

Engineering and Mathematics. I attended an AWSEM banquet about 2 years ago, and the level of enthusiasm of these junior high and high school girls for math and science was absolutely striking. The AWSEM program, I understand, Mr. Speaker, is going nationwide.

There are success stories out there like AWSEM, like Saturday Academy, like the Intel donation program, and I think that we need to focus both on what challenges lie ahead and what we are doing right today. And with that I yield back.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I also thank the gentleman from New York for their contributions this evening. We hope to come back again with another special order to both detail out the progress and at this time yield the floor to our esteemed colleague from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) who has important and critical issues that impact education in his home State of North Carolina to address.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I also thank him for the special order because I think what we have been about this evening is so important, and also let me thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) also for his legislation. The leadership he is bringing to that, there is no question that as he talks about this information highway or the digital divide, not unlike what our colleagues who were here in the 1950s talked about the interstate highway, and he is absolutely correct in talking about that. My friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), when he talked about Intel, let me remind you that those business partnerships are important.

In North Carolina we actually have students in a number of schools actually getting the motherboard from Intel, putting them in and bringing computers up to modern standards from computers that many businesses will share with them. So, Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous partnerships out there, and we have done it with IBM and a number of our high-tech folks in the research triangle.

So there are a lot of great success stories, and I hope we can talk about more of those at a future time, and this evening I appreciate you yielding the last little bit to me so I can talk about some of the schools in North Carolina, specifically in the eastern part of the State, that have been hit so hard by Hurricane Floyd and then followed up by Hurricane Irene that did even greater damage to our agricultural areas.

But here is a photograph that some of you have seen earlier of towns in eastern North Carolina flooded. The truth is when we talk about that, folks do not realize how large the geographic area was. It is an area that includes about 2.1 million people, and the geo-

graphic area is larger than the State of Maryland. So it is a substantial area.

The devastation is substantial. When you look at these for preliminary numbers, it really came out of the local paper early on. They have been refined and are not quite that large, but if you look at the town of Princeville, 100 percent flooded with 2,152 residents. There is Tarboro, 40 percent, 4,300 residents. There is Rocky Mount, 40 percent flooded with a total of 22,900 residents. There is Goldsboro with 24,000, and the number goes on.

The point I want to make tonight, that I call on my colleagues in this Congress, before we go home and wrap up this year, we have to appropriate the funds needed to make sure these people can get their lives back together, they can get in homes, farmers can get their crops in the ground and ready for next year. The devastation has been tremendous. This has been the largest natural disaster in the history of my State. It affected Virginia, it affected Maryland, it affected New York and parts of South Carolina. Preliminary numbers I have here: on November 19, over 30,000 individuals just in North Carolina had registered with FEMA. The number of homes that are going to be destroyed or displaced are now approaching 10,000, and there may be as many as another 15 to 20,000, maybe higher than that, going to need help. There are a lot of businesses in trouble. I talked with a businessman in Wilson who lost everything that he had, his whole life's work. He was in his 50s. His business was flooded. He had no flood insurance because he never had any need for it. It was a 500-year flood plain.

Last Sunday I was in Rocky Mount at the request of a constituent. He wanted me to come down. I went to visit. I went to the homes of his three daughters. One had been in a home 5 years, another one 7 years, the other one a bit longer. She was on the other side of town. They were nice brick homes. Unfortunately, none of the three had flood insurance, and all three of them lost everything they had, and he said to me:

"Congressman, we don't need any loans. If they get a loan, they can't repay it. They owe loans on the house to have even the furniture that was in it. And if we don't get some help, we will not recover."

I only tell that story because it can be repeated thousands and thousands of times in eastern North Carolina. We had up here today over 70 members of the North Carolina General Assembly House and Senate saying please help us, help us before you go home; and I call on my colleagues to do the same. We should not go home until we appropriate money to help these people who pay their taxes, who live by the rules, who have been subjected to a disaster today we were not expecting. We need

to help them. We help people around the world. It is time to help people at home.

THE WESTERN STATES

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), my good friend, former Speaker of the House of the State of Utah, and I will spend the next hour talking with you about issues that we think are vitally important to the United States, but we think in a large part are being ignored by many parts of the United States. What we are going to talk to you about this evening is the West, the western States, the Rocky Mountains, Federal land, land-use policies, wilderness areas, water, land of many uses, Teddy Roosevelt. There are a number of different subjects, Mr. Speaker, that I would wish that you would think about as we talk because it is very important to the people of the West in this country. Frankly, it is very important to the people of the entire United States.

□ 1900

Let me begin with a little history about the Western United States. As you know from the history of our country, when the pioneers and the settlements in this country took place, most of it was on the eastern coast. Of course, I am stepping aside from the Native Americans. The Native Americans were throughout the country. This is the history as the United States as a country began to become formed.

On the eastern coast of the United States, the philosophy was to acquire more land. Our forefathers had a vision of a great country, and I think today that they would stand here, frankly, and take a look at this country and say you have created a good country. You have a country that is strong in its people. You have a country that is strong in its land. You have a country that has a vision. You have a country that has character.

But that is what they wanted to build, and, in doing that, they wanted to enlarge the country. They did not want just 13 states, they did not want 14 states, they wanted to enlarge the country. So they began to acquire land, through for example the Louisiana Purchase and some of the others, through treaties and so on.

Then they began to urge people to become pioneers. You remember the old saying, "Go west, young man; go west." Well, as people and the pioneers began to go out west, they found wonderful, wonderful lands, the Kansas farmlands, the Missouri lands, the Missouri River and the Mississippi River. They got out there and they found on a

very small portion of land you could have a very healthy agricultural response. In other words, it did not take a lot of land to support families, and we had a lot of families going out for the purpose of agriculture.

Now, when we read the history books, we see a lot about mineral exploitation, about the gold, going to the mountains for the gold and going for silver, but the long lasting impact for the West was from the pioneers in agriculture.

Well, the difficulty that the administrations back in the East found out was that in the West there were not a lot of people going to the mountains, to the Colorado Rockies, to the Utah mountains, to the Montana and Wyoming mountains. So what they did is they sat down and said we need to figure out how do we get new settlers to go into these mountains? How do we get new settlers to go out into the West?

Well, what happened is the government decided to figure this out and go out there, and they sent some explorers out there, and you know the early days of the Lewis and Clark expedition, and somewhere along the line somebody discovered, you know something, when you get to the mountains, or you get to the lands of Utah and the lands of Colorado and Wyoming, of course, those were not states at the time, but when you get out to those lands, it is very difficult to produce an agricultural product on a small piece of property. In fact, what you need are thousands of acres.

Well, the policy of the government was to give incentive and to get people invigorated about going to the West. You let them homestead. They could go out and stake their ground. What do I mean by staking their ground? In the old days they could go out and literally place stakes in the ground up to certain amounts, say 160 acres or 320 acres, and they could homestead that ground. If they plotted that ground, plowed that ground and took care of that ground for a certain period of time, they got the land. The land was theirs to keep.

Well, when they got to the mountains and they got the reports about the difficulty of having agriculture in the mountains and in the West, they came back to the government and they said, Mr. President, Mr. Administration, Mr. Congress, you cannot do it on 160 acres in the mountains. You cannot do it on 320 acres. We do not know how we are going to encourage people to go into those mountains unless you, the administration and Congress, want to give them thousands of acres.

Well, they thought about that, and, of course, the response was politically we cannot just give away thousands of acres of land to individuals. With the system we would have to set up, we would very quickly encompass large portions of land with few owners. What else can we do?

Therein came the concept of what we call multiple use. What they decided to do, colleagues, is instead of giving the land away through homestead and so on, what they figured out was, well, what we will do on the government lands is we will allow people to have many uses. We will retain ownership, speaking of the government. We will retain ownership of the lands, but we will allow our pioneers and our citizens to go out into these lands and use the lands. That is the concept of multiple use.

Well, you can see then as a result in the Western United States the government primarily owns the land. They are the big landowners in the Western United States, as a result of this multiple use policy.

In the East, that is not the picture at all. In fact, in the East the majority of the land is under private ownership. In the Western United States we face unique problems, unique as compared to the land in the Eastern United States, and it is important for our colleagues, for my colleagues and Mr. HANSEN's and my colleagues from the East, to understand the differences in land ownership and why we are so reliant in the West on government lands.

To my left here is a map of the United States. The map, as you can see, follow my red bead on the map, government lands. All of the colors that you see on the map are owned by the Federal government. You have got some big spots up here, you see down here in the Shenandoah Valley, in the Everglades down there in Florida. But take a look at all of this open land. That is private ownership. That is owned by the citizens of this country individually.

As you can see, as you come down through Montana and Wyoming and Colorado and New Mexico, look at those blocks of land. That land is all Federal or government lands, state land in some cases, but primarily Federal land.

Take a look at the state of Alaska, which I have the bead on down there in the left-hand corner of my demonstration here. Look at Alaska. I am not sure of the exact percentage, but I think it is 98 or 99 percent of the state of Alaska is owned by the government.

Well, that works okay under the concept of multiple use. But what we see happening is a lot of special interest groups in the East have decided it is time to take this land in the West that is owned by the government and, for their own reasons, to push their own advocacy of their special interest groups, they have decided in essence it is time to kick people off of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acres.

When I grew up in Colorado, and I am from Colorado, my district is in Colorado, the 3rd Congressional District of Colorado, when I grew up, we grew up under a sign, a theory called "land of

many uses." So, in other words, when you would go into the Forest Service, you would come up to a sign and it would say, watch, it would say "Welcome to"—I did not put the "Welcome to" on the top, "Welcome to the Rocky Mountain National Park." Then underneath hangs a separate sign that says "A land of many uses."

Well, what is happening today, in my opinion, and this opinion is shared by many people in the West, is an all-out assault to take away this, and replace that, "A land of many uses," with a sign that simply says "No trespassing."

Now, there are a lot of issues that I want to talk to you about in a little more detail, but I think at the beginning of my comments and my colleague's comments it is important for all of us in here to realize that in the West, the majority of land is owned by the government. We have a different style of life in the West.

Now, we are all Americans. We all believe in the flag and motherhood and apple pie. That is not the issue here. I am talking about the geographic difficulties that we deal with in the West, and there are a lot of distinguishing issues.

For example, water. In the East, again, back to my first chart, follow my red dot, in the East back here your problem back here with water is getting rid of it. Our problem here in the West where I show you this, our problem is being able to store the water, to be able to preserve the water.

In Colorado, for example, which is my state, and, by the way, my district is where this red bead is, it is the 3rd Congressional District of Colorado, geographically it is larger than the state of Florida, and in that district in our particular state 80 percent of the water is in the mountains, and 80 percent of the population is out here.

Well, it is the same difficulty that we have over here. In Colorado, for example, we are the only state in the union where all of our free-flowing water goes out of the state. We do not have water that comes into our State.

We have the headwaters for four major rivers, the Platte, the Arkansas, the Rio Grande and the Colorado. My good colleague over here in Utah, take a look at the Federal lands. Water preservation. We need the Federal lands to help us store our water. We need the Federal lands to help us protect our environment. We need the Federal lands to enjoy recreation, like mountain biking, and I love mountain biking. I have enjoyed it for years.

I have been on the Colorado River ever since I was a high school student, river rafting. Many of you colleagues who come and visit in the West, many have vacation homes in the West. You love river rafting. You like the hiking. Many of my colleagues like the hunting. It is hunting season. All of these

are a necessary part of the concept of multiple use. And if we allow the concept of multiple use to begin to crumble, I will tell you what will happen. You will lose the river rafting, you will lose the ski resorts, and in my district those ski resorts provide 35,000 jobs off the White River National Forest, just off that forest alone.

By the way, one-third of our forest out there is wilderness area, one-third of it. We protect that for the environment. We want that protected for the environment. I voted on that bill. But two-thirds of it is predominantly recreation, all of these different things.

If we begin to let this concept of multiple use collapse, you will see over a period of time the elimination of mining. Now, that, of course, to a lot of people sounds good. But take a look at how many products in our society depend on mining. That is the first thing that will go. In my district it is pretty well gone. We have some mines up near Meeker, Colorado, near Paonia, Colorado. For the most part, mineral exploration is gone out of there.

The next thing they go after is grazing for our cattle ranchers and farmers. In the East you have farming, it is important for you. We do too in the West, but we have to do it on government lands, and we take care of those government lands. Frankly, we in the West are pretty proud of the job we have done. You see over here a lot of times about pictures of abuse. Those are being put forward by special interest groups that want to destroy this concept of multiple use.

But after ranching and farming, they are going to go after the ski areas. No more expansion of ski areas. Restrict the ski areas. Downsize the ski areas. Then what is next? Then you have got your mountain biking and you have got your river rafting. Then you have got your ability to store or transfer across Federal lands the water that we need. It goes on and on and on.

So I am thrilled tonight to have the opportunity to work with my colleague the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN). I am going to turn the podium over to Mr. HANSEN so we can carry out for you this evening a little further explanation of why we need your help, not your resistance, we need your help, your help in going out there to preserve this concept of multiple use, so that we in the West can protect our water, so that we in the West can enjoy our recreation, so that we in the West can have the kind of environment that you all dream of, that you come out and vacation in.

That is our goal tonight, is to communicate with you the differences, geographically, the differences with our water, the differences in the descriptions of wilderness and so on, so you are not snookered, quite frankly, by some of the national special interest groups that want to convince you that

the West is being trashed by the people of the West, and that the only thing that is going to save the West is for the special interest groups of the East to go in and tell the people of the West what is best for them.

So, with that, let me thank my colleague Mr. HANSEN for joining me today. I appreciate very much this, and I would yield to the gentleman from the State of Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the gentleman from Colorado. I think he has done a magnificent job in explaining how the lands of America were settled and who has control of them. If you are a history buff, and I hope you are, you will find out a lot of people when they first came to this country, it was on the eastern seaboard, and they controlled that ground. A lot of it at that time probably belonged to just anybody who wanted to go out and stake a claim for it. There were no restrictions on it.

Then as we went through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, things such as that, that ground was pretty well filled out. I enjoy this eastern part of the country. I have been here for 10 terms. I love going out to the different areas and looking at it. But I do not see much ground that is public ground. Maybe a park here and a park there, but the vast, vast majority is owned by individuals.

□ 1915

Different than the West, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) pointed out, most of it you can use it for something, you can plow it, you can grow things on it, you can put cattle on it, you can own that ground.

Now, when our early pioneers went out to the West, they have got these huge Rocky Mountains. They have got all these various areas that extend from Canada to Mexico. So you are really not going to use a lot of that ground.

So after a while, about 100, almost 200 years ago, 100 something years ago, they started the Forest Service. The Forest Service was put there to take care of our beautiful green forests. They were told to manage the forests.

As we go back to talking about how the Forest Service started, their instructions was to manage the force for its many, many uses. A lot of it was timber in those days. Most of the folks, they lived in the valleys, and they farmed, they ranched in other areas.

That resolves this piece between what was private, what was forced, and what is that in between. So later on, the government decided what do we call that ground in between? The Bureau of Land Management handles that area. That is the area between Forest Service and the private people who own their ground.

Now, the gentleman from Colorado talked about multiple use. Basically, what is multiple use? It is the sign that he put up there, land of many uses. All of us who were raised in the West, we have seen that all over the West. He talked about some of the uses, the idea that you can go in there and you can do a certain amount of cutting.

Now, why is it that the Forest Service is under agriculture and BLM, Park Service, Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife is under Interior. It was put that way, if we go back and look at the history of how Congress does things, because it is a resource like corn or wheat. It grows and is taken out.

I get letters all the time, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands that say, "Let us leave that forest just as we found it. I flew over it in a 757, I looked down there, and there is this beautiful green carpet, and I want it left just that way." Well, then, take a picture of it with your camera, because it is not going to stay that way because things change on a regular basis.

We had the whole part of the Uinta Mountains, the big east-west part, and the only east-west mountain range in America, and a whole group of environmentalists call up and say do not touch it. Leave it alone.

So we had a hearing on it a few years back. We brought in all these people from land grant colleges and asked them to respond to it. These people said, "We do not want you in there clearing out the pine beetle, because that is nature's way."

Well, this man got up, and he said, "Well, I will just tell you what will happen." He said, "If we go in and we do not kill out that pine beetle, it will not be too long. Instead of that beautiful green carpet that you want us to keep that way, it will be a whole bunch of dead sticks, because they will kill that entire forest. But we could go in, we could spray for them, we could cut out that area of high infestation, and the healthy trees would make it." They said, "No, leave it alone."

The next gentleman got up from Utah State University. He testified and said, "Let me explain to you what will happen." He said, "I do not have a dog in this fight." He said, "Let me tell you what is going to happen. What will happen is the whole entire north slope of Uinta Mountains will be dead and anywhere else in the West if we do not take care of that." He said, "Then I will tell you what will happen. You have got a 100 percent chance that you will have a fire." In other words, it is guaranteed.

I may just deviate a minute and say that, because we have not managed the forest for a long time, we have the highest fuel load we have in my lifetime all through the West; and people wonder why we have forest fires all over the place.

Anyway, after the fire, the next man said, "And I will tell you what will happen after the fire. I will give you 100 percent guarantee that you have one of these flash floods that occurs in August, September, these big summer cumulus nimbus referred to as thunderheads, and they will pour water over that, and you will have a flood. And that topsoil that has taken 100 years to build up will go down to the valleys, and you will have a desolate area for all that time, because we are not managing the forest for multiple use."

Now, I thought about that for a long time. Then I found out down in the Dixie Forest that is down around the southern part of Utah, a beautiful area. I talked to some of the people there who had photographs when the early pioneers went in there, the first ones they called tin or some type of photograph. There was not a tree on those grounds because there was not anything there. It was just rolling sagebrush. They went in there and started planting trees. Out of that, they came up with the beautiful Dixie Forest, reputed to be one of the prettiest forests around.

About 1993, Hugh Thompson, the forest supervisor down there, he said, "We have got an infestation of pine beetles up there by Brian Head." That is a big ski resort. So he went in there and said, "I could cut out 17,000 acres, harvest those trees; that timber could be used for lumber." But, no, one of the large environmental groups filed an injunction against him.

So at that time, I do not know if my colleagues can see this, Mr. Speaker, but here is this beautiful green forest. That is what we had at that time. A year later, it looked like this, because he could not beat down that injunction in time. But those little pine beetles, they just kept munching around. Now see how this turns kind of red. Well, then, a year after that, what do we have? We have an entire dead forest, and that is what it looks like.

Now I am getting letters all over the place saying why did we not take care of the forest. I would like to put up a sign that says this dead forest brought to you by the courtesy of some of the high environmental groups.

So the other day, we had a hearing. One of the large environmental groups was there. I asked this lady, I said, "Why is it that you will not let us manage the forest?" She said, "Well, let nature do her thing. Let nature do it."

Well, I do not know about my colleagues, and I do not mean to spout scripture here, but as I read the Old Testament, it said, when the Lord created the Earth, on one thing he said, I will give you the ground to till and take care of this ground, and you are supposed to take care of it.

I often believe that America has done it right. We have managed and taken

care of the ground that is owned by each of us. It is owned by us.

But we can go back to this thing and say, oh, no, let, mama nature take care of it. How does she do it in fire, wind, earthquake, flood, and what have we got? So why do we go in there and we build culverts? Why do we go in there and we take care of it?

So I have to go back to this idea of why is it we call Forest Service under agriculture, because it is a renewable resource. Have we in the past cut too much of places? Absolutely we have. Have we overgrazed the forest sometimes? No question about it. But that does not mean we cannot learn from our mistakes. That does not mean we cannot take care of the forests and use it for the benefit and joy of all America. That is one of the things that kind of bothers me.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) talked about how we got into some of the history, and the history was interesting as he gave it. At one time back in the turn of the century, we had a President by the name of Theodore Roosevelt, a great conservationist and a great guy. He could see that some things were being mutilated that we should preserve, so he asked Congress to pass an act in 1906 called the Antiquity law, the first law I think that was ever there, Mr. Speaker, to take care of people like historic and archeological and scientific sites.

Out of the Antiquity law came a lot of monuments; and out of some of those monuments came some of our better parks, Zion, Bryce, Grand Canyon, a few others.

But now that law is pretty well gone. In fact, I really question in my own heart of hearts if it is constitutional, because the Constitution basically gives the right of public ground to Congress, not to the President. But I do not think it has ever been challenged in court.

Well, since that time, we have had the 1915 Organic Act, called the Park bill where all of our beautiful parks, which we now have 377 parks, come under. Our monuments basically are handled under that which we have 73 at this time.

In 1964 came the Wilderness Act. In 1969 came the NEPA Act. In 1976 came the Federal Land Policy Management Act. The list goes on and on, the Wild Rivers Act, the Horse and Burro Act, the Mormon Trail Act. Boy, you name it, there is a dozen of them on there. So we have got plenty of legislation that takes care of our area.

Now we find ourselves in an idea of the interpretation of these that the gentleman from Colorado was referring to by some of our friends on the extreme environmental side.

It is interesting, I have been in this place now 10 terms, and I have talked to a lot of groups from all kinds. I like to go to a group and ask the question,

"Can you give me the definition of wilderness under the 1964 Wilderness Act?" It is rare that anybody can ever do it.

They all talk about, well, hey, I love that area, and I want to take care of it, and I want to leave it just as it is, and do not touch it and all that kind of stuff. But it is untrammelled by man as if man was never there, no sign of man.

Now, go over and listen to what Hubert Humphrey said, who carried most of it in the Senate side. He said, "The most you will ever see, and I am stretching it to this, will be 30 million acres." We have gone through 100 million acres and climbing. We had 100 million acres right in Alaska. We have got ground like you cannot believe.

Do my colleagues know what, Mr. Speaker, the vast, vast, vast majority of Americans do not know what that means. Let us throw out the term. Let us call up somebody tonight and say, "Mr. Posnowski, do you want more or less wilderness in America?" What will he say? He will say, I want more, because wilderness is a romantic word. Look what it conjures up in one's mind, these beautiful green forests, the smell of how it is in the forest, and the Aspen trees, and the clear water, and the fresh air.

Yet, on the other hand, if we said, "Mr. Posnowski, do you want more or less restricted area?" What would he say? He would say, "Heaven's no. I want the right to use this."

In 1980, I started working on a bill with Jake Garn, who was then a Senator, and excuse me for referring to the other body, Mr. Speaker. But in that particular area, we came up with one for Utah Forest Service Wilderness. We put almost all of the Uinta Mountains in it. We put almost a million acres in it.

We had a dedication ceremony up at those beautiful Uinta Mountains, with the Forest Service, with the governor of the State, with the environmental groups and others. Then we came back, and nobody liked the bill, so it must have been a good bill. The environmentalists said we did not go far away. The developers said we went way too far. Anyway, take it as one may.

Our phone started ringing off the hook. The main thing we heard from people went this way, they said, "Boy, I am sure glad you and Jake did that, because now we can take our four-wheelers, and get up in that wilderness area and enjoy ourselves."

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of people do not know is the definition of the 1964 Wilderness Act, "untrammelled by man as if man was never there. No sign of man." Now look at the dictum that fell out of this thing, no sign of man. That means no structures. That means no fences. That means no pop cans, nothing. One as in the first guy God put on earth, and there it is, there is no sign that man

had ever been there. So our people have a misinterpretation.

So our good friends from the East, they get these solicitations in the mail, and they say things like this, they say "You will help protect that land out in Colorado or Utah or Idaho or wherever it may be. You send us \$10, \$20, \$30, and boy, we are going to help it out that these crazy nuts do not go in there and desecrate this ground." So they send them the money, yet, they really do not understand what they are doing in that instance because, in effect, we are hurting the ground by not managing it and using it for multiple use.

So, if I may point out, we see a lot of people, and if I may be a tad critical of this administration, they have in my mind desecrated the 1906 Antiquity law, and they did it on September 16, 1996 in southern Utah, and they put 1.7 million acres into a national monument called the Grand Staircase Escalante. But they failed to follow the law. The President did not even say in his petition what it was for.

Then on top of that, he put 1.7 million acres in, and the law says one will State what it is. Is it a historic or archeological site. The next sentence says, "and he shall use the smallest of amount of acreage to protect that site."

He did not say what it was, and he gives us 1.7 million acres. This is an end run. This is a sneaky way to take away from Congress their right to take care of the ground as the Constitution gives it to them.

Now, I hope people who are listening at this time, Mr. Speaker, realize what is a monument. It has got to be an archeological or it has got to be a historic site.

Where the two trains came together when, that obviously is a historic site. Go down to Glen Canyon recreation area and look at that beautiful arch we call Rainbow Bridge. Obviously that is an archeological site.

So I start looking around at all of these proposals on monuments, and I do not see anything that fits it other than here is a sneaky way to grab up as much ground as we can.

Now, a couple weeks ago, what did we get? We got something that said the President by executive order is saying we are going to put 40 million acres of ground, Forest Service ground, mind you, into a roadless area.

So they sent me up this thing, and I got a call from them. It says, here is all the usage one can do. They ask a question, and they give an answer. However, they do not define it. The last one I found very interesting. "What does this rule do to access? Aren't you shutting out the American people of their own forest?" They say no.

The next one, "How many roads will be closed as a result of this proposal?" They say none, none whatsoever.

So I asked one of the Secretaries down there, "What is a road? Would you folks mind defining a road?" Because they have closed roads all over. I will stipulate that two tracks put down by a deer hunter is not a road. On the other side of the coin, it cannot be an interstate, so to speak.

So my colleagues are going to see out of this, if I may respectfully say so, places where the American public has been going up into the mountains of Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Arizona, holding reunions, fishing, hunting, camping, bird watching, enjoying themselves, just getting out, just getting away from everybody, and standing there and looking over this vast panorama and loving every minute of it. Those folks are going to be without.

What are they going to find, and they have found it under this administration for the last, since 1992, there will be a great big sign there that says "this road closed."

□ 1930

I have fished and hunted and camped all over the West. And I was talking to the Forest Service today, because there is a road out in Wyoming that I have been on since I was 10 years old. The other day I was up there with my boys, doing some trout fishing on that stream, and I came to that road and it said, "Road closed by order of the Forest Service." Why? So I called the forester up there and asked him about it, and I am still waiting for a good response as to why he is closing a road that has been used by sheepmen, by timber people, by elk hunters, and by fishermen. A beautiful road, maintained very well, closed. For no reason at all except some folks want us off that ground.

Now, I want to go back to my friend here from Colorado, but I would like to say this. There sure seems to be a lot of folks, besides this administration, that wants to, in effect, close up that ground, make it a single purpose, and not many people to go there. This Uinta Mountains I was talking about, I do not think there is a kid from the whole Wasatch Front of Utah, when he was a Boy Scout, that did not go up to the Uinta Mountains. We all did that with our scout master. And now they are saying, oh no, we do not want you to do that. We do not want any horses up there. Boy, that is a big country. We do not want any horses, and we want groups of less than three. How do scout masters take a scout group in that is composed of less than three?

They also do not want fishing up there. Some of the best fishing in America. Trout fishing, fly fishing. Why can people not take their sons and their neighbors and their uncles and aunts and go up there? They also do not want any hunting. So, in other words, close it up. So there are a lot of ways people are closing up the grounds that they should not.

I say to my good friends from the East, which we have the greatest respect for, you folks sit back here thinking of all those wonderful things out west, and the chance of going there maybe once in your lifetime, but we have to live there. We have to raise our families there. We expect that our people can use this ground. And multiple use has worked successfully for well over 100 years, and it can just bring tears to your eyes thinking about changing an entire way of living that is happening now because some people are not thinking.

They start putting money into these extreme groups who want to get rid of all the things that the gentleman from Colorado is speaking about. Take the motors off the rivers. Well, let us see someone run the Grand Canyon without a 35 horsepower motor on the back. You will spend 2 weeks on it rather than 5 days. I remember a time when people came and said, well, the roar of that motor will ruin our trip. Oh, give me a break. You would have to have ears like a Doberman Pincer to even hear that thing. You are going through those great big rapids. You can hardly hear that little putt-putt on the back. But it holds you straight and gets you through all right.

They want people not to land airplanes. As a pilot myself, I have put down an airplane on back strips all of my life, and some in the Speaker's area up there in the River of No Return, which is kind of scary stuff. But, still, on the other hand, why take those out that we cannot land in some of those areas and enjoy it? Why can we not take some of these little ATVs in some areas? Why is it everything has to be one way and there is no compromise?

It is very interesting that there is one organization called the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, and I wish some of them were from Utah. Most of them are from New York, Wisconsin, Minnesota. Hardly anybody from Utah, but they want to tell us how we can run our ground.

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, for letting my paranoia spill out a little bit, but I am afraid I do get a little tired of that. With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and would like the opportunity to speak again.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Utah joining me.

One of the great people of our country that the gentleman talked about was President Roosevelt. Theodore Roosevelt. I will write it again on my little chart over here what his philosophy was in regards to the Federal lands. Now, remember, Theodore Roosevelt hunted in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. If you have been to Glenwood Springs, Colorado, it is a wonderful community, it is my home, it is where my parents still live, and we have family there. We have a hotel called the

Hotel Colorado. It used to be called the Western White House because that is where Theodore Roosevelt used to hunt.

Theodore Roosevelt came out and he used the Federal lands, but he had a philosophy about the lands, and his philosophy really is best summarized with a very few short words. What President Roosevelt said, and if my colleagues will look at my chart, in regards to these Federal lands, first look at the left, again look at the quantity of Federal lands in the western United States. And what President Roosevelt said was, going to my white chart here, "Use it, enjoy it, but don't abuse it and don't destroy it."

Why do my colleagues think that those lands look as good as they do? Because, in my opinion, those of us who live out there, and a lot of us live out there, my family has been there for generations, and my wife's family has been there for generations, and we hope our families can stay there for generations more, but one of the reasons we are there is because it is so beautiful. But we have a right to make a living out there, and we think that we have been able to maintain a balance that is preserved, a lot of the beauty that you see.

For a lot of people, especially here in the East, who have never had the good fortune to travel to the West into the mountains, into the Rocky Mountain range, hear horror stories from some of the more radical environmental groups and their image of what is going on out there is a ski area every 2 miles, cabins being built every 50 feet, coal mines, forests being clear-cut, highways everywhere. People would be amazed if they came to the third district of Colorado, my district, that they could fly, not drive but fly, for hours without seeing another human.

People going into those mountains know that we know how to take care of those mountains. You can go into those mountains and walk 50 miles in those mountains and not see one piece of trash. You cannot walk a block from this capital here and not pick up a bagful of trash. We know how to take care of those lands. It is a very precious resource for all of us, for all of the people of the United States. But we have to approach our guardianship of these lands in a very balanced fashion.

I have a couple of examples that I would like to go over with my colleagues. One is the right way to approach this balance and the other is the wrong way to approach this balance.

Let me start with the right way, the positive way, to approach it. We just did it. Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, my respected colleague from the State of Colorado, the United States Senator, and I attended an event last weekend, the dedication of the Black Canyon National Park. National park. It was a national monument.

Senator CAMPBELL's bill out of the Senate, my bill out of the House, we made it a national monument. It was a great day. In fact, when I went jogging that morning, at 4 in the morning in the Colorado mountains, we had a full moon. And as I ran, looking at that moon, a person cannot help but feel proud, number one, to be an American, but also how lucky we are to live out there. And we feel a deep commitment to preserve the area that we are in, but also to allow humans to enjoy it.

At that dedication ceremony, by the way, I made the comment that the beauty of the preservation of the Black Canyon National Park was that we were able to work in a very cooperative fashion with the local people, with the State people and the Federal people. And what we preserved is not just the national park itself, but we preserved the right for people to go up to the national park and enjoy it. That is very important. Very important.

Now, how did the Black Canyon National Park, from a monument, come about? It was not driven by Washington, D.C. In fact, it was not driven by an elected or a political official at all. It was driven by the local community. At the local level, people got together, in Montrose, in Gunnison, Colorado, in Delta, Colorado, in Ouray, and they got support from the media, like the Daily Sentinel in Grand Junction, Colorado, the Montrose Daily Press, my good friend George R. Bannock, other people like that in the press, helped support this concept of let us work our conflict out at the local level. So we did not jam it down from Washington, D.C. this thing came from the ground up.

And what is the Black Canyon National Park; what is the beauty of this park? It preserves multiple use. It has many uses of the park. Now, I am sure that there are many national environmental groups, probably Earth First, for example, that would have one use for that park and that would be an anti-human use. Get the people off it. Get the recreation off it. If you are not an able-bodied hiker, which, in general, is younger than I am, you are not going to come up here. That is the radical viewpoint over here.

The radical viewpoint on this side of the spectrum there are the people that say, well, we ought to be able to go up there and timber wherever we want to timber, hunt wherever we want to hunt, mountain bike wherever we want to mountain bike, graze wherever. No. No. The local people sat down and said somewhere in between a position like the National Earth First and just complete freedom to do whatever you want, which of course leads to abuse and destruction in those forests, somewhere in between we have a way to resolve this conflict. And what they did was they resolved it. They resolved it. They preserved multiple use. They preserved

certain areas in that park as wilderness.

In the new national park designations we have wilderness designation. They preserved the right for people to go down the river in a raft. They preserved the right for some grazing on the national park. They preserved the right for a paved road. We have a paved road right up to the visitor's center where an individual can stand on the edge of cliffs that drop 2,000 feet. Two thousand feet. And when the sun is at the right angle, and you have a pair of binoculars, the water is so clean you can see fish. If you have the binoculars, you can see the fish in the stream.

We preserved the right for people to go up and enjoy that and we did it at the local level. And the local people then brought it to the State people, who then brought it to the United States Congress. And thanks to people like the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and my good colleagues Mr. ALLARD and Mr. CAMPBELL on the other side in the Senate we were able to move that from a national monument to a national park.

That is the right way to do things. We did not have people in the East bashing it on us in the West. We had people in the East cooperating with us. The people in the East said to the people in the West, you have lived on that land, you care about that land, you know about that land, so maybe we ought to listen to you about that land. Instead of coming up with Washington knows better. That is the right way to do things. Come up with that balance. Preserve those water rights.

And by the way, in the Black Canyon, that project would have been dead in the water, no pun intended, dead in the water if they would have gone after those Colorado water rights. Our water rights in the West, it has been written in our State capital in Denver, life in the West is water. That is what it is about. Water is life in the West.

But the local groups got together and they said, here is how we can preserve those water rights. Now, let me tell my colleagues there is a huge threat to the West on water rights. For example, as my dear colleague knows, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), down at Lake Powell, and many of my colleagues, I am sure, have enjoyed Lake Powell. It is one of the most wonderful lakes in the world. It is wonderful for recreation; wonderful for families. If you want to see a good family activity, or taking kids off the street or taking the kids from somewhere and bringing them down to this lake, they get on these house boats and it provides recreation and family time.

It also provides a huge amount of power. It helps us prevent the flooding, and provides us huge quantities of water storage. But the National Sierra Club, their number one goal is take out

the dam, destroy the dam and get rid of Lake Powell. That organization is out of Washington, D.C. That is what they want to do.

We did not buy that with the national park in Black Canyon. We did not buy the philosophy of Earth First. In other words, getting rid of multiple use. We bought the philosophy in Washington, D.C. of the people in Gunnison, in Montrose, in Ouray, and Delta, out there in Colorado, the people who had their hands in the soil every day. My father-in-law, David Smith is a rancher, and his family has been on the same ranch since 1882, 1883, somewhere in there, and he told me one time that an environmentalist is somebody who has had their hands in the dirt, who understands the earth.

Well, that is the right way to do things, to let the people at the local level help us all come together in a common fashion to help preserve multiple use, where we have protection for the environment through wilderness or special areas; where we have national parks and national monuments; but where we preserve the right to go biking on a mountain bike, where we preserve the right to canoe on the river or ride a river raft, which is a thrill. Anybody that has been on it with their family, their kids will remember it. They probably have pictures of them hanging on a raft in their bedrooms. Where we preserve the right to ski. If you do not ski in the mountains, it is pretty tough to ski anywhere else. We have not figured out how to make that sport work without the mountains.

We need to preserve those rights, and the rights of ranchers, like my father-in-law, and my father who is in the business of supporting the ranchers, the right for them to be able to operate their farms and ranches in those mountains.

□ 1945

Now let me talk about the wrong way, and then I want to turn it over to my colleague. The wrong way. I want my colleague, when he takes back the podium here in a couple of minutes, I hope he talks to you about the wrong way and what happened in Utah with the Staircase over there in Utah. But let me talk about what is about to happen in the State of Colorado.

Anasazi Ruins. The Anasazi is down in the Four Corners. The Four Corners is the only place in the United States where four States come together. I will point it out with my light here on my map. The Four Corners is right here. You have four States that come together in one spot. Really kind of exciting. They have got a little spot, by the way human access, you can walk up to it and you can literally be standing in four States at once.

Every young person that has done that has remembered it. Well, there is a lot of land around this. We preserve,

of course, the monument. We have a national park down there in the Four Corners. But over in this area right here, the Secretary of the Interior, who spends most of his time in Washington, D.C., who consults very little, in my opinion, with those of us in the West, made recent trips down there. And he said, I want to take this land and put it under some kind of executive order, I want to put this land aside and put it as a monument. This is hundreds of thousands of acres.

So now you have a perception what we are talking about. Think of the acreage that you own with your home. Colleagues, your house is probably on a half an acre. If you are very lucky, it is on an acre. But more likely, you are on a quarter of an acre or less.

Well, the Secretary of Interior has talked about coming down into this Four Corners area and taking hundreds of thousands of acres for a monument. Do you know what kind of response he got at the local level? Wait a minute, Mr. Secretary. Listen to us. What about the water rights, Mr. Secretary? What about the access? What about the needs? We do have to have power lines that come through there. What about our ability to go up and hunt or camp or fish? What about our ability for our cattle to graze? What about the local opinion on how best to protect our environment, how to keep our waters clean as our water is today? What about that, Mr. Secretary?

Do you know what the answer is from Washington? They show up and they pretend like they are listening. But as far as they are concerned, the decision has been made.

Now, that is a pretty strong statement. Where does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) come to the conclusion that Bruce Babbitt in Washington, D.C., who has come down to the Four Corners maybe twice or three times, probably no more than that, in his lifetime, who wants to take several hundred thousand acres of land and put it in a monument, how does he know that Bruce Babbitt is going to go about doing this regardless of what the local opinion is?

I will tell you what happened to me and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) last week. I had a constituent of mine come in, and she had been down to a big luncheon for the Heritage, protection of Heritage buildings and historical areas. It was here in Washington about a week ago. Bruce Babbitt was the guest speaker. This is exactly what Bruce Babbitt said. And I will summarize. This is exactly what went on. He said, and this is as reported to me, he said, down in the Four Corners of Colorado there is some beautiful land that we ought to put in a monument.

Now, the local people do not buy into this. And the State delegation of elected officials, they do not agree with me.

And the Congressional delegation does not agree with me that we should do this. But I, Bruce Babbitt, I am going to do it. I am going to do it irrespective of what the local people say.

The Federal Government, the people in the East, Washington, D.C., comes into our State and says, regardless of local input, I am going to do it.

Do you know what that lady said to me? It is interesting. She said to me, I was sitting in there wondering, wow, is this the country of which Constitution I studied in high school? Is this what the Constitution says? Are you guys really representatives of the people or are you little dictators out there that are just going to decide we will take this land, we will take that land. You know, it does not affect us.

If they go down there, frankly, Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues in this room will not even blink an eye. If they take 200,000 acres in the Four Corners of Colorado, they will not even blink an eye. They probably will not know what happened.

But what about those families? Oh, there are not a lot of them. In the East you have these big cities. And we have some in the West, but not like you do in the population in the East. It does not affect a lot of people. But do you know what? Those people deserve to have the opportunity to live and dream and enjoy the heritage they have in those mountains and in those special places in the West as much as you do here in the East.

And even if it is just a thousand families, even if it is 100 families, even if it is just 50 families, do the people in the East have a right to come out and dictate the policies of the West without at least local input?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) coming down here. I hope that we are able to continue to kind of have a series of discussions into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me point out, if I may, my colleague mentioned a lot between the East and the West. Still, if I may say so, it is really kind of a disaster and a sad time that the East does not have more public ground. You know, they really should have.

We tried to get a bill through a couple years ago that was called the Eastern Wilderness Bill. Basically what it would do, it would say to the big States in the East, why do you not find some ground out there? You maybe have to buy it. You maybe have to condemn it, or whatever, but find some ground. Because people here, they do not have that. They do not even know what it is like.

As my colleague pointed out earlier, everything is private ground. And so,

in a way, they kind of tell the rest of us how to manage our ground even though some have never even been to our areas. They, of course, have that representation here, and many of them do it because they become part of some of these groups that I would characterize as rather radical.

Where do these groups come from? As a college student many years ago at the University of Utah, I was struggling along selling suits for a guy down at ZCMI, a big store, and trying to make ends meet and married with two little kids and my wife was teaching school; and I used to send \$5 or so to the Sierra Club because I believed in what they were doing. They were doing things like trying to keep things clean and fresh and that type of thing. And I think the genesis was pure.

I have seen a lot of these change now. I have seen now they have become big industries. I think it is typical of my many years on the Committee on the Interior, 20 years now, or will be at the end of this term, where we see these people, regardless of what we come up with, they keep moving the goal post on us.

We talk about this thing of wilderness and some people say, take the State of Utah, for example, we want three million acres. We will not settle for any less than that. Then that three million acres then went to 5.7 million acres. And now it is up to 9.1. And at the hearing we had last week, some people want 14 million acres.

To come right down to it, if I may be brutally candid here, these people in these industries have started an industry. So they get that. Do they extinguish? Do they go away? Heavens no. They stay here forever. And why is that? They started out with nothing. They just had some people who believed in their heart of hearts they were doing right. And now, as time went on, they have lawyers, they have accountants, they have millions of dollars. They take out full-page ads in New York papers and the Washington Post, it costs them \$50,000 a whack, to try to influence people on this floor to influence people out West.

What is it to a lot of our colleagues, anyway? It is a throw-away vote. What do they care? It does not mean anything out there in Idaho or Colorado or Utah or Arizona. Big deal. So they put a lot of money in these people on their campaigns and then they call them up.

I remember years ago, my 14 years on the Committee on Ethics, I had some good friend from the other side of the aisle call me up and say, Jim, why is this organization giving me five grand? I said, well, think about it. And about 2 or 3 weeks later they said, it kind of dawned on me a little bit because you got a bill about your State in Utah and they want my vote. So these people know how to play the game but they do not go away. It is kind of like the downwinders in Utah.

When I was first here in 1980, we got in the situation of how to deploy the MX missile. President Carter came up with an idea of putting it in Utah and Nevada and running in between them. Well, it did not work. It was not a good idea.

I carried the amendment to kill it, in fact, back in those days. The downwinders were totally dedicated to taking the MX out of Utah. The MX is a good missile, but that was not the way to deploy it.

At the end of that, did they go away? Did they extinguish? No. They ran up and said, well, there is an electronic battlefield going up here. Let us see if we can kill that now.

Well, after that finally died because Dick Chaney said he could not afford it, did they go away? No. It kept getting bigger. And then they got an area we are trying to get rid of 43 percent of the obsolete chemical weapons. And now we look at the Sierra Club. Did they go away? Did SUA go away? Did Earth First go away? Did the Audubon Society? Did the Wilderness Society? No.

Well, I am not saying they are not meritorious in some areas. They probably are. But in many areas they have established an industry and they would not settle these things if we wanted to.

I guess nobody in this House is more sensitive to it than me. Because I have been on the Committee of Public Lands, Forests, and Parks for my entire time and I have worked with these folks and they do not want to settle because the industry would end.

Frankly, it disturbs me because we do not have that honest, pure intent of let us get the job done that we should have done.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) talked about the Sierra Club going to crack the dam, which is Lake Powell. I do not know if a lot of people here listening understand about Lake Powell, but most of them should. It is one of the biggest reservoirs in the United States. It is 186 miles long. It has more shoreline than the entire West Coast. And people love the area.

The gentleman adequately pointed out the idea that the whole southwest part of America lives because of water. If we did not have the Fontinell and Flaming Gorge, and Lake Mead, and Glen Canyon and Parker and Davis, close up L.A., close up Phoenix and we are done. And hundreds of kilowatt hours, or thousands, millions of kilowatt hours go out of those dams. In fact, on Lake Powell it would take seven coal-fire dams to replace what we would lose from hydropower. And everybody knows that hydropower is the best we have got.

Some of these people do not seem to care. Let a river run through it. Go back to these movie actors that have all these romantic ideas and no knowledge and they do things by a burning in the bosom rather than by science.

It comes down to the idea we need those dams. The gentleman adequately pointed out, one of the greatest vacations anybody could have is to go down to one of these dams. Get a houseboat. Take your ski boat along. The kids will never forget it. When you come down to the choice should you remodel the bathroom or should you take a trip to Lake Powell, take Lake Powell. The kids will remember that much more than they will ever remember remodeling the bathroom.

Well, the one thing, if I may end on this, Mr. Speaker, is I see all these things, those money-raising schemes going out. Protect this land before it is developed. One of the stupidest ones I have ever seen in my life was put out by a movie actor in Provo, Utah, which had all of those beautiful red monoliths of southern Utah and it had superimposed on it condominiums.

Has not anyone heard of the FLPMA Act? Does not anyone understand that BLM, Forest Service, Park Service has management plans? Do they think they let people go out and do that?

What developer would be dumb enough to go out in the middle of some God forsaken, in the minds of some folks, beautiful to a lot of us, and say let us put a condominium on the top of it? That is ridiculous. Have they ever heard of planning commissions? Have they ever heard of rules and laws made by States and counties and cities? Apparently they have not.

What do they sell to some of our good folks back East? They send them back there and they get that and they get this beautiful calendar. In fact, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance put out one of the prettiest calendars I have ever seen in my life, and it was all about this Utah BLM bill is how they said it, how they had to protect this ground.

Well, of the 12 months out the year, there was only one, only one, that was Utah BLM ground. As I recall, one was Forest Service and the rest were parks, only one in the area. But, boy, that is nice if you are a dentist out there in New York, as one of my pen-pals is, who criticizes me about once a month. He has that hanging in there and as he leans over there grinding teeth all day, or whatever you do, Mr. Speaker, I know you would know more about that than I would, he can envision the day he can go out and visit that beautiful country and just enjoy it with his family.

We have a coal fire plant out there. And this one fellow said to me one time, when I come to Utah, I do not want to see that smoke stack. Well, that smoke stack is in a pretty remote area called Linden, Utah, right out on the west desert. I doubt if he would see it. We have put millions of dollars in putting scrubbers on it so it will not put any pollutants in the air. In fact, it is so clean that we have that local

Grand Staircase, but I will not go into that. They had to throw sulphur into it even to check the thing out, which is amazing. But he did not want to see that thing. But out of that, millions and millions of people have power. And that is kind of necessary too.

So, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) points out, there is a moderation in there. It is not this side or that side. Somewhere we can say there is moderation in all things. I do not know who came up with the term, it ought to be scriptural because that is what makes sense; and thinking people, people who can sit down and be reasonable and think things out, can find that middle ground. We do not always have to take these polarized, extreme positions.

I say to our many, many, many friends from the East who spend millions of dollars on these organizations, think about it a little bit. The rest of us have some rights, too. We just want to get along with our Eastern friends.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2037

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3064, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-419)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia, and for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

For programs, projects, or activities in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000, provided as follows, to be effective as if it had been enacted into law as the regular appropriations Act:

An Act Making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

TITLE I—FISCAL YEAR 2000

APPROPRIATIONS

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for a program to be administered by the Mayor for District of Columbia resident tuition support, subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation for such program by Congress, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, usable at both public and private institutions of higher education: Provided further, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit and such other factors as may be authorized: Provided further, That if the authorized program is a nationwide program, the Mayor may expend up to \$17,000,000: Provided further, That if the authorized program is for a limited number of States, the Mayor may expend up to \$11,000,000: Provided further, That the District of Columbia may expend funds other than the funds provided under this heading, including local tax revenues and contributions, to support such program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR INCENTIVES FOR ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia to create incentives to promote the adoption of children in the District of Columbia foster care system, \$5,000,000: Provided, That such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2001 and shall be used in accordance with a program established by the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That funds provided under this heading may be used to cover the costs to the District of Columbia of providing tax credits to offset the costs incurred by individuals in adopting children in the District of Columbia foster care system and in providing for the health care needs of such children, in accordance with legislation enacted by the District of Columbia government.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CITIZEN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for administrative expenses of the Citizen Complaint Review Board, \$500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

For a Federal payment to the Department of Human Services for a mentoring program and for hotline services, \$250,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORRECTIONS TRUSTEE OPERATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee, \$176,000,000 for the administration and operation of correctional facilities and for the administrative operating costs of the Office of the Corrections Trustee, as authorized by section 11202 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 712): Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: Provided further, That in addition to the funds provided under this heading, the District of Columbia Corrections Trustee may use a portion of the interest earned on the Federal payment made to the Trustee under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1998, (not to exceed \$4,600,000) to carry out the activities funded under this heading.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, \$99,714,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$7,209,000; for the District of Columbia Superior Court, \$68,351,000; for the District of Columbia Court System, \$16,154,000; and \$8,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: Provided, That of the amounts available for operations of the District of Columbia Courts, not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be for the design of an Integrated Justice Information System and that such funds shall be used in accordance with a plan and design developed by the courts and approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies, with payroll and financial services to be provided on a contractual basis with the General Services Administration (GSA), said services to include the preparation of monthly financial reports, copies of which shall be submitted directly by GSA to the President and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For payments authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Code, and payments for counsel authorized under section 21-2060, D.C. Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), \$33,336,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts" (other than the \$8,000,000 provided under such heading for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities) may also be used for payments under this heading: Provided further, That in