

unit rate broadcast time to be nonpreemptible for candidates (with rates based on comparison to prior 180 days) and requiring the rates to be available to national party committees. The bill also would also require broadcasters to maintain records of requests of broadcast time purchases. Based on the latest figures from the National Association of Broadcasters and the FCC, affected political advertising would bring in revenues of \$400 million to \$500 million in Presidential election years and \$200 million to \$250 million in other election years. CBO does not have enough information to accurately estimate the effects of the requirements in the bill on those revenues. Based on information from industry experts, however, CBO concludes that such losses could exceed \$100 million in a Presidential election year.

H.R. 2356 would also impose private-sector mandates in several additional areas. These areas include: restricting the use of soft money by candidates and state political parties; additional requirements to report information to the FEC about political contributions and expenditures by individuals and political parties; restricting contributions from minors and foreign nationals; restricting disbursements for election-related communications by individuals, labor unions, corporations, and political parties; and prohibiting certain campaign fundraising.

The direct costs associated with additional reporting requirements would not be significant. In general, most entities involved in federal elections must submit reports to the FEC under current law. New requirements in H.R. 2356 also would impose some costs for individuals and organizations who pay for certain election-related communications associated directly and indirectly with federal elections. Finally, mandates that restrict the ability of individuals and organizations to make certain contributions or expenditures would impose additional administrative costs.

Previous estimate: On July 9, 2001, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 2360, the Campaign Finance Reform and Grassroots Citizen Participation Act of 2001, as ordered reported by the Committee on House Administration on June 28, 2001. That bill contained some of the provisions in H.R. 2356 and CBO estimated that it would cost the federal government \$2 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Neither bill contains intergovernmental mandates.

Both bills would impose private-sector mandates by placing new restrictions on contributions and expenditures related to federal elections. The mandates in H.R. 2360 would not impose costs above the statutory threshold. The primary mandate in H.R. 2360 would limit the use of soft-money contributions in certain federal election activities. The primary mandates in H.R. 2356 would impose costs above the threshold by banning the use of soft money for national committees and changing the rules that apply to broadcast rates for political advertisements.

Estimates prepared by: Federal costs: Mark Grabowicz, impact on State, local and tribal governments: Susan Seig Thompkins; impact on the private sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

THE UNIQUE QUALITIES OF THE AMERICAN WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman 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 and 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 and 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 standards 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, Roy Rogers, and Marty Robbins saw about the American West.

I can say that Michael Martin Murphy in my opinion rises to the level of those legends, the legends of Marty Robbins, the legend of Gene Autry, the legend of Roy Rogers; that he rises to their level, because in my opinion he is able to communicate the message as those people did for their generation, and Michael Martin Murphy does that for this generation. I think his music will carry that message to future generations.

It was a wonderful experience. We were up on the mountain plain, Chalk

Mountain right in the distance, of course among 14,000-plus foot peaks. The wind was blowing slightly, the sun was going down, not until about 9 o'clock. It was cool. The mountains can get awful cold this time of year; not like winter, obviously, but very, very cool.

It was just the perfect setting. It was the perfect setting to let one's mind rest for a few minutes and to go back in history and remember the values upon which this great Nation was built, upon the individual characters that stepped forward to settle the West, to stand strong for the West, to make sure that the wrongs were righted, because we know there were wrongs that were committed in the acquisition of the West.

It is interesting, when we look back in history, our history professors tell us, Mr. Speaker, that history often repeats itself, and that if we look upon the strong values of this country, the foundation that made this country the greatest country known in the history of the world, when we look back we see certain characteristics that I think have been represented in music, at least in the West, by the legends of the Gene Autrys, the Marty Robbins, and Roy Rogers, and in my opinion, Michael Martin Murphy.

I intend here in the next few days to issue a tribute for Michael Martin Murphy, because I think it is so important for the generation, for our generation, the obligation of our generation to pass on to the next generation what life in the American West really is about; how wonderful it is and how important it is to preserve that independence, that love of nature, that mountain area way of life.

There are several ways we can do it. Of course, we can put it in history books. We can teach it in our classes. Those are all important. But it seems to me one of the most effective ways to pass the message from one generation to the next generation is through music. Michael Martin Murphy does exactly that.

I was not enthralled, so do not get me wrong, I was not starstruck by Michael Martin Murphy. I was impressed, because I felt that I had met an entertainer who was much more than an entertainer, but an individual who really cared about the American West, an individual who understood the land values and the need for open space and the beauty of the Rocky Mountains, yet firmly believed that people had a right to live in those areas; that people have a right to enjoy that.

In Michael Martin Murphy I saw not a superstar, but I saw a star kind of different than like a Hollywood set. What I saw was a superstar in character, a person who spoke about the characters that are necessary for our new generations; about the obligations we have, the obligations that were fulfilled by previous generations.

We live in a great country, wherever one lives in this country. I just happen to have a prejudice towards the mountains, whether it is in Virginia or in the Missouri flats or up in Montana, up in those areas, Idaho, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, and of course my district, the Third District of Colorado, which is essentially the mountains of Colorado, whether one is in Durango, Buena Vista, Walsenburg, Steamboat Springs, Meeker, Colorado, Glenwood Springs, Beaver Creek, all of these communities.

What is important is that there are a lot of generations that have come ahead of us, including multiple generations on my side of the family and multiple generations on my wife's side of the family.

It is a way of life. It is a way of life that I think we can preserve. It is a way of life that we should not allow the elitists to come out and destroy. It is a way of life of those people who come out and buy property in the mountains, or come out to the West and buy land, whether it is in the prairie or in the mountains. It is a responsibility that kind of runs with the land. It does not disappear from one owner to the other, it is a responsibility that should go with everybody who touches the land. It runs with the land, and it should run with the land for all future generations.

A part of getting that message out is through the music of the likes of Michael Martin Murphy. So for that, I intend to issue a tribute, because I consider him in that bracket, having met that standard of a legend, not just for the music, which by the way is beautiful, whether it is Wildfire, or his rendition of the Yellow Rose of Texas, or I could go through a number of different songs; but most importantly, what Michael Martin Murphy says and what he practices and what he encourages other people to do in regard to the preservation of the American West.

Let me point out some differences in why life in the West requires some special attention, why it really does. I am not trying to preach to my colleagues this evening, but I am trying to say that out in the West we have a unique situation. It is not found in the East, or very rarely in the East. It is unique to the West. We have to have a good understanding of it if we really want to comprehend the challenges that we face out West.

It all started years ago with the founding of this country. As we all know, the country was not founded on the west coast. It was not founded in the mid country, it was founded on the east coast, out in this area. The population was up and down the coastline.

As our forefathers decided to expand this wonderful dream of theirs to build a country of freedom, a country that was free from the king, a country where we would have no king, a coun-

try which allowed for a representative and democratic type of government, to do that they in to expand, so they purchased land. They needed to encourage people to occupy that land.

What happened back then, just because one had a deed, they had a piece of paper that said you owned this piece of property, that did not mean much.

□ 2215

What meant something was for an individual to be actually placed on the land with both their feet. Possession of the land. And frankly, not only possession of the land, it also probably required in a lot of cases, a six-shooter strapped to one's side. This was a new frontier for us, and it was a frontier we wanted to build into the country.

And thank goodness they had the raw courage and the persistence to go out west. Despite the illness, despite the fact that there were no maps, despite the fact that they had to break the trails and hunt for their food and negotiate with the Native Americans, we still had people that did it. That is where, by the way, the saying came from, "possession is nine-tenths of the law." That is where that came from.

So let us go back to this map. We know we have people settled on the East Coast. We know that the Government wants them to move to the West. Now remember, to the West could be simply getting them out to Missouri. Somehow we have got to get the American people out into this new land that we want to expand into a country, the United States of America. So they tried to figure out ways and incentives for the American people to move west. Interestingly, they came up with an idea. In 1776, what the Government did, and this is very interesting, by the way, for those who are history buffs, in 1776, the Continental Army decided, hey, let us offer free land to people. Let us allow, in effect, homesteads to soldiers that will defect from the British Army. If they are defectors, we will reward them in our new country with free land.

Well, years later, as our expansion began to take place, and remember our expansion was delayed somewhat because of the ongoing battles between the North and the South. The North and the South, neither one of them wanted to have the other get an advantage over this new land, an advantage that would allow slavery or an advantage that would not allow slavery. So the expansion and the possession of these lands was somewhat delayed. But when they got finally to a position where the Government could really encourage it and take it as a serious effort to go out and settle the American West, they decided that the incentive should be to give away land, and they called it homesteading.

Again, that idea originated in 1776. Now, maybe if there is a history pro-

fessor amongst my colleagues, they may have a date preceding that, but my reading shows about 1776 with the defections from the British Army.

So now we speed up again back here where we are possessing the country. How do we get people out there? So we decide to homestead. They offer people to go out into Missouri, into Tennessee, out west to Kansas and to Colorado. Go out there and farm, set up their families, and be given 160 acres. If they would go out there and work it for a fee of like \$12 and a closing fee of like \$5, they could have this land, 160 acres.

And every American, even today, every American dreams of owning their own piece of land. That is one of the beauties of the United States of America, one of the things that sets our country apart from other nations throughout the entire world is the right of private property. It is deep in our heart. It is deep in our heart to own a piece of property. So the Government encouraged families to go out west and be given ownership to 160 acres. They had to go out and work it. They need to put their family on it. The Government wanted it to be farmed, to be productive land. And if a family would make it productive land, if they were dedicated to the cause, meaning that they persevered through all the tough conditions, after a period of time, a few years, they got to own that land free and clear.

However, there was a problem; and the problem is clearly demonstrated by this map that I have to my left, and that was that the frontiersmen, and I say that generically, because clearly it was families that took on this challenge, not just the men of the country but families. And back then the conditions were harsh. Think of women in childbirth, the death rate of women in childbirth. It was horrible. The sacrifices were enormous that these people made to expand our country and in part to go out and find the American Dream.

But as I said, there was a problem; and it is demonstrated by this map. Take a look at this map very carefully. The western United States has lots of color on it on this map. The eastern United States, with the exception of the Appalachians, a little shot down there in the Everglades, a little shot up there in the northeast. With those exceptions some of these States hardly have any color in them at all. Why? The color denotes government lands.

Now, my colleagues might say, well, gosh, there are hardly any government lands in some of these States. And the lands that have very little government land, what we call public lands, are in the East. They are not in the West. Why? Why would be a logical question on this map to my left. Why would all the West be in color or public lands and very little in the East, comparatively speaking? Private property is held by

private individuals. That was the problem they ran into. What happened was, as the frontiersmen began to hit the Rocky Mountains, they discovered that 160 acres not only would not support a family, it would not even feed a cow.

So word got back to Washington, and it kind of put a stop in the expansion plans. They said, hey, we are having a problem. This Homestead Act has worked very, very well getting people halfway across the country, because 160 acres in eastern Colorado, unlike 160 acres in western Colorado, can support a family. 160 acres in Missouri can support a family. Same thing in Kansas. Same thing in some of these other States. But when they hit the mountains, it was a lot different.

So how did we resolve this? What do we do? How did we encourage people to go into those mountains and take the sacrifice that was necessary for us to expand this great country of ours? One of the answers was, well, to get people into this area of the western United States, if 160 acres does not do it, let us give them 3,000 acres. Let us give them whatever amount of land it takes to be comparable to that family in Kansas or Nebraska that can make do on 160 acres. But somebody said, well, we cannot do that. Politically we could never give that much land away to an individual.

So somebody else, one of the other policymakers, came up and said, well, let us do this. In the West, where we meet the mountains, let us just go ahead and keep the land titled, the actual ownership of the property, let us keep it in the name of the Government but let us allow the people to use it as if it were their own. And, in fact, let us encourage them to go out there and use it. And let us call this land that is owned by the Government, it is not a title that fits here in the East, it is a title that was designed for this block of color in the West, let us define it by a land of many uses, public lands.

This was a title held by the Government but described as a land of many uses; a land that will allow people to support families, land that will allow people a sense of freedom, land that will allow people the enjoyment and, in my opinion, the absolute pure pleasure of being able to live in the Rocky Mountains or go up into the plateaus of the Grand Mesa or down into the San Juan Mountains and see the fresh water streams and the waterfalls. It allows this to be a land of many uses.

What we have seen, though, recently is that we have more radical environmental organizations. Now, I think some of the strongest environmentalists are the people who have had to put their hands in the ground, the people like my family who, for generations, next to their family, their deepest appreciation was for where we lived and they loved the land. It is like Michael Martin Murphy. His deepest apprecia-

tion was being a part of the American West and a big part of the American West, as he very ably described in his comments and in his music, is the beauty of the land, the ability to get on a horse and ride and not see other people for a long ways. And yet the ability to take that horse back to a barn where hay can be grown to support it, grain to support that horse, and to have a family that could enjoy that horse.

As of late, some of the more radical environmental groups in our country have decided that the Government, what they want to do is go to the populations, and remember most of the populations, when we look at this map to my left, most of the populations, with the exception right here, and again we see the private property, the big white section here in California, that big white section, and the East, that is where the population in the country really is. Here in the West, that is sparsely populated land. So what has happened is some of the more radical environmental organizations, groups like Earth First, groups like, the National Sierra Club, they are trying to educate people in the east that this land in the West is unfit for human occupancy, unfit in their description so that humans should have minimal contact with these public lands; that the design of these public lands was not in fact the concept of multiple use, or a land of many uses.

They use it as one of their priorities to destroy what we knew the land to be, a land of many uses or, in short, multiple use. Their belief is that multiple use should be eliminated or at least minimized in many, many areas, vast amounts of areas out here in the West, regardless of the impact that it has on the generations of people who started back in the homestead days.

So there is a big difference between the East and the West. And we who live in the West feel very strongly about the fact that we, like our friends in the East, like Virginia, for example, when I go into Virginia, my good friend Al Stroobants, he lives in Lynchburg, Virginia. He came from Belgium, but the pride he shows in being an American and the pride he has for Virginia and the Virginia mountains. There is a very strong dedication to our States, and I see it in my friend Al and all his friends down there in Lynchburg, Virginia. Well, we feel the same way as our Virginia colleagues or as our Kentucky or Florida colleagues, or some of these other States. We feel the same way about the American West. We feel very strongly that our way of life should have as much opportunity to be preserved as the way of life in Virginia or Kentucky or Tennessee or Maine or Vermont.

We are lucky. We have 50 of the greatest States in the world. We have probably the most beautiful land mass.

We have not only the strongest country economically, education-wise, militarily; but we also have perhaps the most beautiful geography in the world. When we take it all together, we have to come out on top, especially when we add in our little bonuses like Alaska and Hawaii.

But my point here this evening is this: I ask my good friends from the East to understand the differences that we in the West face. And it is not just the geographic differences as a result of public lands, but it is also the fact that we are totally dependent in the West, we are totally dependent, completely, 100 percent, I do not know any other way to say it to describe our dependency, on public lands.

The concept of multiple use is the foundation for the utilization of public lands. If we do not have multiple use, if my colleagues buy into some of the more radical organizations in our country, that the way to eliminate multiple use, for example, is to burn down the lodges in Vail or go to Phoenix, Arizona, and burn down homes, luxury homes. That is sometimes the kind of tactics that they revert to to eliminate multiple use; that is wrong.

And one of the other more legitimate ways, although I disagree with it, is to try to educate the mass population in the East that life in the West is kind of like life in the East; not to educate the people on the need for multiple use. If I went down the street here in Washington, D.C., I bet I could stop 100 people; and of those 100 people, I bet I could not find two, maybe not even one, maybe not even one who could tell me what the concept of multiple use and what public lands really means.

□ 2230

Now, I will bet also out of those 100, based on the educational efforts of some of these more radical environmentalists over the last few years, I bet the perception of a lot of those people out of that 100 is that in the West we are destroying the lands; that Yellowstone is being drilled upon; that we are cutting down all of the forests. It could not be further from the truth, colleagues.

Most of you probably vacation in my particular district because of the resorts. I would hope that you take an opportunity, especially during our August recess, to go out into these public lands. Take a close look at them. Put all the propaganda aside and go out and see it for yourself. Go out to Jackson Hole. Go out to Beaver Creek. Go over to Durango. Go to Buena Vista and see just how well that land is cared for.

If you have an opportunity, which should be a basic requirement of your visit, just go stroll on down to the coffee shop. Go talk to a cowboy or cowgirl and ask them a little about the lands. You know what you will get?

You will get the same kind of feeling I get out of Michael Martin Murphy and a lot of people, millions of people get out of Michael Martin Murphy.

You get a sense of belief out of the American West. You get a sense of the love that these people have for the land upon which they live and upon which they thrive. You get a sense of our inherent responsibilities to protect this land while at the same time enjoying the use of the land, but to protect it in such a way that we can pass on this gem, and that is what it is. It is a gem. It is a diamond in the rough. Pass this on to future generations.

That vision for future generations, as I just mentioned, we consider it an inherent obligation, a part of our heart. Out in the West it is a part of our heart. We need your support here in the East to help us in the West to continue to thrive and continue to enjoy the type of life-style that our forefathers upon the founding of this country intended for us to have.

That does not mean, by the way, that we turn our face the other way if we sense abuse out there. I think you will find the first people to crack down on abuse are the people that are most closely impacted by it. The people that are most closely impacted by abuse of the lands are the people that live on that land.

I have zero tolerance for people that leave decimated trails and tear up the terrain. I have zero tolerance whether it is mountain bikes, whether it is SUVs, whether it is a canoe or a kayak or a sloppy hiker. I have zero tolerance for people that drop litter, for people who do not properly care for the lands, for people that do not leave the land as much as they found it, for people who do not have respect for that land.

If we allow that to occur we then dilute our obligation and our vision for the next generation. So we do feel very strongly about enforcement, but we also believe in balance. We do not think balance is by burning down the lodge at Vail on top of the mountain. We do not believe that balance is going out into a subdivision just because some people who are building these homes have money and burn their homes into the ground. We do not believe you ought to put spikes in trees. We do not think that is necessary.

We have a lot of different projects. I will talk to you about the Colorado National Monument and our special conservation areas.

In our community we felt that we really needed to instill some vision for this generation. To take the Colorado canyons and the Colorado National Monument and come up with some kind of plan, some kind of strategy to preserve those lands in a special way for the future.

Do you know where that inspiration came from? It did not come from Washington, D.C. That inspiration did not

come from some radical organization like Greenpeace or Earth First. That inspiration came from the hearts of the people that lived on the land, from the hearts of the people that listen to the music of people like Michael Martin Murphy, from the hearts of the people like David or Sue Ann Smith or Cole and Carol McInnis who lived there and had their family there for generations. That is where that inspiration came from.

Do you know what we were able to put together? We have people like the Gore family up on top of the monument in Glade Park. We have people like the King family, Doug and Cathy, from the King ranches. We have people like Mr. Stroobants from his ranch up in Glenwood Springs to sit down with people from our active environmental community, with people from our chamber of commerce, with locally elected officials like our county commissioners in the various counties, with our State representatives and our State senators.

You know what? We were able to put together a vision that helped preserve this land but at the same time allowing multiple use. We put tens of thousands of acres in the wilderness. That is the most extreme management tool you can use out there. That truly does exclude most of the population from touching that land.

At the same time, we have put in special conservation areas so that people could continue to enjoy their horses for their horseback riding. People could take their hikes. People could spot wildlife. People could go down to the mighty Colorado River and sit on its bank and wonder about the millions and millions of lives and the environment and the heritage of that river.

All of this was done as a result of people who lived on that land coming together, not as a result of a coalition out of Washington, D.C., who thought they knew better about how to describe life out here in the West.

We can do it. We are not a bunch of numbskulls out there or rambling cowboys as some people have the image. In fact, we are pretty proud of ourselves. We think we are pretty thoughtful. We think we are thoughtful in that we understand your concerns here in the East.

There are a lot of people in the East who are justifiably concerned that, regardless of where you live in this country, whether it is the beautiful mountains in Virginia, whether it is the hills of Tennessee, whether it is the coastal areas of Florida, we all as a Nation should be concerned about the preservation of these lands and about the life people lead.

A basic and fundamental part of that concern should be a communication, an expression and participation from the people that live on the land or live on the shore or live on the hills or farm on

the plains. Those people ought to have a strong voice at the table. Why? Once you sit down with them as we did with the Colorado Canyon Lands Project, once you sit down with them you will find out that that old geezer has something to say. There is a little history there.

You sit down with somebody like a David Smith and you find out more about water than you ever thought you would know in just a few minutes and about the importance of water in the West and why life in the West is written in water. It is so dry out there that water is fundamentally important.

Mr. Speaker, my real concern this evening, I think I have ably expressed, and I want to deeply again express my appreciation to the communicators in the West, the people who are able to communicate the balance that is necessary so that we can come together as a team to preserve our way of life in the West. Amongst those communicators are the people like the locally elected officials, the State representatives, the State senators, our local county commissioners, our Chamber of Commerce, our local environmental organizations. Those are communicators, ordinary people that love the land, that know the history of the land in the West, that are proud to be a part of the American West.

Also, as I have mentioned several times, I pay special tribute to one of the finest communicators of today's modern day through music, and that is Michael Martin Murphy. It is obvious I have a bias towards his music, but when one goes beyond the music and looks at the message and looks at the intent and deep dedication and the focused love of the communicator, one understands that this is a good way to communicate the word of the importance of the American West.

Not long ago I heard somebody say, "You better get used to it. Your days in the American West are limited. That is something in the past. We have moved on. The old frontier is out of here. There are no more great, vast areas." These are the kinds of people who want to destroy our open space. These people want to come out and tell people they are not allowed to farm and ranch the land. They are not allowed to do this and do that, the big brother out of Washington, D.C., knows best for the West. And that somehow they reinterpret or reinvent the history of why this block of color is located in the West, while there is hardly any color in the East.

Mr. Speaker, they want to educate and use propaganda to say this was intended to be kind of off limits to people. Here in the East, we already have our piece of land. We already have what we want. But out here in the West, we want to control your lives. We have no use for that type of philosophy. We think at the local level, at

the regional level, with input at the national level, because it is one Nation, that we can put together a plan, a blueprint so that the next generation can experience the West as we have experienced it.

Fortunately, because of the visions of people like Teddy Roosevelt and others, in the communication of Gene Autry, as Michael Martin Murphy pointed out so well, or Roy Rogers, they were able to in that generation figure out a blueprint so that the appreciation of the West could continue to my generation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have laid out a blueprint or been a participant, whether it is the Colorado Canyonlands, whether it is Sand Dunes National Monument which last year we put into a national park, whether it is the Black Canyon National Park which Senator CAMPBELL and I created about 4 years ago, we hope that we have somehow participated in that blueprint to pass on the dreams and the life of the West.

Mr. Speaker, it is not something that needs to be eliminated. It is not something that in the East you have to force your way of life upon. It is something that you, too, as American citizens or as visitors to our great country can enjoy. But when you come out there, do not come out with earplugs in your ears, and do not come out thinking that you know it all or trying to impose your values, which may be good values, but for your area. Do not come out and try to impose your values on us in the West. Do not listen to all of this propaganda that you hear.

And I can tell you the propaganda machine about what ought to happen in the West is a well-oiled, well-moneyed machine in the East. I am not saying totally discount what the other side has to say. Listen to that propaganda, but take the time to look up what the other side of the story is. You know the old saying: "There are two sides to every story."

That is why I take this microphone tonight, colleagues. I am asking take a look at the other side of the story. Because. When you do, you will understand why we are so proud of our heritage in the West, why we think that we take pretty good care of the Rocky Mountains and the Dakotas and Utah, Montana, and the Colorado River. It is our lifeblood. We care about it. I want you to care about it and care about it in such a way that the next generation and the next generation can live on it, enjoy it, preserve it and respect it because, if we do that, we will have accomplished a great deal for the next generation and for the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of this week looks like it is going to be very busy, and it looks like we are going to be working quite late nights. I was hoping to make some comments tomorrow

evening and go into specific detail on missile defense. So break away those 40 minutes about which I have spoken to you about the American West, and let us shift our mind into missile defense and talk for just a few minutes. I will not be able to brief Members this evening like I intended to brief Members tomorrow or Thursday evening, but it looks like I will not have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we had a pretty remarkable success with the missile defense this weekend. We had a targeted missile coming under our scenario, a missile aimed at the United States traveling at 4½ miles per second. And we had an intercept missile coming in at 4½ miles. The two of them had to hit. Remember they could not miss by more than three feet. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet, the effect of shooting a basketball in California and making it through the hoop in Washington, D.C. It is a tremendous success.

Now some would say, oh, especially the Chinese and the Russians, how terrible. Who could imagine the American people ever agreeing to protect themselves from incoming missiles.

Mr. Speaker, most American citizens believe that we have some kind of protection from American missiles. They have heard of Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs, the home of NORAD. Do my colleagues know what NORAD does, NORAD detects?

□ 2245

It is a huge complex, built within the granite mountain of Cheyenne Mountain. They can detect missile launches anywhere in the world. There are a lot of things that they can do for our security. But once they make that detection, that is about all they can do. They can call you on the phone and say to you, hey, look, despite all of the treaties, despite all of the promises made, we have just had a foreign country launch a missile against the United States, against the people that you are sworn to protect. That missile is going to land in about 30 minutes, and we believe it is carrying a nuclear warhead. What else can we tell you?

What are we going to do?

There is not much we can do. We can repeat what we just told you, where it is going to land, the nuclear warhead that we think is on top of it. I think that there is a responsibility for the leaders of this country, not only for this generation and the future generation, but for the people of the world, to provide missile defense so that we do not end up in some kind of horrible, horrible situation, with a world at war, because a missile, an incoming missile, was not stopped before it hit a city like Los Angeles or New York City or Washington, D.C. We can stop that.

The best way to stop a war from happening, the best way to maintain peace is to disarm your neighbor, especially

if it is an unfriendly neighbor. Think about it. Why on earth would you say we should not defend ourselves against incoming missiles? It does not make sense. It is kind of like your neighbor having a gun, and your neighbor deciding that he wants your watermelons. And the neighbor is known to sometimes use that gun against you. Do you think it is crazy to set up some kind of defense, maybe a big fence that your neighbor cannot get over to come use his gun? That is exactly what we need to do here.

At some point in time in the future, and mark this, Members who are opposing some kind of missile defense network, at some point in the future, somebody will launch a missile against the United States of America. For those of you who oppose a defensive system, not an offensive system, a defensive system, for those of you who will cast a vote against a defensive missile system, you, I hope, will be around to answer to the survivors of a missile attack against this country. I hope that you will never have to do that. I hope that the idea that a missile would be launched against the United States does not happen.

But I think every one of us has to be realistic here. The fact is, the odds are that somebody at some point will launch a missile against the United States of America and that the United States of America is fooling itself. There is a saying out there. The last person you want to fool is yourself. The last person that the United States of America wants to fool ought to be itself. Kudos to the President. Kudos to our defense and our military operational heads to say, look, we cannot afford to put blinders on and pretend. Look, nobody is going to fire a missile against us. Look, nothing is going to happen against us by these rogue countries.

Take a look at how many rogue countries now have missiles. Take a look at how many of these rogue countries have nuclear warheads on those missiles. Do you think that the United States of America by patting them on the back is going to get them to destroy those missiles, or to disarm? No way. These countries are not going to disarm. They could care less what the United States of America tells them. Having a nuclear missile or any type of missile, that is a pretty macho thing in some of these countries. In some of these Third World countries, having the ability to simply reach over and push a button and take on the strongest country in the history of the world and destroy one of their cities or, even worse, it makes them feel pretty good. We play right into their card game; we play right into their game if we do not build some kind of defense.

We need to have a defense. We use it everywhere else, not missile defense, but we use defenses everywhere. Take a

look at highways. We put speed bumps to slow you down. Why? Because we do not want an incoming car. We want to slow them down. Every one of my colleagues could think of example after example after example where we deploy a defensive mechanism to protect our health and well-being or the health and well-being of our children. That is why we have speed zones at schools. That is why we have crossing guards. That is why we have tough law enforcement, so that we can preserve those things that are special to us. Now, for us not to put out a defense that protects a country that is special to us is foolish.

Now, because I cannot go into the details, but I will in the next week, I hope, I am going to have some diagrams and some charts and show you why this system will work. Now, remember that the critics of this system will tell you, first of all, we have offended China and Russia. Do not offend China and Russia. And our European colleagues, they are upset about this because of the fact we might offend Russia and China.

Who do you think is likely to use a missile against the United States? Not only those rogue countries, but do not discount China and do not discount Russia. I hope it never happens. I hope we become allies with these people. And if we do become allies, then we do not need to use a defensive missile system. You just have it in place. You never have to engage it. But the reality is somewhere in the future there is going to be a difference of opinion, a professional difference with these two countries. A rogue nation, a rogue Third World nation may not need a reason to fire a missile against us. People have been willing to blow up our airplanes, they have been willing to shoot athletes at the Olympics, they have been able to set off a bomb at the Olympics. Do you not think that someday somebody may want to launch a missile against the United States?

Now, the critics, as I was saying earlier, will say, well, the system has had too many failures. How many failures did we have before we came up with penicillin? How many failures did we have before we mastered the car? Of course you are going to have failures. The technological requirement, the expertise to have two objects that are traveling 4½ miles a second, to be able to bring them together and to be able to intercept right on the spot, you cannot afford to miss. You do not get two shots; you get one shot on that intercept over the weekend. It worked. I can assure you that our European colleagues and that the people, the leadership in Russia and China are saying, wow, American technology.

By gosh, we may disarm Russia and China simply by coming up with a defensive mechanism. Why put all your money in an offensive missile system if the country that you are concerned

about, the United States, has the ability to stop them? You want to know what is going to stop missile growth in this world? It is the ability to make them an ineffective weapon. But how do you make them an ineffective weapon if you do not have some type of shield against them? What we are talking about with our missile defense system is a shield, a shield that not only protects the United States but a shield that we would share with our allies. Frankly, a shield that the more it is shared, the less likely that there will ever be a missile attack because the missiles, which are very expensive and the technology that is required is substantial, those missiles become pretty darn ineffective. How could somebody legitimately argue that we should not deploy a strategy that will make missiles less effective?

Mr. Speaker, we have a heavy burden on our shoulders. That heavy burden requires that we protect. We have an inherent responsibility to protect the citizens of this country from somebody who decides they want to launch a missile against us. This is not starting a war. It is not starting an arms race. That is rhetoric. And even if it was not rhetoric, are we going to let them bully us into not defending our citizens? Members, we are elected to the United States Congress in part to not only protect the Constitution but to protect the people of this country.

We have deep, running obligations to the people and the safety and the welfare of this country. It is in every bill we pass. A part of doing that requires us to deploy, in my opinion, a missile defense system so that the United States and its allies, 20 years from now, I want them to look back and say, gosh, those missiles, that is what used to scare them back then. Today, nobody could fire a missile anywhere because you could stop it in flight or better yet you could stop it on the launching pad.

So there is a lot to think about with the missile defensive system. But the basic philosophy, the basic thought ought to receive a "yes" vote from everybody in these Chambers. Everybody in the Chambers, every one of my colleagues ought to be in support of a missile defense system. I think you owe it to the constituents that you represent.

In summary, we need a missile defensive system for this country. Technologically we are going to be able to do it. Sure it is going to be expensive. The airplane was expensive when we deployed it. Landing a person on the Moon was expensive. Sending a ship to Mars was expensive. There are lots of things the technology requires is expensive. Conservation is going to be expensive for us but it works. And this missile technology worked this weekend, and we have years of testing left; but it will work and it will be a lifesaver for hundreds of millions of people in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues had an opportunity to listen to my comments on the American West. I am proud to be an American citizen, but I am deeply proud of being able to have been born and raised in the American West. I hope all of my colleagues have that opportunity to experience what I have been able to spend an entire lifetime experiencing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KERNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today and July 18 and 19.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 360. An act to honor Paul D. Coverdell.

S. 560. An act for the relief of Rita Mirembe Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembe).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 18, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: