

Mrs. Heillesheim or Mrs. Stoker or Mrs. Mulroy or Mr. Trumain in the elementary school at Roosevelt in La Crosse, or whether it was Mr. Knutson or Mr. Kroner, Gary Corbiser, Mrs. Bee Small in the middle school at Logan. In high school, there were so many good teachers who I had the privilege to have teach me, whether it was Ernie Eggett, who taught me advanced algebra or calculus; or Joe Thienes who made physics and chemistry interesting for this student; Mr. Anderson, Mr. Markus, and Diane Gephardt who taught me how to write; Ron Johnson who sparked my love and interest in history that I carry with me even today.

I just want to conclude by thanking them, in particular, for the role that they had in bringing me up because it did not necessarily have to end up here in the Chamber of the people's House, the House of Representatives. But for their influence and their concern about the future and my life, as well as a couple of loving parents that I had growing up under, it could have been a lot different for this kid on the north side of La Crosse.

So tonight I just want to pay special tribute to those teachers who had a major impact and influence in, and influenced my life.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, one can see the leadership that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) shows, and he shares with us in showing how great teachers and quality teachers can bring about a quality Member of Congress.

I suppose I started also in talking about the person who was instrumental in my life, my father, because my mother died when I was 3½, and I was brought up by my father. This is why I carry the full name of JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD. But he was so absolutely so strong on quality education.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4141 is potentially detrimental to both the Safe and Drug Free School Act and the 21st century community learning centers. Further, the national program on hate crime prevention sponsored by the Safe and Drug Free School Act could lose much-needed funds if this particular provision, that transferability clause, passes in this ESEA reauthorization.

We can no longer, Mr. Speaker, tolerate violence, especially gun violence that affect the lives of our students. We have seen that with Columbine and the others.

So I plan to offer an amendment which repeals the transferability clause in Title I of H.R. 4141 when it comes to the floor. I believe that it is extremely harmful for the local education agencies to be able to transfer funds between educational programs thereby weakening the original mandate of those funds.

Again, Title I is for our poorest of children, the poorest of schools. I have those schools in my district of Watts and Wilmington and other places.

I say to all of us in this House, let us not forget the disadvantaged student, the one who critically needs quality education.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3709, THE INTERNET NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. LINDER (during the special order of Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-611) on the resolution (H. Res. 496) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3709) to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple and discriminatory taxes on the Internet, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 701, THE CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER (during the special order of Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-612) on the resolution (H. Res. 497) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 701) to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreational needs of the American people, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

LAND OF MANY USES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). 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, I have a very serious subject of which I want to address to my colleagues, a subject of which many of my colleagues in this room, while it is not in their district, they may not have the kind of knowledge that I hope to kind of infer into them this evening during our discussion.

What I want to visit about really is specific, as it first comes out to the State of Colorado and to the Third Congressional District. Did my col-

leagues know the Third Congressional District is one of the largest districts in the United States? That is the district that I represent in the United States Congress.

That District geographically is larger than the State of Florida. It is a very unique district. I will kind of point out the district here on the map to my left. It is this portion of Colorado. It consumes over 60 percent of the State of Colorado. In that area, just roughly speaking, with the exception of Pikes Peak and part of Estes Park, all the other mountains, for the most part, are contained within the Third Congressional District of Colorado.

Now, this district has some very unique features about it. First of all, the amount of Federal land ownership within the district, which exceeds 22 million acres. This district is also a district which supplies 80 percent of the water in the State of Colorado, even though 80 percent of the population lives outside the Third Congressional District.

This district is also unique. Well, in fact, the entire State of Colorado is unique in that Colorado is the only State in the whole union, the only State in the whole union where we have no free-flowing water that comes into our State for our use. In other words, all of our water flows out of the State.

Now, in this particular district, as my colleagues know, because of the amount of Federal land, we have a concept called multiple use. I want to give a brief history of multiple use. Although I have talked many times from this podium to my colleagues about multiple use, I am asking for their patience again this evening, because I want to give a little history of multiple use and why in the West we have much different circumstances or consequences of decisions in Washington, D.C. regarding land than they do in the East.

Let me put it this way, multiple use is critical for our style of life. There are many organizations that are up and down the eastern coast around in these areas that really do not understand what it is like to live surrounded by Federal lands. So it is very easy for them to criticize those of us who live in the West for our lifestyle. It is very easy for those individuals to tell us to get off the Federal lands as if we had no right to be on those Federal lands.

Well, let us start with a little history. After I go through the history, then I am going to move into the White River National Forest. It is one of the most beautiful forests in the world. It is an area which I grew up on. I was born and raised in Colorado. My family has been there for multiple generations. I can tell my colleagues that there are a lot of people that are very proud of the White River National Forest. So we will move into the White River National Forest.

But, first of all, let us start with a little history on the concept of multiple use. In the early days of this country, the United States, as a young country, wanted to expand. Obviously the only place to expand was west because our people and our country started over here on the eastern coast near the Atlantic Ocean.

But as the United States began to acquire land, for example, through purchases like the Louisiana Purchase, they needed to come out here into these new lands. Back then, having a deed for property, unlike today, today if one has a deed for property, it really means something. One can go into the courts and enforce it. In those days, in the frontier days and the early days of the settlement of the United States as we know it today, having a deed did not mean a whole lot. One had to have possession. That is where, for example, the saying possession is nine-tenths of the law. That is where that saying came from.

So the challenge that faced our government in the East was how do we encourage our citizens who have the comfort of living in the East to become frontiersmen, and I say that generically, to become frontiersmen to go West and settle the West and get possession of the lands that we want to become later States in the United States.

So the idea they came up with is, well, let us do the American dream. One of the pillars of capitalism, one of the pillars of freedom, one of the pillars of which the concept of our government was made, that is private property. Let us give them some land. I think it is every American's dream to own their own home, to own a piece of property.

It was many, many years ago, hundreds of years ago when our country was formed. So they thought, the leaders at that time, the way to get these people to move out here to the West, to settle all of this new land, let us give them land. Let us see if they go out there and they work on the land, and they show that they really care about the land and they devote themselves to the land. Let us give them the land, maybe 160 acres, maybe 320 acres. It is called the Homestead Act.

That worked pretty well, except when one got to the West, to the West right here, out here, 160 acres, for example, in Kansas or 160 acres in Nebraska or 160 acres in Ohio or 160 acres elsewhere, in Missouri or Mississippi, one could support a family, or maybe 320 acres, one could support a family off that.

But when they got into the Rocky Mountains, for example, they found out that 160 acres, it will not even feed a cow. So they went back to Washington. In Washington, they said, what do we do? We are not getting people to go out here and settle in these areas where we want them to settle.

So they thought about it. One of the thoughts, of course, was to let us give them an equivalent amount of land. Let us say to them, look, it takes 160 acres to support a family in Nebraska. Let us give them 3,000 acres in the mountains. The leaders thought about it, and they thought, politically, we cannot give that much land away because we expect a lot of people to go out there.

So then someone else came up with the idea, well, let us do this. Let us go ahead in the West. In the West, let us have the government continue to own the land as a formality, and let us let the people use the land just like they do in the East; thus, the concept of multiple use.

Now, many of my colleagues who have been in the West and have entered a national forest, they may have seen a sign that says, for example, "Welcome to the White River National Forest," and underneath there hung a sign that said "A land of many uses." That is what this really represented, a land of many uses.

Later in my discussions, we will talk about how a land of many uses has expanded, how it has expanded to protect the environment, how it has expanded much beyond ranching and farming and mining and things like that. It has expanded into recreation. It has expanded into multiple, multiple uses. In fact, that doctrine has grown unusually.

Let me tell my colleagues what we have right here, the map that I am showing them. This map represents here in the east where most of the white spots are, with the exception of the Appalachians here and the Everglades down in Florida, there is very little Federal land ownership out in the east. These big blobs in the West, all of the colors we see, that is land owned by the government.

So at this point, what I want to stress upon my colleagues as I address them here on the floor is the difference between land ownership by the government in the east, of which it is, for all practical purposes, at a minimum, and land ownership in the West which, for all practical purposes, is almost total.

Now, understanding that, when one lives in one part of the country where the Federal Government has very little Federal ownership and really for development or planning or zoning, one can go to one's local city council or one's county governments in the East, compare that living style to, in the West where, really, when one wants to have some kind of zoning or thing like that, one has to go to the government in Washington, D.C., because one is surrounded by government lands.

Now, let me say that, in these big blobs of federally government-owned land, Federally-owned land, and other government-owned land, there are communities out there. There are small towns. I will give my colleagues some

examples of towns which they will recognize right away: Aspen, Colorado; Vail, Colorado; Glenwood Springs, Colorado; Meeker, Colorado.

Now, the reason I am giving my colleagues those communities is I am kind of focusing this in on the White River National Forest.

□ 2030

All of the communities, in fact, all the ski resorts in Colorado, are located within the boundaries of the Third Congressional District, which I represent. Now, those communities are totally dependent on cooperation from the Federal Government. We here in Washington, D.C., dictate what those communities, and hundreds of other communities just like them, what they get to do. We dictate whether or not they get to have power lines to bring power into their communities. We dictate whether or not they get to have highways that come into their communities. We dictate their water resources.

In some cases, the Federal Government, under a new policy, is now attempting to reverse, turn on its head, or completely ignore the long-standing doctrine that recognizes State water law and go into States like Colorado and say, look, if your water, for example, is stored upon Federal land, runs across Federal land or originates on Federal land, even though you own it, we are going to confiscate a part of it and we are not going to let you have access to it any more. In other words, the government has complete control of the life-style in the West.

In the East, people are generally very free from the government. And when I say the East, let us go ahead and draw a boundary here on this map. Coming up here from the Canadian border and right down and through Colorado, actually going down I-25, half of Colorado has very little Federal land ownership in it. Coming down here, up through here, through Oklahoma and down right to the border there in Arizona, over in this area over here, everything east to the Atlantic Ocean, very little government ownership. Everything to the west almost total government ownership.

Well, that leads me into the topic that I want to visit this evening on, and that is the White River National Forest. The White River National Forest is a huge forest, about 2.7 million acres, approximately. One-third of that forest today, one-third of that forest, is held in a wilderness area.

Now, a wilderness is the most restrictive management tool that the government uses. It is the tool for management that has the least amount of flexibility. I know something about wilderness. I have sponsored and carried into law a number of wilderness bills. The White River National Forest has amongst the highest percentage of

wilderness anywhere in the United States, and certainly has the highest percentage of wilderness within the State of Colorado.

Wilderness is very appropriate under very tight circumstances. And when people talk about wilderness, obviously, it is a very fuzzy word. How many of my colleagues in here do not like the word wilderness? How many people have my colleagues ever met, when asked if they like wilderness, do they like mothers, do they like ice cream, have ever heard them say no? It is kind of like finding someone that is anti-education. They are not out there. But when we take a look at the legal definition of the word wilderness as it applies, for example, to Colorado water rights, as it applies to a number of other things, we have to be very, very careful about the application of a wilderness area.

I have a bill called the Colorado Canyons Bill, which I intend to present to my colleagues here in the next couple of weeks. In that one I am proposing 72,000 acres that is in a wilderness study acre to be converted to wilderness. But I do that only after very, very careful study.

So we know now that the White River National Forest has many, many different communities contained within its boundaries, and within those particular boundaries we have one-third of the forest, or about 750,000 acres of the forest, which are in wilderness as we now speak.

Now, when we take a look at the White River National Forest, let us talk about some other issues. There are issues, like water. What is important to remember about the White River National Forest, and let me kind of show, it is very hard to define it, but it is an area about like this on the map, it would be about the size of a silver dollar here in this area, in the White River National Forest we have six rivers which start in that forest. Six rivers originate in the White River National Forest and a seventh river, the Colorado River, comes through the White River National Forest. So water is a critical issue.

Now, remember, as I spoke earlier in my comments, water in Colorado is very unique. We are the only State where our water runs out. We have no water that comes in. In the particular area of the State where the White River National Forest is, we supply 80 percent of the water for Colorado. Eighty percent of the population in Colorado resides outside the Third Congressional District, and probably, oh, 95 percent of the State's population resides outside the boundaries of the White River National Forest.

Well, what happens, in managing these forests, and now, remember, these forests across this country, it is our land, remember the song *This Is My Land, This Is Your Land*, it is our

land and it represents ownership of all of us in this room. Some of us are obviously much more directly impacted by that because we live there. Many of my colleagues have never set foot in it. I hope, by the way, some of my colleagues all have an opportunity to visit the White River National Forest.

By the way, if any of my colleagues have ever skied in Colorado, ever river-raftered in Colorado, ever mountain biked in Colorado, ever kayaked in Colorado, ever snow-boarded in Colorado, or ever camped in Colorado, the likelihood is very high that any of those family recreational activities that my colleagues have participated in occurred on the White River National Forest.

As I said earlier, these are our forests, they belong to us, and we have a fiduciary relationship to the people of this country to run those forests. So we have an agency that is in charge of the forests called the United States Forest Service. Now, obviously, they are subject to review and guidance by the United States Congress. So, really, the buck stops here.

To manage our forests what we have decided to do is to put out what we call a forest plan. Now, with today's technology it changes so rapidly that a long-term plan has to have flexibility built into it. In the older days, for example when the plan that this forest is now managed under was first drafted, in about 1984, we did not see that kind of rapid change so we could have a 10- or 15-year plan for the forest. Well, that plan is about ready for review. It needs to be replaced with a new plan. So the U.S. Forest Service has spent a good deal of time going out and seeking opinions on what is the best way to manage this forest, and that is what we are going to discuss tonight.

Now, I should tell my colleagues that I believe very strongly in a quote by Theodore Roosevelt when it comes to these forests, and I ask that my colleagues listen to the placement of the words, because I think it is very appropriate as it relates to what we are speaking of. By Theodore Roosevelt: "I recognize the right and the duty of this generation to develop and use the natural resources of our land, but I do not recognize the right to waste them or to rob by wasteful use the generations that come after us."

When the forest issued its plan, I think, frankly, they did a pretty good job in solicitation of opinions. And I can tell my colleagues that a lady by the name of Martha Kattrell, Lyle Laverty at the U.S. Forest Service, and a number of other people down there really have put some hard work in this and I wanted to recognize them this evening. That does not mean I agree with them. I will cover a number of different subjects of which I do think we have agreement on, but I will cover some subjects, specifically water, of

which we have drawn the line in the sand.

Let me go back to what they have done. The Forest Service has come up with a recommended plan. When that plan came out, I objected to it quite strenuously. I objected to it on a number of different counts, the first and foremost of which is water.

Now, look, in Colorado we have to stand up strong for our water. There are a lot of my colleagues in this room that do not live within the boundaries of Colorado but who depend on Colorado water and are very anxious to get as much of that water as they can. If I lived in their States, I would want as much Colorado water as I could get too. By the way, it is the best water in the country: Rocky Mountain spring water, Coors beer, et cetera, et cetera. But I do not live in any other state, I live in the State of Colorado, and that is an asset of which Colorado has and places great value. I think my colleagues place great value on it too.

But I think we have to be very fair in how we deal with water, and the White River National Forest plan, the plan that the Forest Service has come out with, in my opinion, ignores, preempts, or bypasses Colorado water law. Now, Colorado water law is exactly the law that every other citizen in the State of Colorado must live by. There are no other citizens in Colorado that get exempted from Colorado water law. There are no kings, no queens, no special privileged class that gets to treat water as it wants without falling under Colorado water law.

Now, the Federal Government wants to come in and create a special class. The Federal Government wants to come in, and by the way this is above the level of Martha Laverty, this is from Washington, D.C., they want to come into Colorado and create a very privileged class. It is called the Federal Government. It is called the Washington, D.C. bureaucracy of the United States Government. They want to be treated differently than anybody else in the State of Colorado when it comes to water. And guess why? Because they want our water in Colorado. And, frankly, it has an impact on the water that some of my colleagues use that comes out of the State of Colorado.

So we had a disagreement on water. We will cover that even further as I go into my comments. But what did I see as another fallacy in the plan? I saw water as a fallacy. What other fallacy did I see in the plan? Really, as I said, they gathered a lot of good comments, but what I think they did in error is they took these good comments and they spread them over several different plans. They did not just pick one plan. Although they came up with a suggested plan, in their review they reviewed a number of what they call alternatives. So they had like six or seven alternatives and they came out

with their recommended alternative or recommended plan.

Well, in each of these plans they put some pretty good recommendations, but they spread them out when they only got to pick one. I was critical of that. I thought we could do a better job. That is not to be adversarial to the U.S. Forest Service. Although let me make it very clear, let me make it very clear, that my position with the United States Government is adversarial when it comes to Colorado water. There should be no doubt about that. I am on one side of the line on Colorado water and the United States Government is on the other side of the line.

But that said, with the exception of water, I found my relationship, my working relationship with the U.S. Forest Service on the White River National Forest very constructive. But I was critical of the way they came out with their plan, so I decided to do what no other Congressman in the history of the United States Congress has done, what no other U.S. Senator has done in the history of the U.S. Senate, and that is, in essence, draft the U.S. Forest Service's forest plan for them.

Now, first of all, I had to figure out what was my theme. What did I really want to see in the White River National Forest. Remember that this forest has thousands, tens of thousands of direct jobs related to recreation. The world class ski resorts are located in this forest. And by the way, I do not see anything inherently evil with skiing. I do not see anything inherently evil with snow-boarding. I do not see anything inherently evil with riding a mountain bike. I do not see anything inherently evil with camping, or with kayaking, or with riding an ATV. Where the inherent evil is if we abuse the resource which we are utilizing for family recreation. There I see inherent evils, and we needed to address that in our forest plan.

So I titled my forest plan, Forest Rest and Forest Use. Again, Forest Rest and Forest Use. That was kind of the boundary within which I wanted to contain or to construct something that I think would be a positive addition to what the United States Forest Service came out with in regards to their plan. And I will give my colleagues a little bit of my own background.

I was born and raised in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. My family had been there for a long time. My family has been in the district for many generations. I had my first date on the White River National Forest. Now, do not worry, it was not that exciting. I had my first fishing trip in the White River National Forest. I have had a lot of experiences, hiking, and I have learned lots of things about the environment, about wildlife in the White River National Forest. I have a deep appreciation for that forest, and I think I know that forest as well as any layperson.

Now, my colleagues may notice that I used the word layperson, because there are people who have far more expertise on that forest than do I. And in order to draft a plan that I thought was a balanced plan, that really fell within the boundaries of giving the forest a rest and using the forest in a proper way, in order to do that, I felt I needed to have an expert on board. I was very fortunate. Without qualification, one of the top experts in the United States of America, specifically on the White River National Forest, is a gentleman named Richard Woodrow. His nickname, by which most people know him, is Woody. Seems appropriate for this forest. Although I should tell my colleagues that this forest is not a timber forest, just so we know that up front.

□ 2045

But Woody supervised that forest. Woody drafted the last forest plan. The forest plan that we are currently under right now was drafted by Woody in 1984. Woody was the deputy secretary or the deputy assistant under the Forest Service for all wilderness and all recreation. There is no question that he is qualified.

I can tell my colleagues that some special interest groups decided they were going to criticize me before they even read what I had to say. But during all this criticism, not one of them criticized the credibility, the integrity, the knowledge, the instinct, or the hands-in-the-dirt concept of Richard Woodrow. That man is a scholar when it comes to the White River National Forest.

I went to him and I said, Woody, would you help me draft a plan for the White River National Forest which could be seen as a constructive addition to what the Forest Service is attempting to do? He said yes. But he said, yes, with some conditions. Number one, it had to be balanced. Number two, I had to be willing to stand up for forest health.

Now, it is very easy in that forest for somebody to say, no timber cutting. But if you know about management of wildlife, if you know about the health of a forest, you know that you have to harvest some timber. That is not a timber harvest forest. This is not where companies go to get timber. Companies come in there at our request to take some out. In the last 100 years, less than four percent or so of the forest has ever been timbered.

But he had said, look, there is going to be pressure on you to back down on this. You have to stand with me on forest health. You have to stand with me on balance. I said, I am in. Let us go together. Let us put together a team.

The next thing we decided we had to do, well, what should our process be? I felt very strongly that the process to construct this plan needed to be built at the local level.

We have nine counties involved in the White River National Forest. Now, these are large counties by eastern standards. But we decided that five of those counties have much more impact by the White River National Forest. So we decided that we would go to each of these counties and we wanted to build this plan from the local level up. Now, remember, I had a very short window of opportunity to do this.

This report, and this is a copy of it right here, it is about 160 pages without the maps, it is highly technical. Highly technical. I had less than 5 months to go out, do the research, visit with the people, get the input, send the input back, have it back and revise it, send it back, revise it, send it back, get it ready for final print, and meet the deadline of May 9, which is today. We had to meet today's deadline, and we did meet that deadline. But I had a very short window of opportunity, which means I had to get some volunteers out there to help me out.

Those volunteers were the counties. We went to county commissioners. We went to county planners. We went to user groups. And we went to all user groups. We went to Colorado Ski Company. We went to Fat Tire, the mountain bikers. We went to the wildlife division, natural resources. They provided our expertise for Division of Wildlife. We went for water expertise. Even though I think I have a lot of background in water, we went to the Colorado Conservation Board. We went to the Colorado River District Board.

We sat down with all of these different groups and we said, provide us with expertise on what we ought to do with the White River National Forest.

Now, I can tell my colleagues, one of the criticisms we got out there was from some of the more special interest environmental groups. And by the way, they do not own the term "environmental." I think everybody in this room is environmental. Certainly the people I live around care about their environment.

But they said, look, SCOTT MCINNIS never sat down with us eye to eye. Well, that is true but it is a kind of play on words. They had submitted their own alternative.

Unfortunately, the Forest Service in doing its alternative had drafted all of their alternatives in-house except for one. They allowed one out-of-house, so to speak, alternative to be submitted for consideration of their plan. And that was drafted by groups like the Aspen Wilderness Society, Sierra Club. I think some others might have been involved in that.

That plan, by the way, was called Plan I. That plan was very well-drafted. It was well-worded. It was easy to understand. I did not agree with all of it. Although I did agree with some of it. In fact, I adopted some of it in my own alternative right here. But that document was right in front of me.

So, instead, because of the short window of opportunity I had to complete all of this work, and it really was a huge task to complete, instead of meeting with those different groups, I had their plan written. We went through their plan line by line. We went through their recommendations recommendation by recommendation. Some we rejected.

For example, when it comes to water, let me tell you, the national Sierra Club and some of these other organizations do not have Colorado's water in mind from a perspective of the need of Colorado people. So we disagreed on water. There were areas of the so-called environmental plan, Plan I, that I felt were worthy.

So we sat down and looked at that. We reached out. We reached out into the community. Because I felt that we had to go out there and figure out what uses we could manage, how could we manage those uses, what areas need special management tools, whether it is a designation of a wilderness area, whether it is an intermix area, whether it is a special interest area. But in order to do that, I felt local input was critical.

Now, some people will say, well, gosh, SCOTT never visited with me. I am a hiker. I hike up on the White River National Forest. Look, we could not meet with everybody, but we did the best we could with the resources that we had. I think we have come up with an excellent product. In fact, I think some of the critical reviews of it have been pretty good.

Let us talk a little more. That is the process. So we wanted to gather at the local level, which meant we processed it up. And then our job really was kind of like an architect or like a general contractor. We subcontracted to each county. Garfield County we kind of subcontracted. Okay, Garfield, tell us where you would like wilderness areas. Tell us what kinds of uses you think are appropriate in your county on the forest. Tell us what you are dependent upon as far as highways.

Every power line into Glenwood Springs, every natural gas line, every highway, all of their water, all of their TV towers, all of their radio towers, all of their cellular towers. In most of the communities in the forest, they are all dependent on the forest allowing them to do that.

So we went to each county like a subcontractor and we said, all right, give us a bid, so to speak. Tell us what you can do with the project as a whole. I will act, with the assistance of Richard Woodrow and a number of other people, including my staff, by the way, who, if I could pin five stars on them, I would, they did a wonderful, wonderful job in this, but I wanted to submit this; and then we, as the general contractor, would try and mold the project, try to flow chart the project so

that we could come out with a plan, which we did.

That was our mission. That was the process.

Now, in doing that, we covered a number of areas. Let me say at the very beginning there was one area, I have mentioned it several times, I will mention it again, there was one area of which I said was non-negotiable, non-negotiable. I really was not interested in negotiating with anybody on that particular subject. And that is Colorado water.

The water of Colorado should be administered by the laws of Colorado. The water of Colorado belongs to all of the people of Colorado. And in order to adjudicate that water, we have laws that are time tested, court tested, and put-on-the-ground tested, so to speak.

Colorado has management of its water. We have some of the best in-stream water flows in the Nation. We have lots of protection for our streams. We have gone through lots and lots of controversy on our water. Our water law is true and tested and it is non-negotiable as far as allowing an exemption to it.

What the Federal Government wants is an exemption. They want to be able to come in and preempt, saying, hey, we are the Federal Government. We are bigger than you. We are from Washington, D.C. We will get our way in Colorado. We do not care what your Colorado water law says.

I reject that on its face. That was non-negotiable. But that is about the only point, my colleagues, about the only point that I started out with as non-negotiable. Everything else I felt was negotiable so that we could come up with the best plan for forest rest and forest use.

My belief is that we have a right to use it but we have no right to abuse it. How do we siphon out the abuse? How do we manage it without eliminating it?

Now let talk just for a moment about the recommendation that the Forest Service made. Their recommendation, in essence, said that the historical use of this forest, which one-third, as I told you, has been used for wilderness, two-thirds of it has been predominantly utilized for recreation, they turned that on its head. They said, from now on, we are going to give priority to biological and ecological considerations.

Well, I do not think this is a zero-sum game. I do not think it is either or. Let me tell you, that forest really is a family recreation forest. I think we can have family recreation and I think we can give priorities, customize priorities, to our biological and ecological concerns that we have out there. But I do not think that we have one at the total elimination of the other.

That is where my plan differs from the Forest Service. I have drafted a plan that protects wilderness areas. I

have drafted a plan that goes in and even customizes to a greater extent what we do with our wildlife, how we protect our wildlife.

For example, from the Forest Service, they have got a lot of elk and deer habitat in the summer. In the summer in Colorado, the elk and deer have plenty to eat. It is in the winter. We have some pretty tough winters out there. We have deep snow. We shifted the elk habitat from the summer to the winter.

On recreation, we did not go in and say no more consideration for expansion or growth in ski areas. Whoever imagined, for example, snowboards 15 years ago when this plan was drafted? We went in and said, look, recreation is compatible with the management of the forest if it is correctly monitored, if it is correctly reviewed before it is allowed to be initiated on the forest, and if it is correctly managed. If it meets those terms, then recreation should have a place on that forest.

That is exactly what we did, for example, with ski areas. Now, they will make it sound like there is some outrageous thing going on with ski areas. Not at all. We do not waive one NEPA review. We do not waive any other type of environmental permit. We do not waive any type of environmental study at all. We do not waive any public meetings.

All we said is that what is allowed today for ski area expansion is too much. It needs to be reduced. But we are not going to eliminate it. We are going to allow for consideration, only for consideration. We do not automatically grant it. We do not say there is any kind of special privilege. We just say there ought to be consideration.

We went back on wildlife management and we went to our experts, like the Division of Wildlife, and we asked them for their expertise. We did a lot of things with wildlife we are proud about, including even the utilization of trails and trails that would help the management of wildlife.

Wildlife, if my colleagues could hear Woody talk about it, Richard Woodrow, if they could hear him talk about it, he talks about how certain ages of the forest are more conducive to certain wildlife. That is why in one area of the forest we may want to have a burn or we may want to do some timber for beetle kill, because elk and deer love where we have had a controlled burn. They love to come in and graze on that a year or two later. We need to know how these all connect together. We had the expertise on board with Wildlife to figure out how this connection is made.

Let me say on travel management, as I mentioned, this is a family recreation forest. And what has happened in Colorado, many of our constituents who have money have discovered Colorado and they are out there buying the land.

When I grew up, we really got permission to go really anywhere we

wanted. We could walk across fields. We could go hunting and fishing and wildlife watching. There were a lot of different things we could do.

Well, today what we have seen, and I do not complain about it, I mean, they have the right to buy property, people have come in and purchased the property and they have put up "no trespassing" signs.

What that means is that the White River National Forest has become even more of a common-man forest. This is where the common person gets to recreate.

Now, there are a lot of elitists who have never set foot in that forest. There are a lot of elitists who do not depend on family recreation in that forest. There are a lot of elitists who go into that forest for a once-a-year recreational experience and then they are out of it.

□ 2100

This is elitists, they are saying, hey, wipe this recreation out. I have got a lot of families out there in Colorado that camp every weekend, that go fishing, that go river rafting. They are younger kids, even people my age. My knees will not hold out, but they go snowboarding. It is a common person's forest. And recreation is not inherently evil if properly managed. That is what my plan does. My plan properly manages what we call travel management. We have loop trails. We worry about people leaving the trail. In fact, what my plan calls for, for summer motorized use, for some use, you cannot leave a designated trail. Right now you can actually in a lot of different places, you start wherever you want, take any kind of apparatus you want, whether it is a motorcycle or a mountain bike or a horse, start anywhere you want and make your own path in the forest. Those days are gone. We are not going to let you make a path anywhere you want in the forest. We are going to make the paths, and you are going to follow the rules on them but those paths are going to be a great experience for you.

For example, one of the problems we have had with trails is that they go one way. When you get to the end of them, you have got to turn around and come back. People tend to get bored so they tend to leave the trail. We loop some trails. We don't build any new roads to loop the trails, by the way. We find a trail here, find a trail here, find a connection with an old mining road, we loop them so they are not coming back the same direction. So the incentive to leave the trail is not there.

We are putting in under my plan a new program called Forest Watch, kind of like Crime Watchers, kind of like Wildlife Watch. What we do is we want people to report people that are abusing the forest. If somebody is abusing the forest, get them the hell off it. Get

them off that forest. Nobody in Colorado wants people that abuse the forest up there. The people of Colorado recognize the privilege, and it is a privilege, to use that forest. There are always going to be people that abuse the privileges. We have people within the great halls of Congress who abuse their privileges. Get them out. Get them off the forest. That is what our Forest Watch will do.

We will have a 1-800 number. I noticed the criticism, that it has to be within the Forest Service budget. Where else are you going to get it? We are not asking people to insert a quarter or 35 cents in the telephone. We should provide that program. We also put together what we call our Youth Conservation Corps. We have a county, Eagle County, we have had great commissioners, by the way, who have worked with this. But out of Eagle County the commissioners are saying we have got a lot of great young people in our county. They want to get involved. They are wildlife oriented. They are outdoor oriented. If we put up money to help them maintain trails, would the Federal Government match it? We call it the Youth Conservation Corps. We get them outdoor experience at a young age and let us make that experience one where they are up maintaining trails, where they are helping to help preserve the beauty we have on the White River National Forest. That is an idea contained within my plan. It is called the Youth Conservation Corps.

Our scenic byways. We do special scenic byways. The more scenic we can make our byways, the less inclined people are to leave the byways. Think about it. When we manage people on the forest, some people, some in my opinion elitists would say get them off the forest. I take a much more moderate position. Manage the forest. The way you manage it is you try and think about it. Okay, for example, loop the trail. For example, scenic byways. The more attractive we can make the byway, the less likely somebody is going to leave it. That is a clever way of management.

We have an area called Camp Hale. Bob Dole, the dear colleague of all of ours who was in the 10th Mountain Division, you have heard a lot about that, Camp Hale is where they did their training. Right now that area is overused. Some would suggest we shut it down. Some would suggest get the people off it. Most of those suggestions, by the way, come from people outside of the area. My position is do not shut them out. Manage it. Let us put in an interest center. Let us have management of that. Let us have people come in, just like our rivers, we have to manage those. We can do that. They can come in and get information. Let us help make their experience good but let us make the experience on the forest good for the forest as well.

On wilderness, wilderness is important. We did not just go out though and paint a blanket brush of wilderness. We went to the counties and said, tell us where you think wilderness is appropriate. Just because an area is not in wilderness does not mean that it does not receive protection. There is an entire spectrum. If you were to draw a spectrum, there are all kinds of tools. You can manage a forest or government land as a park, as a monument, as a special interest area. There are 100 different tools. The most extreme management tool is wilderness. But if you do not put something in wilderness, it does not mean that it is not protected or it is not managed. In fact, there are 100 different or more tools to manage that, to help control it to protect the resource.

That is what we do. We go and say, is wilderness the most appropriate way to manage it? If it is, it is in this plan. It is in this plan. We have good wilderness designation in that plan. I have good wilderness designation on my Colorado Canyons bill.

We talk about grazing. Grazing is a privilege on the forest we want to protect. Why? Remember earlier I said that a number of our constituents are coming out to Colorado and they are buying up the land? Ranching is a tough business. What we are seeing is people are coming in and making ranching not as viable as it used to be, because they buy the land for subdivisions. They buy the land to build huge mansions on it. My point is this. Let us try and keep these ranches in business. These ranches and farms, let us keep them in business. But one of the ways we can help keep them in business is supplement their private property with grazing rights, properly managed grazing rights.

My plan goes in where there are vacant allotments and it does not automatically close all those allotments as has been recommended. My plan goes in and says, wait a minute. We sat down with the ranching community and the farm community. We say, which allotments really will you not use, let us close those, that is an easy decision. Which allotments are really necessary to keep the farm, the ranching community viable so that we do not have our ranches turning into subdivisions? We do not want them out there, those subdivisions. Obviously we all want to have a home. But you know what I am talking about. That is why grazing is important. Grazing protects open space. We want open space properly allocated. My plan does that. This plan takes care of that. It protects those grazing rights.

Recreation, I have talked about it. As I said earlier, think about it. It is not inherently evil to go out and recreate. Here in the East, do not forget in the East you can recreate, you can go out and recreate all over the place. In

the West we are very limited. We have to recreate on government land. Look at Alaska. Ninety-six, 97 percent of the whole State is owned by the government. We have a right for recreation just like you do. My family did not go to the children's museum. We did not go to the zoo. I never saw a zoo until I was in my late teens. We went out into the mountains. That was our family recreation. We had that privilege. That privilege has not been abused to the extent that it should be eliminated. But it has been abused to the extent that it should be managed, and that is what we do in this plan. This McInnis plan, Mr. Speaker, manages that recreational use.

Let me just real quickly show you some quick differences between what is currently allowed. Here is a prescription, that is the use, this is the existing plan. This is how the forest is managed today. That is what is in existence right now. This is my blended alternative. That is my plan. Some people have called it the McPlan, some people have called it the McInnis plan. We call it the blended alternative. Let us talk about recommended wilderness. In today's existing plan, the plan of which the current forest is managed, it has zero acres recommended for wilderness. We come in with 16,000 acres. Those 16,000 acres are custom selected. We did not just go out and say here is a good area for wilderness, let us put one here and one there. We went out and studied it. We had the experts.

This plan does a good job. Back country recreation nonmotorized, which means you cannot use an ATV or a Jeep or four-wheel drive. Under the existing plan, they have a plan for 80,700 acres of that. We up that to 92,730 acres. Research, natural areas. They have 300 acres planned for that, where you do research on the natural area, just as the words describe it. We think that needs to be dramatically increased. We jump up 300 to 11,317. Special interest areas, from zero acres, we go 1,741. That would be an example of Camp Hale. Back country recreation year round motorized. Look at this number. They allow under today's management plan 170,000 acres. We cut it down to 30,000 acres. What the Forest Service did is cut it down to 4,000 acres, from 170,000 to 4,000. We said, look, 170,000, with today's kind of growth and use of the forest is too much. It needs a dramatic cutback. But not elimination. It needs management. We prefer management over elimination. That is why we come up with 30,357 acres.

Back country recreation, non-motorized with winter motorized, snow machine or so on, 100,000 acres today. We reduce that by 40,000 acres, by 40 percent, is our reduction. Scenic byways, scenic areas, vistas or travel corridors, zero acres, we increase it to 20,000 acres. Forested flora and fauna

habitat, they have 150,000 acres for this habitat management, 150,000. We move it to 518,000 acres. Deer and elk winter habitat, they have 134,000 acres under today's plan, we move it to 190,000 acres. Bighorn sheep habitat, 7,000 acres to 23,000 acres. We depended very heavily on our expertise from the wildlife management to help us plan that. The elk habitat, 16,000 acres, we move it to 70,000 acres, from 16,000 to 70,000. By the way, my district has the largest elk populations anywhere in the world. The intermix, which is very important, from zero acres to 12,000. And ski-based resorts, existing and potential, they have it so you could expand to 70,602 acres outside its current permit. We call for 58,198 acres, just for consideration. Remember, that is not automatic at all. That has to go through a review that is stringent, and I think it should be stringent, and it has lots of permits that are required. I agree with that.

So when we take a look at what we have done compared to what the way it is being managed today, we think it is a significant moderation. Now, there were some plans, for example, there was one plan on one end that would allow you to have a free-for-all in the forest. Come on, give me a break. Those days are gone. That forest belongs to us. We have to manage it. We intend to manage it. My blended plan does manage it. It does manage it. Let me say to you that there is a plan on the other side that says, hey, the best way to protect the forest in essence, eliminate the recreation, let us go toward our goal of eliminating multiple use and let us really change the priorities of the forest. Instead of having the biological and ecological concerns working in concert, working together, working alongside with recreation and multiple use concepts, let us just give them the priority. Let us take the historical use and bump it down, not equal, which my plan does. It says let us give a priority over here. That is that extreme side.

So I can tell you, my plan, which is, as I said, the first in the history of Congress to be put forward by a Congressman, my plan is going to have about 15 percent, 10 percent maybe on this side that are not going to buy into it, that thinks it is outrageous, and 10 percent on the special interest environmentalist side. You can tell by the letters to the editor that that side right there, on both sides, they are angry. But in the middle, in the middle that 70 percent, those people that think that we can moderate the uses of the forest, that we can protect the forest and that we can give the forest rest and forest use.

Let me go very quickly over a couple of letters to the editor that I think are important to cover. I have got one letter from a Gay Moore. I hope to call Gay. Gay says, "According to BEN

NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL and SCOTT MCINNIS, supporters of Alternative D are not local people but outsiders." Let me correct that to the writer, one of my constituents. I am talking to my colleagues but let me say to you, we did not say that anybody that disagrees with us were outsiders. We did not say that at all. We did say, however, you ought to give some weight of opinion to the people who make their living on the forest, who are surrounded by the forest, who enjoy the forest for its beauty, who wildlife manage in the forest, whose water and power comes off the forest, whose natural gas comes off the forest. The people that mountain bike, the people that raft, the people that snowboard, the people that ski, those are the people whose opinions we ought to look at. We never once said that if you objected to it, you are an outsider.

The writer goes on to say, "I was brought up to be a responsible forest user. Pack your trash, don't drive off the road." You are absolutely correct. That is what we are trying to do. My plan says, let us manage it, let us not eliminate it. Let us in appropriate spots give forest rest and in appropriate spots give forest use. Let us make sure people understand they have a privilege to use the forest but they have no right to abuse the forest. Let us take the people that abuse the forest and kick them off the land. Let us do that. We agree.

"Treat the land with loving care." Absolutely. You are right. "Because without it you will not survive." Again, you are absolutely right.

"When the forest is destroyed by unchecked use of any kind, then the jobs you all seem so worried about are also gone." I know that.

□ 2115

"You are right, and that is exactly what this plan takes into consideration.

"We move on from there very quickly. The McGinnis plan gives support. I am writing to voice my opinion. I am not writing on behalf of business, the motor heads or the environmental heads. I am writing because I have a passion generated by the forest."

She talks about this person, this Dendy Heisel. She talks about those who depend on their livelihood, our recreation, promotion or recreational opportunities, yet promoting our environmental protection. This is a balanced person, this is a balanced plan. That is what this does.

Here is an article of my opinions submitted to the Glenwood Post, Blended Alternative Strikes a Balance. "Let me say that in the final analysis, as I am writing here, my locally-driven alternative," this right here, "is balanced and eminently fair. It is a plan that achieves the twin objectives of preserving the forests' natural splendor.

We protect the forests' natural splendor while, at the same time, protecting the privilege of the people to enjoy it."

I think that is very important. The White River National Forest is a diamond, but it is not a diamond that should be locked in a safe where nobody can ever see it. It is not a diamond that should never be allowed to be worn in the public, but it is a diamond that when it is worn in the public or when it is seen or observed by the public, that it deserves protection. We manage how we bring that diamond out of the safe, so that we can preserve that diamond for future generations.

Again I say, and in my concluding remarks, I say, we have put a lot of intense work into this plan. This was not just some song and dance, although there is a lot of song and dance going on out there. We had a lot of people, Richard Woodrow, lots of different people, my staff out there, even my wife, a lot of different people put time into this.

We put a good work product out. We think it is constructive, not adversarial to the Forest Service, except in the case of water, but otherwise, very constructive. We think the use of this plan and some of the recommendations should be put into the recipe so that we can take the diamond and protect it and manage it when it needs to be managed and protected; put it in a safe at night, but during the day, bring it out so somebody can see it. We can save it for the next generation, by giving it proper diamond rest or forest rest, but we can also enjoy it today by bringing it out of the safe and letting people see it, letting people touch it, letting people wear it.

The key, again, and in conclusion, the critical issue here is not elimination; the critical issue is management. We all have a right to use and enjoy the forest. We have no right to abuse the forest.

#### ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before the House again on a Tuesday night to address the topic that I normally address on Tuesday night before the House and to the American people on the subject of illegal narcotics and drug abuse and its effect upon our Nation and the responsibility of this Congress to address that terrible social problem that we face.

Tonight, I would like to provide an update. We were in recess during the spring work period, and I would like to update the House and again the American people on some of the things that have happened relating to illegal nar-

cotics. When I make these presentations, I try to look at what has been in the recent news and highlighted, sometimes violence which is highlighted, unfortunately, in our newscasts about what is happening in our society. Again, I think there is no greater social problem facing this Nation than that of illegal narcotics. It has a dramatic impact on our communities and our children.

Before we left for recess, I addressed the House and spoke about the untold story. The untold story of a 6-year-old bringing a gun into school and shooting a 6-year-old and all of the attention focused on the gun. We did look a little bit behind the scenes and found that the 6-year-old was the victim of a crack house family that was disjointed; drugs and narcotics prevalent. I believe the father was in jail on a narcotics charge.

Again, if we look at the root problem, we see narcotics, we see again a dysfunctional family, and societal problems. The gun was the means by which this 6-year-old committed a terrible act, a murder, but the root of the problem is, I think, what this Congress and the American people must focus upon in their attention to correct the situation.

Then I think the American people were focused and the news also riveted in on a 12-year-old who brought a gun into school and had his classmates I believe at bay with a weapon, and again, if we look behind the scenes, and I related to the Congress, we found that the child, the 12-year-old had taken a gun to school and attempted to get attention and get arrested because he wanted to join his mother, who was in jail on a drug charge.

Another incident of illegal narcotics being at the root of the problem, the gun manifesting itself again is certainly a very serious problem, a problem of bringing a weapon into school, but again, a child with many problems, illegal narcotics at the root of some of his family problems. Then, during the holidays, right at the season of Easter and Passover, I think the entire Nation and the world was focused on Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, which has some of the strongest gun control legislation and laws on the books of any locality in the United States. In fact, it is almost illegal to own a weapon that is unregistered and there are very tight control laws. Yet, a 16-year-old terrorized a family day at the National Zoo here in the District of Columbia. The report, of course, focused on the young teenager who was using a weapon and fired into the crowd. But the rest of the story was not told.

Let me just cite a little bit about this young man, a 16-year-old by the name of Jones who was actually the son of an enforcer in the District's biggest drug gang, his father was one of

the biggest drug gang participants in the 1980s, and this young man, again, was the victim of illegal narcotics, and what it had done to his family. He was brought up as really the product of illegal narcotics and crime that emanated from illegal narcotics. His father, this article went on to say, James Antonio Jones, was already in jail, a source to the family confirmed. The elder Jones, 43, is serving a life sentence in a Federal maximum security prison in Beaumont, Texas, after a 1990 conviction for his role in the drug hierarchy run by Raphael Edmond, who was a notorious drug dealer and head of a crack cocaine gang here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, in almost every one of these instances I have cited and others that we see on the nightly news with the attention of the media, in fact, all of these cases have illegal narcotics at the root of their problems. Some 70 to 80 percent of those in our prisons, in our jails, in our Federal penitentiaries are there because of drug-related offenses.

Many would have us believe that these folks are in prison for possessing small amounts of marijuana or some other drug. The fact is, most of these people are there for repeated felonies. Some of them, in fact, have been on drugs when they have committed these repeated crimes. Many of them have repeated their crimes time and time again, are multiple offenders. Most of the people in our prisons, in fact, have two or more felony convictions in our Federal penitentiaries and State penitentiaries, according to the studies that our staff from our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice has undertaken.

So there are a lot of myths about what is going on, there is a lot of misinformation about who is committing crime and these illegal acts. In fact, we try through these weekly presentations before the House of Representatives to get the facts to the American people and the Congress.

Again, this is the worst social problem that we face. It is a horrendous problem. The toll is not only those behind bars, but those who die annually.

The most recent statistics that we have on deaths, direct deaths from illegal narcotics are 1998 figures, and that is 15,973 Americans died. If we take all of the other deaths related to illegal narcotics, people driving under the influence of illegal narcotics, people who die as a result of illegal narcotics, not necessarily an overdose, but some other act, total, according to our National Drug Czar, Barry McCaffrey, more than 50,000, almost as many in one year as killed in some of our international conflicts.

So this, indeed, is a great problem. It is a problem that can cost our society as much as a quarter of a trillion, \$250 billion a year. That is in dollars and cents, not in heartaches to mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers