the Nation, which was a huge achievement and a huge difference in the history of this country, we kind of gotten taken to the cleaners of the land we gave to the railroad barons. So people are not very excited about us giving more land away.

What happened was they made a decision. Somebody said, okay, to get around that problem, let us go ahead and we will keep ownership of the land. The government will keep the lands, and we will allow people the use of the land. Let us call it multiple use, the concept of multiple use, a land of many uses.

Let me show you now my poster. Take a good close look at this poster of where the government lands are in this country. The color on this poster, these are government lands. Some of it is BLM land. Some of it is Forest Service lands. Some of it is State forests and so on.

By the way, down here in the left, and I hope you can see that, that is the State of Alaska. I think the State of Alaska is 98, I think it is 98 percent of the State of Alaska is owned by the government, not by the people, not by the private individuals who build a home but by the government.

Take a look at this comparison. This is what happened. People got here. This is when the conscious decision was made not to preserve this land so that humans never walk on it for future generations, although that happened correctly with wilderness areas. It happened correctly with our national parks. It happened correctly with our national monuments. This land, the only reason this land does not look like this land is because of the pressure as a result of giving too much land away to the railroad barons. So now let me go on to my point why it is different in the West under regulations and rules than it is in the East.

If you look in the east anywhere east of Denver, Colorado, with the exception of perhaps the Everglades down here and the Shenandoah and a little area in the Northwest, when you want to put a fence up and let us say you have some trees and you want to thin your trees out or you want to treat your trees, first of all, if it is a private forest, you go do it and you do it because it is logical to do it. If you want to make an addition to your house, you go to your local planning and zoning commission down at the courthouse or over at the county courthouse. This is not what happens in the West.

In the West, because the government owns the land, you know where our planning and zoning office is? Right

here, little tiny government town called Washington, D.C., they are the ones who dictate what happens out here in almost half of the country. Keep in mind, our big population centers are in California and on the East Coast. Out here in the West, it is pretty sparsely populated. So all of the sudden you have a majority of people that do not live in the West dictate how people in the West live on government lands.

One of the big problems that we have suffered as a result of this disparity has been reflected in the forest fires that we have had over the last several years. I am experienced in forest fires. I fought forest fires. I used to be a volunteer fireman, municipal volunteer fireman. I used to be a police officer. I have personally seen the ravages that fires do to, first of all, human lives. I have removed bodies off mountains as a result of a fire on that mountain. I have seen what it does to wildlife. I have seen what it does to pollution. I have seen what it does to watersheds.

Do you know that the leading killer of endangered species in our country is? Wildfire. Kills more endangered species than any other threat across this Nation.

What happened in these big fires that we have seen are really a combination of a number of factors. One, around the turn of the century, we used to lose to fire, this is an extraordinary number, hard number to believe, but we used to lose to fire about 45 million acres a year.

□ 1845

Back in Washington and across the country we said look, we have to start fighting these fires. That is where the birth of Smokey the Bear came from, by the way. So we adopted a very intentional policy to put out fires. What we did not know was putting out these fires over decades and decades allowed a large accumulation of trees that was unnatural. It was not native to the forest. It allowed a large accumulation of trees.

We were allowing an acre that maybe had 60 trees on it, we were allowing 600 trees on that acre. Combined with the environmental movement in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s that did everything they could, the radical aspect of that environmental movement, to push out timbering, to say cutting down a tree was bad. Keep in mind also in our early days, we used wood for everything. We used it to heat the house, build the house, for the fence, wagon. Wood was much more widely used in proportion to the population than it is today.

What happened is we have now discovered if we want to avoid these fires, we have to manage the forests. What happened in the 1970s as a result of a radical environmental movement, we had a group of people say we will never be able to be smarter than the Forest Service because the Forest Service, the BLM people, the Fish and Wildlife, the State foresters, they have been edu-

cated in the management of the forest. They have experience in the forest. Many of those people who work for our Forest Service, it has been their lifelong dream to be a forest ranger. You are not going to be able to debate these people on the merits of how to manage a forest. They have a good idea how to manage it. Certainly they have a better idea how to manage it than Earth First or the Sierra Club. These groups, like Earth First, knew you were not going to win the argument at the local level with the forest ranger, so they had to get it away from science and get the decision made based on emotion.

The way to do that was to move the decisions being made on the forest to Washington, D.C. because back here in the Nation's capital many of our decisions are based on emotion. Sometimes that is good, but most of the time it is not. There is a balance in there. They were very successful over a period of time of several years of taking the responsibility of managing our forests away from the U.S. Forest Service and away from our forest rangers and moving that to the United States Congress.

I am chairman of the subcommittee that has oversight on all of the Nation's forests. We have continual debates in the United States Congress in my subcommittee, which by the way I do not believe anybody in my committee has a major or even a minor and certainly not any kind of experience to speak of in managing forests, and we have on a regular basis bills to restrict the Forest Service from cutting trees. Remember on public lands, and you do not have much of it here because these are private forests, so it is primarily in the West, we actually have bills that envision restricting the Forest Service; they cannot cut any tree more than 4 inches wide, regardless of whether the science says it is healthy to thin some trees out.

In the 1970s, several environmental organizations were correct, clear-cutting was devastating and the clear-cutting in the West was an abuse. Now in some cases it was the science of the day so I am not calling these people criminal, as some of the radical organizations would. But the fact is when we learn something you are doing is not good, stop doing it.

So the effort to stop clear-cutting in the West on massive parcels was well-intended; and, frankly, it was correct. But now the pendulum has swung so far the other way that in the State of Colorado we have no major timber industry left in that State. None. We have a matchstick company which employs 30, 40 people down in the southwest corner, but we have to pay people to come and cut those trees and take them out. We have to pay them. They have been very successful.

Just like the condemnation of mining, how terrible mining companies are, how terrible timber companies are, how terrible ski areas are. There is really an attempt, instead of having land of many uses, to putting out a

sign in the West that says no trespass. Well, what has happened is unfortunately many of these efforts have been successful. As a result of that, we have not managed our forests. We have not managed them by science. We can get away with it for a while; but at some point it catches up with us, and that is what has happened in the last few years.

In my district we had several major fires. I mean, fires where the smoke plumes looked larger than the atom bomb. They would be 30, 40 feet in the air. These smoke plumes get so high in the sky they actually form an ice cap on top of them, and the ice cap eventually collapses inward, comes out the bottom and creates hurricane-like winds and spreads the fire. Only one or two were started by man, and most are as a result of mismanagement, of not going out and thinning the forests, of not letting the forests do what nature had them do.

Some people say the answer is controlled burns. Keep in mind that one out of five of our controlled burns gets out of control. We know what happened in New Mexico. We almost wiped an entire town out. It is difficult to manage a controlled burn; but controlled burns are useful as a tool, but we also need to be able to go in and clear these forest floors and thin out trees. If there is an acre that has 600 trees on it, and historically its natural holding of trees is more like 60 trees, it needs to be thinned.

So we have introduced legislation, bipartisan legislation. This is a bipartisan bill to thin these forests, to let us go into these forests and manage these forests as we need to do. That bill is called the Healthy Forest Bill. That bill will come to the House floor some time in the next week or two. I look forward to being part of an effort by the United States Congress to transfer from emotion back to science the management of our Nation's forests.

If we look at the Hayman fire in Denver, Colorado, that is the one that most people saw on television. Hundreds of thousands of acres were on fire. Unfortunately, we lost some lives last year in Colorado, airplane crashes, a tree fell on a firefighter in Durango. But when we look at the losses in the Hayman fire, let me point out some other losses. Obviously Members are aware of the human loss. That is the highest priority of losses. The most expensive loss in monetary terms outside of the loss of human life was the pollution in the watershed, in the water supply for the city of Denver. The water supply for the city of Denver looks like a thick chocolate malt.

Other damage was the pollution. Look what happened to our clean air. In Denver, Colorado, there was more pollution off the Hayman fire than there was from all of the vehicles combined from the city of Denver in 1 year. Other damage was the horrible devastation to our wildlife and wildlife habitat. Could this have been avoided? I

think so. Let me show an example of thinning a forest.

This poster to my left is Mesa Verde National Park. It is down in the Four Corners of Colorado; and just for some promotional purposes, it is the only place in the Nation one can stand in four States at once. I hope people come and spend a little money in Colorado on tourism. This is Mesa Verde. It may be hard to see, but this area that looks kind of dark gray, that is all burned out. A couple of years ago the superintendent of the Mesa Verde National Park decided they needed to protect antiquities and protect employee housing and the lodge and government buildings up here. They ought to thin, and so they thinned the forest. You know how you can tell where they thinned, to the line of thinning, that is exactly where the fire stopped. The fire did not burn through here. Why? Because it was properly spaced. Why? Because it was much more in its natural setting. It was not a fire-break that was built like you would imagine, something as wide as an interstate highway. It is because this area was thinned. There was not the underbrush and all of the waste on the forest floor. They cleaned this area out.

When the fire started on Mesa Verde, we would have lost lots of history, lots of wonderful artifacts had that park superintendent not thinned this area. This is what happens when you thin. This is good forest management. This is how we ought to manage our forests. By the way, this type of management, this park superintendent's action was not directed to him by the United States Congress. It actually would probably have been opposed by some Members of Congress, what he did. It would probably have been aggressively opposed by the Earth First organization and other radical environmental groups; but this park superintendent, who knows a lot more about that ground and a lot more about a forest and management of these public lands, got to make the decision. He made a good decision. He did not act capriciously or recklessly. Rather, he made a prudent decision.

That is why I am advocating the Healthy Forest Bill. It is time to take the management of our forests and return it to the green hats, the Forest Service people, who I have the highest respect for, our BLM people, our wildlife people, our State forest people. Why am I, from the West, complaining about this? Because in the East, your forests are better managed. Why? They are in private hands. In the East where there is not much government lands, people who own homes understand that there is going to be a big fire if they do not keep the forests clean.

Nobody is suggesting that we clear-cut this area so it does not burn. That is like tearing down your house so it does not catch on fire. We are not suggesting that. Not at all. That is an absurd argument made by some of the more radical organizations.

You will find with interest when you see press releases about thinning of the forests, you will find that several national organizations, including the national Sierra Club, including Earth First and some other radical groups, that in their first paragraph of every press release they issue: one, timber because that has a negative connotation to it; two, clear-cutting because that has an extremely negative connotation to it; three, developers, which has an extremely negative connotation to it.

You can see that they will continue to battle and battle and battle so that the management of our forests is based on emotion instead of having the management of our forests based on science.

My bill is very simple. My bill says run these forests with the right kind of management that is based on science. Let us, to the extent we can, take the emotion out of it. Let us manage these forests in such a way that we again here in the West, and frankly at different spots in the East, that we will not face the kind of devastating forest fires that we saw in the West last year.

Look, just because we are on public lands, that land is owned by the people of the United States Government. It is not just owned by the people of Montana or the people of Colorado or Utah, but the fact is we need to respect the opinions of the people that manage those lands. If one lives in New York State, you should yield to the judgment of the park superintendent at the Mesa Verde Park on which is the best way to manage that because if you live in New York, or South Carolina, you probably do not know a lot about the forest. It is a very arid region out there. That is what we are asking in this bill. We are using a commonsense approach to the management of the forests.

□ 1900

I would urge all of my colleagues, although a number of them have already signed onto this bill, we have lots and lots of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, I would urge my colleagues to stand up to the barrage of press releases that are going to come out from the Earth First type organizations about how terrible it is to let the local forest guy manage that forest. Or gal, by the way. I do not intend to discriminate on gender there. I ask that my colleagues stand up to this, that they take and they adopt the approach of management of the forest by science, management of the forest by people that have been educated on the forest and people that have worked in the forest from day to day. If we do that, we will once again return to the forests of this country, of which we now have 190 million acres at high risk. If we allow our Forest Service and our BLM people to manage the area that we have given them the responsibility to manage, if we allow them to manage it, in return we will be the big winners because we

will have healthy forests, we will not have these horrible type of forest fires, we will not have the kind of devastation we have seen on wildlife, we will not have the kind of devastation we have seen to the watersheds, to the water supply system, we will not see the kind of devastation we have seen to the wildlife habitat. It is positive, positive, positive. It is our opportunity to make a change. We should not in the United States Congress be managing the day-to-day operations of a forest out in western Colorado or eastern Utah.

This bill is a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to join the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who has put hundreds of hours into this bill. The gentleman from Oregon has actually been one of the top leaders on the House and Senate side on this issue, that they join the gentleman from Oregon, they join myself, they join the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, they join the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Committee on Resources, in our effort to make these forests manageable by science, manageable by common sense, managed by the people that really understand it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1261, WORKFORCE REINVESTMENT AND ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (during Special Order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-92) on the resolution (H. Res. 221) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1261) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 6 on account of touring the tornado damage in Tennessee.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of awarding the Purple Heart citations to veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom.