almost all of it just in the last few years, and that 70 million acres does not even count what we have in the national forests and all of that.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not wake up and realize that we are slowly, very slowly doing away with private property in this country, we are about to lose a very important element of our freedom and our prosperity, and we are about to lose the freedom that this man fought for and supported all of those years and why so many people have given their lives for this country and in defense of that flag. I am very pleased that this Miss Jacobsen realized that and wrote such a moving column in Newsweek. I just wanted to call that to the attention of my colleagues tonight.

SAY NO TO H.R. 7, PRESIDENT’S FAITH-BASED INITIATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will vote on H.R. 7, the President’s faith-based initiative.

The question before the House is not whether faith is a powerful force; it is. The question is not whether faith-based groups do good works; they do. The question is not even whether government can assist faith-based groups in their social work. The government does and has so for years.

Rather, the vote on this bill boils down to two fundamental questions. First, do we want American citizens’ tax dollars directly funding churches and houses of worship, as this bill does; and, second, is it right to discriminate in job hiring when using Federal dollars?

I would suggest the answer to both of those questions is no, emphatically so.

The question of using tax dollars to fund churches is not a new one. It was debated at length by our Founding Fathers over two centuries ago. They not only said no to that idea; they felt so strongly about it that they embedded the principle of church-State separation into the first 16 words of the Bill of Rights by keeping government funding and regulations out of our churches for over 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, America has become the envy of the world when it comes to religious freedom, tolerance, and vitality. I challenge the proponents of this bill to show me tomorrow one nation in the world, one nation where government funding of churches has resulted in more tolerance or vitality than right here in the United States. All of human history proves that government involvement in religion harms religion, not helps it.

Our Founding Fathers understood that fact, and today’s world proves that fact. Just look around. In China, citizens are in prison for their religious beliefs. In the Middle East, religious differences have perpetrated conflict and death. In Afghanistan, religious minorities are being branded with Nazi-like tactics. In Europe, government-funding of churches has led to low church attendance.

As a person of faith, I thank God that our Founding Fathers understood that religious liberty is best preserved by keeping government funding and regulations out of our churches.

To my conservative colleagues, and to those across this country, I would suggest that they should be the first to fear the government regulation of religion that would inevitably result from billions of taxpayer dollars going directly to our churches and houses of worship.

Surely it was one significant reason why over 1,000 religious leaders, from Baptists to Jews to Methodists, have signed petitions against H.R. These people of faith understand that direct Federal funding of our churches would not only be unconstitutional, it would result in government regulation, audits, and yes, even prosecutions against our churches and religious leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I have great personal respect for President Bush, but on the question of Federal funding using tax dollars to fund our churches, I must stand with Madison, Jefferson, and the Bill of Rights. The principle of church-State separation has protected Americans’ religious freedom magnificently for over 200 years. We tamper with that sacred principle at our own peril.

Mr. Speaker, now let me address a second question I raised regarding this legislation: Is it right to discriminate in job hiring when using Federal dollars for those jobs? I believe the vast majority of Americans would say no.

Under H.R. 7, citizens could be denied or fired from federally-funded jobs because of no other reason than their personal religious faith. I would suggest that having the government subsidize religious job discrimination would be a huge step backwards in our march for civil rights.

No American citizen, not one, should have to pass anyone else’s religious test in order to qualify for a federally-supported job.

Under H.R. 7, a church associated with Bob Jones University could put out a sign “Paid for by taxpayers. No Catholics need apply here for a federally-funded job.” That is wrong.

Under H.R. 7, federally-funded jobs could be denied to otherwise qualified workers simply because of their personal faith being different from that of their employers. That is wrong.

Under H.R. 7, churches that believe women should not work which use Federal dollars could put out a sign saying, “Women need not apply here for a federally-funded job.” That is wrong.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 2356, THE BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, House Rule XIII (c)(2) requires that a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office be filed with a committee report. When the committee report for H.R. 2356 was filed, this cost estimate was not yet available.

Attached for inclusion in the RECORD is the completed cost estimate.
Basis of Estimate: Based on information from the FEC, CBO estimates that the agency would spend about $2 million in fiscal year 2002 to reconfigure its information systems to handle the increased workload from accounting and processing more reports, to write new regulations implementing the bill’s provisions, and to print and mail information to candidates and election committee officials about new requirements.

In addition, the FEC would need to ensure compliance with the bill’s provisions and investigate possible violations. CBO estimates that conducting those compliance activities would cost $2 million to $3 million a year, mainly for additional enforcement and litigation staff.

CBO estimates it would cost GAO less than $500,000 in fiscal year 2002 to complete the report required by the bill.

Enacting H.R. 2356 could increase collections of fines for violations of campaign finance laws, CBO estimates that any additional collections would not be significant. Civil fines are classified as governmental receipts. These fines would increase collections, but CBO estimates that any increase would not be significant.

Estimated impact on the private sector:

H.R. 2356 would make changes to federal campaign finance laws that govern activities in elections for federal office. The bill would amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to: raise the limits on annual contributions; increase expenditures; prohibit national committees of political parties from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring, or spending so-called “soft money”; require numerous additional filings and disclosures by political committees with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) for certain expenditures; strengthen the prohibition on foreign contributions to federal campaigns, and increase fines for violations of election laws; direct the General Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study of recently publicly financed campaigns in Arizona and Maine; and restrict advertising rates charged by television broadcasters to candidates for public office.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 2356 would cost about $5 million in fiscal year 2002 and about $3 million a year thereafter, subject to appropriation of the necessary funds. Those amounts include administrative and compliance costs for the FEC, as well as costs for GAO to prepare the required report. Enacting the bill also could increase collections of fines, but CBO estimates that any increase would not be significant. Because the bill would affect direct spending and receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply.

H.R. 2356 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

H.R. 2356 would impose several private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. CBO estimates that the direct costs to the private sector of complying with those mandates would exceed the annual statutory threshold in UMRA ($115 million in 2001, adjusted annually for inflation) primarily as a result of new mandates on national political party committees and television, cable, and satellite broadcasters. Moreover, CBO estimates that they net direct costs to the private sector could exceed $300 million in a Presidential election year.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 2356 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 800 (general government).

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Estimated impact on the private sector: The most costly mandates in the bill would impose costs on television, cable, and satellite broadcasters. Moreover, CBO estimates that the net direct costs to the private sector could exceed $300 million in a Presidential election year. Further, the bill would provide for future indexing for inflation of certain limitations on annual contributions. The bill would also raise limits on individual and party support for Senator candidates whose opponents exceed the designated level of personal campaign funding.

The increased contributions limits would allow candidates and national and state party committees to accept larger campaign contributions. Based on information from the FEC and other experts, CBO expects that the incremental increase in such contributions could be between $200 million and $1 billion in a Presidential election year. Thus, such savings would only partially offset the losses from the ban on soft-money contributions.

Additional mandates in H.R. 2356 would impose costs on television, cable, and satellite broadcasters by requiring the lowest
THE UNIQUE QUALITIES OF THE AMERICAN WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 17, 2001, from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues this evening to discuss one of my favorite topics, of course, the American West. I plan to spend the next few minutes talking about the differences between the western United States and the eastern United States.

I talk quite regularly about these issues because, of course, being a native of the wonderful State of Colorado, I believe very strongly, very strongly in the American West. I believe the West is the future of this country. It is the way of the American West, the virtues and the values of the American West.

I think it is important, because of our small population out there, that we continue to be heard in this country; that our way of life in the American West somehow be preserved and not trod upon.

I had a wonderful experience this last weekend. I was in Buena Vista, which in Spanish stands for “good view.” Buena Vista, Colorado, I had a couple of friends and my wife, Laurie, we went to Buena Vista for one purpose: We wanted to hear a singer, somebody who I had known, a person of great character, a gentleman named Michael Martin Murphy.

This is an individual who is not only able to sing in such a way that it warms your heart, but also has the very canny ability of passing on and communicating through his music about the values of the American West. Not only can Michael Martin Murphy communicate about the values of the American West, he also communicates about the need and the necessity of character, of real character; of the need to pass on values that we as Americans ought to live up to.

When we went to Buena Vista and we heard some of the discussions, we had an opportunity not only to listen to the music of Michael Martin Murphy, who I pay tribute to today; not only to meet his good friend, Karen Richie, but also to listen to some of the background and some of the values and the future that people like Gene Autry, the Marty Robbins, and Roy Rogers, and in my opinion, Michael Martin Murphy.

I can say that Michael Martin Murphy in my opinion rises to the level of those legends, the legends of the American West. I believe the values that people like Gene Autry, Roy Rogers, and Marty Robbins saw about the American West.
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