

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey again. One of the things that I wonder about is our Republican leadership here, as I have said, they have refused to pass a patients' bill of rights and a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, and I wonder how they are going to face these seniors and say, well, wait 4 more years. How are they going to face these seniors that are thrown into terrible situations and say, well, we did not do it, but we are going to. We are with you. We are going to do it some day. How are they going to face a little boy that has lost his limbs?

Mr. PALLONE. What I find is a lot of times they will try to address maybe the individual's problem who comes to their office and see what they can do to help, but the bottom line is that everyone is suffering from this. Everybody in an HMO has the potential, no matter how wealthy they are or what their situation in life is, where the insurance company comes along and says to them that you cannot have a particular procedure. I do not care what your situation is you find yourself in. I noticed people that are the head of the company, the CEO of the company, that has had that situation. So this is something that affects everybody. This is not just something that applies to a few people.

I think they just pretend like they are doing something about it and hope that people forget.

Mrs. THURMAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We have been doing a lot of surveys and different studies across the country, and then in particular within our districts, by the governmental operations staff to look at the different costs of what it costs in the United States for medicine, what it costs in Canada and what it costs in Mexico.

Just recently we have also looked at another study which has been done through the State of Florida, and looked at the prescription drug coverage for Florida seniors. I found it very interesting, which just tells me this issue is getting more difficult because we are getting more seniors who are losing their coverage, and probably a lot because of the pullouts of our HMO-managed care, managed-choice program.

The survey collected during 1999 showed that 41 percent of the Medicare beneficiaries surveyed in Florida reported now that they had no prescription drug coverage, and in 1998 it was 29 percent of surveyed Florida seniors that reported that they did not have. So just 1 year later, we have already seen an increase to 41 percent. That is almost 50 percent of the population of seniors in the State of Florida.

It would seem to me, and what I am most saddened about is, that we leave the 106th Congress after debating, after recognizing the problem, still with no prescription drug benefit, no relief in sight, and for why not, I do not have the answer, and I do not know what to

tell them at home. It is because they would not have accepted the bill that was passed on this House. They understand that to depend on the very same people who have left them out with managed care and insurance companies, it is unacceptable.

#### ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICA

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

Mr. MCINNIS. I have come this evening, colleagues, first of all I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you. Of course, we are trying to wrap up the session. I have got several comments that I want to make this evening in regards to a great bill that passed today on the Sand Dunes of Colorado, making it a new national park. I want to comment a little about the Colorado canyons. I want to talk a little about the death tax and the marriage penalty. I have a full agenda.

But I have to tell you before I start this, I cannot allow this last hour to go unrebuted. Colleagues, as you know, there were no Republicans involved in the last hour of discussion. It was all Democrats. And the four Democrats, whom I respect as individuals, but professionally, let us call it what it is. All four of these are supporting AL GORE for the presidency, and there is nobody to stand up for George W. Bush.

The best way to criticize George W. Bush is to go out and frighten the senior citizens, throw out these scare tactics. I could not believe what I heard in the last few minutes; scare the senior citizens, tell them how terrible it is, George W. Bush, how terrible the Republican leadership is in the House of Representatives; tell them how nothing is ever going to get done.

That is not how we accomplish things around here. I have urged my colleagues on the Democratic side over there, join with us.

We had a panel, and my colleague knows this, we had a panel, a non-partisan panel, put together to save Medicare; nonpartisan, meaning we had Republicans and Democrats, and we had Republicans and Democrats who worked together. You know what? After a long, arduous journey, with lots of technical roadblocks to overcome, they came up with a good solid recommendation. And it was not the Republican leadership that rejected it in the House. The Senate leadership did not reject this. Who rejected it was the President. The President rejected the nonpartisan solution.

So where are we with this? When we talk about health care, when we have a nonpartisan coalition, Democrats and Republicans, who have come together for a solution, and that solution is rejected at the last minute by the administration, what do we have to do? We have to start at square one, and that is what is happening.

We have got to come up with a solution. We are not going to come up with a solution, and I say with due respect to my Democratic colleagues who spoke in the last hour, we are not going to accomplish it with scare tactics. Really, you may get some political advantage here in the next 2 weeks, but the fact is, in the long run, it does not serve anything to scare these people.

My parents are seniors out there too, and I know most of my colleagues out here have colleagues who are seniors. We do not want to scare them. Let us figure out a solution for them.

My rebuttal, these are my remarks, this is my rebuttal page. I want to go over a couple of these things they talked about.

You know, they talked about a solution. I am not sure what solution they are talking about, but it seems to me that the solution that they talk about, which is not the solution that the bipartisan panel came up with, the solution they talked about is to increase the size of the government responsibility in your health care. One-size-fits-all. One-size-fits-all.

In other words, you, citizen A, and you, citizen B, go to the same doctor, whether you like it or not, and here is how much you are going to get, regardless of what you think your needs are.

By the way, the government, I heard one of my colleagues, with due respect, one of my Democratic colleagues who spoke in the last hour, he said there is no such animal as a government-run health care HMO.

You know what? The largest health care system in the Nation is run by the United States Government. Medicare. Medicaid. Look at the Veterans system. And the worst run system in the United States is run by the United States Government, Medicare and Medicaid. And you are willing to stand up and say, increase the government's involvement in everybody's health care, have the government really run the program to provide health care for the people of America?

That is exactly what Hillary Clinton attempted to do. That is exactly what she attempted to do 8 years ago. But now what you are trying to do is piecemeal.

Look, be up front with the people that we represent. Tell them that on a piecemeal basis we are going to try and put a cloud on top of you called "socialized health care." It means a lot bigger government. It means a system just like Medicare, that is run just as poorly as Medicare.

To my Democratic colleagues who like throwing scare tactics out, go talk to your local medical provider. Ask him what it is like to do business with Medicare. Just ask him. Ask him what it is like to do business with Medicaid. Go out there. I know this is true in the rural parts of the country, because I represent a rural part. Go out and ask rural doctors and rural hospitals, hey, is it a good deal doing business with

the government? How efficient is the government Medicare reimbursement system?

Ask them about it. Ask them how efficient the Medicare coding system is in our health care system that the government runs. And the response? You know what the response is going to be. It is terrible.

I have got doctors in my own district ready to stop taking Medicare patients. They are ready to stop taking them because it is such a hassle to deal with the government-run health care program.

Now, it is fundamentally unfair for anybody to stand up here and say that any colleague, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, that any colleague does not care about the health care of our seniors. That is nothing but an abused and overused scare tactic.

I am a Republican, obviously. I do not know one Democrat, I do not know one Democrat, even the Democrats that I have the most vigorous differences with, I do not know one Democrat who is opposed to some kind of health care, you know, wants to provide health care, wants to help our seniors or help all of our citizens. On the other hand, I do not know one Republican that is against helping our seniors, that is against trying to improve our health care system for all citizens.

So, for some of my colleagues to stand up here and say the Republican leadership is against the senior citizens, George W. Bush's plan is against them, come on, be fair about this.

Look, let us have a fair dispute. Let us have a fair debate on this floor. We can begin the debate by acknowledging that there are certain facts upon which we all agree. Everybody in these Chambers, everyone in these Chambers agrees that our health care system constantly needs to be revised.

□ 2145

We have to look for ways to improve prenatal care. We have to look for ways to make sure every woman gets a mammogram. We have to make sure our seniors have the kind of care so that they can afford prescription services. We all agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman in my career, never seen one, that stood up and said that they are against mammograms and we should not offer them. I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman in my career that stood up and said that they are against senior citizens and that they want them to have high prescription care services. I have never seen a Congressman or Congresswoman, Republican or Democrat, in any of these cases that says that they are against better health care for the citizens of the United States.

So to stand up here and have the audacity to say, well, the Republican leadership does not want health care for seniors, and George W. Bush does not care about seniors and there is no big government thing. Come on. That

is not a fair shot. That is not a fair debate.

Look, we can take shots. We can take the shots, but my colleagues have other people listening to them. They have seniors listening to them and they can be scared. These people can be scared. That is exactly the same type of tactics we are seeing being used on Social Security. George W. Bush comes up and says we cannot exist with the current status quo. Oh sure, my generation can make it. The generation ahead of me can make it on the current status quo with Social Security. But what about the young people of this country, who, by the way, their contributions are funding our generation?

So we get these scare tactics thrown in. How are we ever going to have a government that can really come up with good solutions if we are going to have these scare tactics over and over again?

It was amazing to me that in this last hour, un rebutted, that my four colleagues from the Democratic sides, un rebutted, time after time after time, threw out scare tactics about the Republican Party. They never said one decent thing, not one decent thing about the Republicans. Never. They implied, no, they made it very clear. They did not imply, they made it very clear that Republicans do not want prescription services; they do not want to help the senior citizens; they do not want this; they do not want that; they help fund these TV advertisements, as if the Democratic party is never doing anything like that at exactly the same point in time.

Come on, we need a solution here, and to do it we have to work across the aisle. To do it we have to commit to each other, Republican to Democrat, Democrat to Republican that we will not begin the process with scare tactics. Darn right we can scare the senior citizens. And what my colleagues are trying to do is scare them to the ballot box instead of helping them to a solution. They are trying to scare them to the ballot box instead of helping them to a solution. That is wrong.

Those seniors out there, every citizen in America, those young people out there, those people without insurance, those people who have to pay \$700 a month for prescription services, they are not looking to be scared to the polling booth. They are not looking to be scared into their vote. They are asking us, they are begging us to help them with a solution. After listening to this last hour of un rebutted statements and scare tactics, I want to say, look, calm down, come back and go to work with us, just like we did with the bipartisan commission.

Take a look at the Republicans and take a look at the Democrats that were on that bipartisan commission. This was not loaded with Republican leadership. This was not loaded with Democratic leadership. Neither party had a ringer in there. We had some very dedicated people who wanted to come up

with a solution, who thought the best way to approach it was a committee with both parties involved in it, with people who were respected and knowledgeable on the subject. And that is exactly what occurred. Unfortunately, it was rejected at the last moment by President Clinton.

We did not use scare tactics in there. We came up with a solution. And that is the way this should be done. Come back, come to work with us. That is what we are asking our colleagues to do.

Now, let me move on for a few minutes. I want to talk about a good bipartisan effort that we had today, and it shows that bipartisanship can work. It shows that when we put aside the vigor of our party right before the election, we can work on something and we can come together and do something pretty darned fruitful. And that is what we did today. We created a new national park in this country. This national park is a diamond in the rough. It is a national park which will exist for thousands of generations to come. It is a national park that 200 years or 300 years from now people will look back upon our generation, just like we look back on the generation that created Yellowstone and Yosemite and places like that, and say that somebody was really thoughtful about this, somebody was smart enough to put this into a park and save it for future generations.

Today, on a strong bipartisan vote, we created a new national park, America's newest national park, and it is located in the State of Colorado. I would like to spend a little time tonight first of all thanking my colleagues for their bipartisan support. There was opposition to this, and I will go through some of the points that the opposition made, but first of all I want to give my colleagues some dynamics of where this park is located.

First, a little about the 3rd Congressional District of the State of Colorado. The 3rd Congressional District is here outlined in the blue, where my pointer is. To give my colleagues an idea, this is Colorado, that is Denver, Colorado, that is Colorado Springs, Colorado, and down here is Pueblo. This is a highway called I-25, which goes from Wyoming, up here, down to New Mexico.

The 3rd Congressional District is a very interesting district in our country. First of all, almost all of my colleagues vacation in this district. We have the world premier ski resorts in this district. This district is the highest district in the Nation in elevation. I like to joke about the 3rd Congressional District, and in good humor say that once you go out of the district of the 3rd, it is downhill from there. It is because we live in the highest place in the Nation. Our ski resorts, Aspen, Telluride, Beaver Creek, Steamboat, Durango, Grand Junction, Breckenridge, and I could just go on and on with these premier ski resorts, the Alpines, the Rocky Mountains, the 14,000-foot

peaks, the 56 mountains in Colorado, 54 of them in the 3rd Congressional District, over 14,000 feet.

It is a spectacular area of the country. It is also an area which has huge amounts of Federal land ownership. Take a look, for example, at our borders, then go east of our borders to the Atlantic Ocean. There is very little Federal land ownership. But go from our border in Colorado and come throughout this district and go on to the Pacific Ocean and there are tremendous amounts of Federal land ownership. So for those of us in the West, geographically, there is a dramatic difference in the West versus the East. One, in rainfall. It does not rain in the West like it does in the East. And number two, the location of Federal lands. Most, by far the majority, the greatest majority of Federal lands are located in the West. They are not located in the East.

So when we talk about Federal lands and what happens with Federal lands, there is very little pain felt in the East. The pain is all felt in the West. That is why we have heard people say "the war on the West." A lot of times we in the West are concerned about people in the East dictating to us our life-style, which does not apply to them in the East because they do not have the Federal lands. So we have very fragile feelings because we are very dependent on a concept called multiple use. These lands of the Federal Government were created and originated with the idea of lands of many uses, many uses: environmental uses, park uses, transportation uses.

For example, in my district almost every power line, every road, every cable TV, all our water, many of our rivers, they all have to come across on Federal land; or the water is stored on Federal land or it originates on Federal land. The key to our life-style, just the survival of our life-style out there are these Federal lands. We take a lot of pride in them, and I think that was demonstrated today with the creation of this national park.

Now, the national park that I am going to talk about involves the Sand Dunes. We see here an arrow pointing where the Sand Dunes are. That is the Sand Dunes, the national park we have created. It is a big chunk. This district, for example, the 3rd Congressional District, geographically is larger than the State of Florida. It is larger than the State of Florida, just this congressional district that I am privileged to represent. Down here, tucked away, is something that is absolutely amazing. It is a unique situation of one. Nowhere else in the world do we find what I am about to show my colleagues, and that is what we today put into a national park.

Let me point it out. We call them the Great Sand Dunes. We call them the Great Sand Dunes. Take a look at this. Maybe my colleagues would like to look at this picture here and say, well, they are sand dunes. Amazing, but

somebody must have painted in all these Alpine rocky peaks behind it, these 14,000-foot peaks. Somebody must have painted that in, because nowhere in the world would there be massive sand dunes tucked in between 14,000-foot Alpine peaks. Well, there is somewhere in the world. It is located right here in the Sand Dunes at Alamosa, Colorado.

There are a lot of dynamics to these sand dunes that the average person, in fact some of our opponents to this called it nothing. They said this was nothing but a pile of sand. Fortunately, 366 of my colleagues today were able to have a vision beyond the so-called pile of sand. They had the ability to realize the diamond we held in our hands was a lot more precious than the opponents realized it was. We had the vision to look into the future and say, my gosh, look at the ecosystem, look at the ecological system, the biological system, the environmental, the water resources, the wildlife resources. Look what is contained within this unique setting found nowhere else in the world.

These mountains are not painted in. That is the exact setting. We see these sand dunes. Take a look at the sand dunes in one month. By the way, a human being would be about, well, we could not even see it. It would be at the end of a pinpoint. Probably not even that. A little teeny, teeny dot on these sand dunes, to give an idea of how massive these sand dunes are. If we took a big semi-truck, it would look about like this little thing out here right here.

If we looked at these sand dunes a month from today, a month from today, they would be different. Someone might say, wait a minute, it does not look quite the way it looked a month ago, and it is not. These sand dunes are constantly changing. Nowhere else in the world do we have a stream, a mountain stream that runs in waves. It runs in waves and that is how it carries the sand. The stream dries up just about the same day every year, within the same period of time every year. The stream water all of a sudden disappears, and then what happens is the winds start to come in, and the winds at first are slow but they are dry.

As my colleagues know, in the West it is a dry climate. We are not a humid area. It is a dry arid area. The winds come in slow at first. They dry the sand without blowing it. They dry the sand and prepare the sand to be moved from down here in the streambeds that come off these high Rocky Mountains as a result of the snow. It comes down these streambeds, and at the right time the sand is dried, and then the winds start to pick up more velocity. Then pretty soon the winds are heavier winds, and that is what begins to carry the sands. Then all of a sudden we see formations on these sand dunes, like you have never seen in your life.

We could observe it on a daily basis if we had the kind of technical bin-

oculars, or whatever type of thing would measure that. But on a monthly basis with the human eye we can begin to see those changes, and it is all a matter of sequence. It is all a matter of sequence. And the people of the San Luis Valley for generations have known how special this is. They know how unique it is, and they have come to the government of the United States and they have said help us preserve it as a national park. This is so beautiful, it is so basic to the heritage of our families, we want it to be basic to the heritage of all future generations. We want all future generations to enjoy what families like the Salazars enjoy down there in the San Luis Valley, or like the Kriers, or the Santis, or people like that down in that valley, the Entzes and families like that.

They have come to us, and today we have responded on a bipartisan basis. Both Republicans and Democrats got together to give 366 votes in favor of this. There were only 34 people in this Chamber who voted no against naming this a national park. Only 34. I can tell my colleagues that they put up a heck of a fight. We met opposition to name this as a national park from the first day we proposed it. But the facts overcame the opposition.

I have to say there was a lot of support to name this a national park. It did not start with my colleague Senator ALLARD in the Senate, who did a fine job carrying this and passed it out of the United States Senate without one "no" vote. It passed out of the U.S. Senate with no "no" votes. Unanimous. It did not start with myself, who decided to carry the bill in the House, and 9 years ago stood on one of those mounds with a gentleman named Bob Zimmerman and his family, and he said to me this should be a national park. Bob Zimmerman told me this should be preserved for all future generations; that we have to preserve the system that we have.

□ 2200

It did not all start right there. It started from the generations and generations of families. What happened in the last year, in fact on of these sand dunes stood Senator WAYNE ALLARD; Senator BEN CAMPBELL; Ken Salazar, the Attorney General of the State of Colorado; myself; Bruce Babbitt, the Secretary of the Interior. And during that little conversation we had on one of those sand dunes, of which we were just a tiny spec in this vast wonderful world of sand, we decided that we should respond to the community's wishes.

And we began to respond. First of all, the State legislature in Colorado, the State House of Representatives, passed overwhelmingly supporting this designation as a national park. Then the State Senate did the same thing on their resolution, overwhelmingly.

I can tell my colleagues, Gigi Dennis, a good friend of mine, she led the fight over there on the Senate side. And I

can tell my colleagues that Lola Spradly on the House, she led over there. Russell George, Speaker of the House. I can name name after name. Matt Smith. A lot of different people got together in the State House and out of the House and the Senate they sent a message to the Government of Washington, D.C., make this a national park. We support your efforts. Help those communities preserve this for future generations.

But it did not stop there. The Governor of the State of Colorado, Bill Owens, a well-respected, very powerful, powerful in a positive sense, the Governor of the State of Colorado and his wife, the First Lady of the State of Colorado, they gave this their strong endorsement. The Attorney General Ken Salazar, and Ken Salazar has generations of family down there, Ken Salazar went to bat. We had the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). We had the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). We had a number of different people who have come together as a team to create the new national park in Colorado.

I hope all of you, just as you have experienced the ski areas in the Third Congressional District, most of you have skied in either Aspen or Vale or Telluride or Purgatory or Powder Horn or Steamboat or Breckenridge or any of these different areas, come enjoy this. Many of you in this room have enjoyed the Rocky Mountain National Park.

Colorado will now offer to the people of the United States, to the people of the world, the State of Colorado will soon have four national parks in that pristine country that I talk to you about all within a 2½ hour drive or 3 hour drive. It is exciting. It is spectacular. I invite my colleagues to come down and see it.

Let me talk just a little more about what else is contained here. We know that within this range there is an underground aquifer. We do not have the technical expertise to understand all of the fingers of that aquifer. In other words, we have a large pool of water underneath the ground, and we know it contains a huge quantity of water and we know that that water is fundamental, it is basic to the entire system that operates here. We know that that water is fundamental to the farmers and to the ranchers and to the communities and to the crops that they grow.

But we also know one other thing. We know that if that water is sucked out of this aquifer underneath this, there is not a human being alive that can describe the consequences. Oh, we know they will be negative. We know that taking the water from underneath this and moving this out of a valley to help the growth of another region to move it out of this region and move it to another, we know that the result would be, at a minimum, like the Owens Valley in California where they dried up an entire region for the benefit of the growth of another region.

But what we do not know are totally the consequences of draining that aquifer because we technically do not have the expertise today to figure out where all that water goes.

And water is a sustainable resource. It is the only renewable resource known to man. It is the only resource that can be used and reused and reused and reused. It does not disappear. It recreates itself. And with water, one person's waste or excess water is another person's water. And so we have to be very careful about those water resources.

We had a lot of people involved in water, a lot of water experts: Dave Robins; Ray Kogovsek, former Congressman; Kristine, who works with Ray; the Northern Water Conservancy District; Colorado River District. We had a number of different water experts that say this is a good national park, this should be named a national park. And that water, if ever they could get to the water, you need to leave that water in the valley or you stand the chance of collapsing something that is unique, as I said, known nowhere else in the world.

This is exciting. It is kind of fun. You can get up there in the summertime actually and you are able to literally ski down there without skis on your feet. The wildlife is unbelievable.

What we are hoping to do with this, by the way, and some of the opponents, as I said earlier, some of the opposition to this bill today said, well, this is nothing but a pile of sand. And I am quoting them. "This is nothing but a pile of sand." Let me tell you, on this pile of sand, 34 people bought the argument that this is nothing but a pile of sand. But 366 of you realized, and it is like you had telescopic eyes, you realized that this is not just a pile of sand, that these mountains, these 14,000 peaks, these sand dunes represent a remarkable geographical finding. It is like hitting pay dirt. And it is something that ought to be preserved. And 366 of you today on both sides of the aisle said this should be a national park, this should be honored by all Americans for all future generations for its uniqueness.

What we know about the park today, and I could go through a lot about what we do know, but what we do know about the park today is a fraction of what we will know about the park in just 10 years. It is a minute fraction of what we will know about the park in 20 years. And there is no comparison of what we know today as compared to what we will know about that park in 30 years.

And every year the knowledge we get about this park will only further justify, will only further justify the fact that we had enough gumption to stand up here despite the opposition and with the assistance of the U.S. Senate and with the assistance of the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, the Governor, and the Attorney General, we had the gumption to stand up and preserve it for future generations.

Now, I want my colleagues to know that I am a strong advocate of private property. There are no takings as a result of this national park. There are no in-holdings in this national park that are not aware of this. In fact, the major in-holdings are held by the Nature Conservancy District.

We have elk herds. We have elk. We have falcons. We have eagles. You name it. We have a lot of wildlife in this area. We have a ranch called the Baca Ranch. The controlling owners of that ranch want to see this national park, and they want the Baca Ranch to be a part of it.

Right now the Baca Ranch is inaccessible to the ordinary person, inaccessible because it is private property. These owners would like to see it a part of the park so that people regardless of their economic standing, regardless of where they come from, whether it is the United States or Mexico or Canada or South America, regardless, they are going to be able to go onto the Baca Ranch and enjoy the full diversity of the sand dunes.

Take a look at just the watershed resources that we have on the great sand dunes. I will just hold this up temporarily long enough to read the paragraph.

"The dunes watershed consists of two unique mountain streams originating in the pristine Alpine tundra. These waterways flow through ancient forests of spruce and fir. Slipping quietly past culturally scarred ponderosa pine and colorful aspen groves, they cut along the base of the tallest sand dunes in North America. They flow through the vast grasslands. And they end in a closed desert basin, all within a span of a few miles. This area, combined with the tall dunes and the integral sand deposits, encompass an entire system containing abundant diversity and special scenery. These dramatic contrasts, snow-capped mountain peaks and green forests above towering dunes, constitute a unique American landscape with scenery and diversity comparable to other national parks in our country and stand out as one of the best in the entire world."

That is what it is about. I want to congratulate the 365 Members, or 365 Members because obviously I voted for it, 365 of my colleagues that were able to see beyond this so-called pile of sand, that their vision allowed them foresight into the future and gave them vision into the future about future generations.

We were just talking about health care. We talked about Social Security. I am going to talk for a few minutes here shortly about taxes. The fact is we need as leaders people who have the vision to look into the future.

I think the greatest accomplishment I can have as a United States Congressman and I think the greatest accomplishment that my colleagues can have as United States Congressmen is that years down the road somebody will look back and say, you know, we are

glad that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) or we are glad that so-and-so or we are glad that this person had the vision to see just how important it was that the Ray Blunts, that the different parties involved here had that kind of vision. Because it is so important, because it is so important in our leadership role that is we provide something for the future.

And in the meantime, while we have provided it for the future, all of us get to enjoy it. All of us can go out there. We get to run in the sand. We can watch the wildlife. We can hunt. We can fish. We can travel around and see exactly what it is. And we do it without taking. There is no taking it. It has to be willing seller. There are no in-holdings that are getting taken advantage of. That is the beauty of this thing, and that is why 366 people stood up today despite intense opposition, which by the way only resulted in 34 votes, but despite intense opposition on a ratio greater than ten to one, the people of these Chambers stood up today and said, future America, all of the world deserves to have this as a national park.

I can tell my colleagues I stand up here with a great deal of pride and honor, first of all to be a congressman from the State of Colorado, and, second of all, to represent the Third Congressional District of Colorado, and I stand up here with a great deal of honor to be the Congressman of the district that has America's newest national park, the Great Sand Dunes. And we are going to change it, no longer a national monument, the Great Sand Dunes National Park.

In conclusion on the park, first of all, many of my colleagues have been to Colorado to the Third Congressional District. They have skied it. They have hiked our 14,000-foot peaks. You have rafted our rivers. As you know, we are famous for fly fishing, mountain biking, you name it, horseback riding, off-road vehicles on designated trails. We have got lots of things to draw you to this district. Now we have one more thing.

For those of you, I want you to know that the communities of Alamosa, of Mount Vista, San Luis, Conejas, all of these different areas down there, the valley will welcome you with open hands. And study the history and the historical basis of the people and how they have lived on these lands all of these years. And you are going to walk away from this, you will walk away from these great sand dunes, you will walk away from there very, very inspired, not just by geographically and biologically and environmentally that you have seen, you are also going to walk away from there inspired to know that every United States Senator serving today by unanimous vote supported this and 366 Members of your Congress stood up and voted just today to create this new national park. I am proud of all of you for having done that.

Let me move now to an entirely different subject very briefly. I should

point out here the Colorado canyons. I pointed this out today. My posters are a little worn, colleagues. You will have to excuse that. But last night it was signed by the President. This is the State of Utah. This again is a big chunk of the western portion of my district. This is the Colorado River.

Colorado is very unique when it comes to water. I thought I would spend a couple minutes and talk about water. Colorado is the only State in the Union where all our free-flowing water goes out of the State. We have no free-flowing water that comes into the State of Colorado for our use. And in Colorado, within the boundaries of Colorado, in our district, the Third Congressional District, again it is outlined by this blue line, within this district right here, 80 percent of the water in Colorado comes from that district. Eighty percent of the population of Colorado resides outside that district.

So you can see that because of the tremendous water resources that are in my congressional district, we have lots of trees, lots of understandings, and we have lots of discussions that are ongoing as to the best utilization of that water.

□ 2215

One of those discussions that came again just like the Great Sand Dunes National Park, that started at a community level, was the Colorado Canyons. That bill was signed by the President last night. It was supported again on the bipartisan basis. And it protected the water rights of the Colorado River for Colorado people. Although I can tell you the water in the Colorado River, it is called the mother of rivers, it provides drinking water for 23 million people, including the country of Mexico. It is a huge water resource. We know how to protect it. But we want to protect our rights, too. This bill protected Colorado water rights for Colorado people. This bill created a national conservation area. It created a wilderness area up on the top. We got in our community everyone from our county commissioners to our city council to our environmental organizations to our ranchers, to just community citizens, to people who cared, we put all of this together. I as a facilitator and others as a facilitator were able to come up with this compromise and we call this the Colorado Canyons bill. I am very proud of that. Again, another accomplishment by the people of Colorado to protect the resources of Colorado for future generations, while at the same time allowing current generations to enjoy the utilization of the resources that we have in the fine State of Colorado.

Let us shift gears completely and let us talk for a minute about taxes. I think it is very important. Because I have heard a lot of political rhetoric lately about tax cuts. There are some tax cuts that have taken place and there are a couple of tax cuts that ought to take place that I think when

you sit down with the average American, one, they appreciate the fact that the taxes were cut or, two, they think these taxes should be eliminated. I can start out with the death tax. Do you think that our forefathers when they drafted the Constitution had in their wildest imagination that this government that they were creating, this new concept of democracy that they were putting together, would see death as a taxable event? That your death would result in a money-making revenue source for the government that they were creating? Can you imagine our forefathers thinking that as a revenue-raising, income-raising event for the Federal Government there should be a tax on your marriage? That when you get married that we should have a marriage tax?

Both of those taxes, the death tax and the marriage tax, should be eliminated. How can you argue with that? Regardless of the impact on the budget. Look at the basic concept, the fundamental question. Should we tax the event of death? Is death a taxable event? By the way, when we tax it, are we not a nation that wants to encourage family farms and ranches and small businesses to go from one generation to the next generation? And furthermore ask the question, does the death tax not in fact discourage that going from one generation to the next generation? Is this a country that should be discouraging families from transferring their business from mom and dad to kids, from those kids to their kids, from those kids to their kids? What made America great and what makes us great today is our family, the family foundation, the family block. A death tax has no place in our society in my opinion. I do not care who it taxes. By the way, it does not just hit 2 percent of the population as some like to say. It hits everybody in the community. When that money is taken out of a local community and is sent to Washington, D.C. for redistribution, and it never goes back anywhere close to the percentage back to that community from whence it came, in the same proportion, not even close. And there is a difference out there on this tax and there is a difference in this presidential election. George W. Bush has made it a commitment, he will eliminate that tax. And by a bipartisan vote on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, although the President vetoed it, in fact the President not only vetoed the elimination of the death tax which both sides of this aisle supported, he and Vice President GORE proposed it actually increase this year by \$9.5 billion. In their budget this year they actually had an increase of \$9.5 billion in the death tax. That is a fundamental difference between the bipartisan, Republicans and Democrats, conservative Democrats, not the liberal Democrats but the conservative Democrats that supported that elimination, that is the difference between that team and the liberal Democrats'

and AL GORE's proposal on the death tax.

I am not trying to be partisan here, but let us call facts as they are. Let us call it as it is. Who is for the death tax and who is not? Who is going to stand up and be counted to get rid of this death tax? The same thing for the marriage penalty. That was vetoed by the President. By the way, there are Members, conservative Democrats and Republicans, who say get rid of this marriage tax. No, what you hear from the liberals is, "Hey, let's tax the rich, let's transfer the wealth, let's move money from those who work, let's move money, let's transfer money, not create capital, transfer." It is all a question of transfer. The transfer agent is the United States Government. It is right here in Washington, D.C.

Let me ask you this: If one of my colleagues just won the lotto tomorrow and you won \$50 million, and you want to distribute it around the country, help people out, help people with health care, help people buy open space, help people with hardships, would you send that \$50 million to Washington, D.C. for redistribution to be handed out on your behalf? Of course you would not. Do you think Ted Turner or the Kennedys or any of those people send their money to Washington D.C. for disbursement? No, they create their own foundations because they know through their own foundations they can with some efficiency, a great deal more efficiency, put that money to work. It is the same concept with taxes. Do you think those tax dollars are more efficient in your pocket or more efficient in the pocket of the United States Congress and the President of the United States?

Clearly we ought to have some taxes. We have to fund the military. We have to fund highways. We have to fund social services. We have to fund Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. We have obligations. The average taxpayer out there does not disagree with those obligations. What the average taxpayer disagrees with is the lack of efficiency. The government waste, the size and the increasing size of the government. This is a distinguishing issue in this upcoming presidential race.

Take a look at which side really has the history and has a record. Forget all the talk they talk about. Just look at the record. Which side, the conservatives or the liberals, increase the size of government? Take a look at the Great Society of Lyndon B. Johnson and figure out, was it the liberals who got the government to increase, was it the liberals who put it into the deficit for 40 some years or was it the conservatives? I am not talking about right-wing conservatives, I am talking about moderate people who say, I understand I have to pay some taxes but I want some justification.

Let me talk to you about a couple of the tax cuts. There is one very important tax cut to every one of you and every one of your constituents that we

in the Republican Party with the help, by the way, of conservative Democrats passed and it benefits every one of your constituents that owns a home. Probably the largest tax break they have gotten in their life. We passed it off here and guess what happened? Nothing collapsed. Washington was able to survive. No program on social services collapsed. No child went hungry in a school. Our military did not miss any planes or jets as a result of this. All the dire circumstances of allowing the person who made the money to keep a little more of the money, none of these dire circumstances of not letting that money go to Washington occurred.

I hear the same kind of scare tactics today. George W. Bush talks about a tax reduction, a cut in the taxes for everybody, not just this group, not just this group but everybody. George W. Bush said the other day, the target ought to be everybody, it should not be a little tiny target based on class warfare. It should be a target for everybody. I will show you a tax that we made a target for homeowners which is a broad target. It used to be when you sold your home, if you sold your home for a profit, for example, you bought a home for \$100,000, you sold a home for \$350,000, which means you made a profit of \$250,000, you were taxed on a \$250,000 profit. That was what you were taxed on, \$250,000. On a couple if you bought a home for \$200,000, you sold the home for \$700,000, you had a profit of \$500,000, you were taxed on \$500,000. That is the old regime. That is the old let the government grow bigger. That is the old look for anything you can to make it a taxable event. Tax death, tax marriage, tax an individual's sale of their home.

Most people in this country, the biggest investment of their lives will be their home. The proudest investment they will have in their lives outside of their children, but physical investment will be their home. Where most people will spend time in their lives will be their home. And the government has to tax it when you sell it? Come on.

A couple of years ago, the Republican leadership, with almost complete support, I think complete support from the Republican Members of Congress, as well as support from conservative Members of the Democratic Party, and granted the liberal side of the party will never vote to reduce your taxes. I can assure you, take a look at the history. You can tell that the liberal aspect, the liberal politicians will always want to grow the size of your government. The liberal politicians will always want to take individual rights and form it as a pool, as a group. They sacrifice the individual right to the benefit of the group right. They will transfer wealth, they will transfer money from those who work and give it to those who do not. It is just a liberal concept. There is a fundamental difference.

The same thing showed up on this tax cut, this tax reduction bill. These are

the kind of reductions that George W. Bush talks about. These are the kind of tax reductions that we put into place. After our bill, and this says "After Republicans," and I have got to tell you, we had a lot of Democratic support, conservative Democrats, not the liberal but the conservative Democrats who supported this. Now, look what happens. Our individual, let us say Jane Adams bought the house for \$100,000, she sold it for \$350,000, she made 250. She was taxed on 250. Under our bill Jane Adams buys the house, same conditions, for 100, sells it for 350, makes \$250,000 and that is her tax right there. Zero. That is her tax. Zero. And this is now law.

Even in the old days under the old regime, you only got one tax break in your entire life on the sale of your home and that is if you were older than 62 and you only got a tax break, I think up to \$140,000. We did not just give that tax break to individuals. We said, in our country, most homes are owned by couples. Most homes are owned by couples. What are we going to do for couples? We said, hey, for couples, we double it. If you have got a couple, we are going to allow the first \$250,000, the first \$250,000 per person to be tax free. So if you live in a home, and most of us live in homes that today have appreciated. In other words, they are worth more today than they were when we bought them. That is called profit. I am not talking about equity. I am talking about profit. Most of us live in homes where if we sold the home, we could sell it for a profit. Under the old regime, money would have come out of your pocket and sent to Washington, D.C. simply because you sold your home. That is the only reason that money would be taken out of your pocket and sent to Washington, D.C., simply because you sold your home. We changed that. When we changed it, now when you sell that home for a profit up to \$250,000 per person regardless of your age, renewable every 2 years, that money goes in your pocket for redistribution in your community instead of going out of your pocket to Washington, D.C. for redistribution in the bureaucracy that Washington uses it for.

You should have heard the cries back then. Just like I hear today when George W. Bush talks about a modest tax reduction for everybody, you hear these scare tactics: "Oh, my gosh, we're going to have the deficit tomorrow. School children won't get lunches. We're not going to get medical care. It's going to cost us."

Look at what happened. It is the same thing when we reduced the capital gains tax, which again with the help of conservative Democrats, again no help from the liberal Democrats, but we did get help from the conservative Democrats and the Republicans, we reduced capital gains from 28 percent to 20 percent. We had the same scare tactics out there. Oh, my gosh, the sky is falling. Reducing taxes on

the American people? What a disaster. How could the Republicans and the conservative Democrats even possibly envision a tax reduction? It will destroy the country. Lowering capital gains from 28 percent to 20 percent, boom, the economy went up. Just like that. More tax dollars came in. You lowered the taxes, you had more economic activity, you had more creation of capital and your economy shot up like a rocket and we have been enjoying that for 3 or 4 years now since the reduction of capital gains.

□ 2230

Same thing on this. Did the sky fall in when people started to keep the money they made on the sale of their house? Did the sky fall in because the money individuals, regular working folks out there, because the money they had they made on the sale of their house did not come back to Washington, D.C., was not redistributed by Washington, D.C.? Did the sky fall in as a result of that? No, of course it did not.

We now have more than any other time in history greater homeownership by a larger population than ever in the history of this country. Our economy has improved. It did not go down. The sky did not fall in.

So when I hear these people out there talk about scare tactics because George W. Bush has the courage to stand up and say, look, it is easy to criticize. It is easy to envision that Washington, D.C., ought to be managing our money instead of us. We earned it. Washington did not earn it. We earned it. It is amazing that these scare tactics seem to be working out there. That somehow a tax cut, allowing the person who made the money to keep a larger percentage of that money to reduce the size of government, the sky is going to fall in.

Not being presumptuous, but if George W. Bush is fortunate enough to be elected President, we are going to see a tax cut not for a targeted group of people, not for the low income or the high income, but for everybody. And we are going to see a tax reduction that benefits the economy. Just like when the Republicans took capital gains and dropped it from 28 percent to 20 percent; just like when the Repub-

licans took this tax on the sale of a home and reduced it for the first \$500,000 for a couple to zero. Let Americans keep that amount of money in their pocket and renew it every 2 years, we will see an economic resurgence.

We are going to see a healthy economy because the fact is the more dollars we allow our citizens to keep, the dollars which they worked for, the stronger our economy will be. If we take a look, and by the way the Wall Street Journal has done splendid editorials on this, if we take a look at the three or four major tax reductions this last century in our government and take a look at what happened to the economy after that tax reduction, we will find that in every case, no exceptions, the economy improved. The economy was strengthened, and we actually had an economic boom which followed every one of those.

Why? Because the person that makes the money has a deeper appreciation for the money and is wiser in the utilization of that money than is the bureaucracy of Washington, D.C., which does not have to work for the money. It is simply getting their money by transfer. Our constituents get their money by work. They go out and create something and work and offer a product, they offer something of benefit. They create that capital. In Washington, we do not create capital. We get our money by transfer. We reach out to the people who work. We reach out to the people that create a profit, and we suck that money out of their pockets by transferring it to ours.

As a result of that, since the government did not have to work for the money, the government tends to be much less efficient, much sloppier, could care less in many circumstances how the dollars are spent, and we could show example after example of government waste, than does the individual.

The individual, that young man or young woman or that person, middle age or seniors that went out and spent their working day putting that money in their pocket, at 5 o'clock they get off shift and go home, they are very careful about how they spend their money. They watch their budgets. They try not to waste their money and they manage it. The taxpayer knows

how to manage the money much better than we do in Washington, D.C.

What happens? The consequence of what I am saying, what happens when we allow the taxpayer to keep a few more dollars in their pocket and the government reduce its size and take the dollars that are absolutely necessary but no more? What happens when we allow that taxpayer to manage more money? The money is managed in a much more efficient way. And when the money is managed in a much more efficient way, what happens is that the economy strengthens and it begins to grow.

Mr. Speaker, what happens when the economy strengthens and begins to grow? There are more tax dollars that are originated that come to feed the government. It is a plus for the government. It is a plus for the taxpayer. It is a plus for our society.

So when we hear these scare tactics, just like we heard the hour previous to mine, scare tactics about health care, when we hear these scare tactics about Bush's tax reductions or the Republicans, take a look at examples that have occurred. Take a look at the capital gains taxation. Take a look at this household tax, and we will find out that is exactly what it was. Just like the health care, nothing much more than scare tactics.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up by saying to my 366 colleagues who voted for the creation of America's newest national park, let me say to those 366, their vision will come back generation after generation after generation. They can be proud that during their congressional career this should stand out as one of the highlights. Many generations into the future will look back and say: they did the right thing. They had the vision for future generations.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel by the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, by a miscellaneous group during the third quarter of 2000 is as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 4 AND JULY 10, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Christopher Smith	7/5	7/10	Romania		1,229.25		(3)				1,229.25
Hon. Steny Hoyer	7/5	7/6	Romania		489.90		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		734.85		(3)				1,274.75
Hon. Benjamin Cardin	7/5	7/6	Romania		491.70		(3)				
	7/6	7/7	Croatia		50.00		(3)				
	7/7	7/10	Romania		737.55		(3)				1,279.25