So I have seen some cases where Fish and Wildlife people have worked in partnership and in a symbiotic relationship with the landowners. This has made a huge difference, because when you get the landowners on board, when they are with you and they understand what you are trying to do and they understand you are not out to get them, some great things can happen for the wildlife. So I have seen it that way.

I have seen it on the other hand too. I have seen arbitrary behavior where the Endangered Species Act has been used as a club: my way or the highway. You guys do not have any rights, we are going to shove it down your throat. When that happens, you find that the landowner is forced to choose between a species and his livelihood, and the landowner usually is going to choose his livelihood. The Endangered Species Act, often unnecessarily, forces the landowner to make this choice, and when this happens, everyone loses.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees tomorrow on H.R. 2646.

The form of the motion is as follows: I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2646, an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, be instructed to disagree to the provisions contained in Section 452 of the Senate amendment, relating to partial restoration of benefits to legal immigrants.

WELFARE REFORM AND OTHER ISSUES IMPORTANT TO AMERICANS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, before I give my comments tonight, I want to take note of one individual in particular here in the room with us tonight and those that are also here every single night, every single day on the floor, and they are the pages that have worked so hard to make the operation of this House successful as it is. In particular, one Katie Roehrick, who I spoke to just a little earlier, I want to especially point out and thank her for her work and staying late in the evenings as she does and to her mom, Brenda, for producing such a lovely daughter.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues with which I wish to deal tonight. Before I begin the major body of my presentation, I want to refer to the comments that were made by members of the minority party here earlier this evening, and for at least an hour, perhaps longer, they went on about the concerns they have with the fact that we have, that this body has passed and this Congress has passed, a package of bills that we refer to as a stimulus package and essentially, they are measures designed to reduce taxes on the people of the United States of America.

□ 2230

I think, and they were concerned about this, and they certainly do not want, as they said, they do not want these measures to become permanent. They want all of the temporary tax cuts to remain only temporary. In fact, they are concerned about the fact that we passed them at all. They would just as soon that we never had passed tax cuts.

I would like the people listening, and also, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I want to address this comment to the House, and reflect upon exactly what it was that we had to do in order to get Democratic support for our package, the package that we refer to as a stimulus package. I think it is very elucidative. It tells us a great deal about the difference between the two parties, and about the way in which we do our business here in this House. It tells us a great deal about how we view government and its relationship to the people.

Now, it is undeniably true that as a result of a number of things, traditional economic downturns, the war we are facing, a variety of other issues have impacted negatively on the economy of this Nation. That is undeniably true. No one argues with that.

As a result, revenues have dropped, jobs have disappeared, and Federal, State and local governments are having a more difficult time meeting their commitments because revenues have decreased. That is undeniably true. That is the only thing upon which we agree.

Everybody here can agree there is a problem. The President has articulated the problem, and has postulated a response and a solution. This is what separates the two parties, this philosophy of government embodied in this whole idea of a stimulus package, ''stimulus,'' meaning to get the country moving again.

What can we do, what is there that the Members of this body can do, to reinvigorate the American economy?

Now, when we presented this in the form of a motion here on the floor, in the form of regulations and/or laws, here is what we came up with.

On the Republican side, we said that the best thing that we can do as a body is to in fact reduce the tax burden on the people of the country and on the businesses that employ the people of this country, because we believe in order to get the economy in fact stimulated, as the title of the package implies, we need to increase the number of jobs that are available to the people of the country. We have to make sure that the government does what it can do to make it easier for corporations, for small businesses, to employ other people, to sell their products and services, and thereby prosper. We believe that is the way to get the economy moving again.

What did our friends on the other side offer to this stimulus package? What did we in fact have to include in order to get it passed? The one proposal, the one and only proposal that came from the minority party to stimulate our economy, was to increase the length of time people could be on unemployment compensation.

Now, we can argue for the need for the Federal Government to increase the length of time people can be eligible for unemployment, but that is a separate debate. It should be a separate debate, totally and completely different from the debate over what it is we can do to get the economy moving again. Yet, this is the only thing they put forward, an increase in the amount of time people could be eligible for unemployment.

Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is a perfect example. I cannot think of a better way to explain to the American people the difference that exists between two parties, two philosophies, two ideas of government.

One, because we want tax breaks, we are characterized as heartbreakers, cruel, or only wanting to help the ''rich.'' But as has been said often on this floor, and certainly something with which I agree, Mr. Speaker, I have never personally been given a job by a poor person. Jobs only come from people who can afford to give jobs, companies that can afford to employ people. And their ability to do so, their ability to employ people, is directly related to the costs they incur to be in business.

One of those costs, in fact, I think a very expensive cost, is the cost of the government. I think it is too high. I think we interfere far too much with the marketplace and with people's ability to actually do business.

There are legitimate roles for the government, undeniably, legitimate roles in this area. But when we are talking about trying to get this economy moving again, and then to hear our friends on the other side of the aisle come up here tonight and talk for over an hour about their fear that a tax break, that a tax cut would in some way or other jeopardize the success of our stimulus package, that is absolutely incredible.

Actually, it is not incredible, it is to be expected, but it is also to be rejected. It is a failed philosophy. We cannot tax ourselves out of a recession. What we can do is, of course, unleash the power, the spirit, and the enterprise of the American people, and that is what we have done. That is what this President has requested. That is how this Congress has responded.

We should not only disavow any attempt on the part of the minority