

This year, Petty Officer Roberts was part of Operation Anaconda in eastern Afghanistan. This operation is aimed at containing and eliminating the al Qaeda and Taliban forces still fighting against the newly established democracy, against American troops, and against allied forces in the region. Petty Officer First Class Neil Roberts was there to answer the call and he made the ultimate sacrifice.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Neal's wife, Patricia, and their 18-month-old son; to Neal's mother, Janet; and to the rest of his family and friends. I hope it will comfort them to know that a nation mourns with them and that Neil made us all proud.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### RELEVANT ISSUES TO COLORADO AND OUR NATION

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 look forward to spending a little time with my colleagues this evening. There are a number of different issues I would like to talk about. But first of all, I want to mention a fine young man from Grand Junction, Colorado, Ryan Patterson. Ryan was just selected on Monday of this week as the best young scientist in the world. What Ryan did is, first of all, he has won several contests, scientific contests. He is a very, very gifted young man. He was back here, he racked up another \$100,000 in scholarships and is being recognized here.

Let me just go through a couple of things. Prior to Monday, he won \$192,000 in scholarships, about \$16,000 in cash, two laptop computers, two trips to Sweden to attend the Nobel Peace Prize ceremonies. Throughout all of his achievements, he has obviously maintained his modesty. What Ryan did is came up with a glove, a glove-type of apparatus that can take sign languages, as they work sign language with the finger, and it instantaneously puts it into the written word in a little computer screen. So someone who only knows sign language or who has some other type of handicap and their primary language is sign language can ac-

tually go to a McDonald's restaurant or some restaurant, hold the little screen there and put it out instantly, instantly on to that screen.

This is a young man still in high school; he is a senior in high school. I am awful proud of him. Obviously, he is from my district, Grand Junction. But the achievements and the recognitions he has received this last year probably top any other student in the country in the scientific field and, obviously, in the latest recognition he was seen as the youngest and best scientist in the world for his age. So Ryan, congratulations.

I was going to speak and still intend to speak on some water issues. As my colleagues know, the district that I represent is in the State of Colorado. The State of Colorado is the highest point not only in the United States, but also the highest point on the continent. So I am going to speak a little about Colorado, the dynamics of our snowfall up there, some of the land, the dynamics of the land and the situation facing Colorado, facing all of the States. There are many States that depend on the State of Colorado. I will talk about the geographical nature, a number of different things that I want to visit with on Colorado, but that is going to come later.

Today, I just pulled this off the computer, and I am amazed: "Lawmakers doubt the need for a missile defense plan." As my colleagues know, I spend a great deal of time on this House floor talking about the absolute necessity for this Nation to have a missile defense. It is unbelievable to most of the citizens that I represent that this country, the United States of America, has no capability, zero capability, zero capability to stop an incoming missile into this country.

Now, we have lots of capability to determine that a missile has been fired against this country. In fact, the primary location of that headquarters is in Colorado, NORAD, Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado Springs. We can, within seconds, determine anywhere in the world that a missile has been launched. We can within seconds of those seconds determine where the destination of the missile is, what type of missile it probably is, what kind of warhead it is probably carrying, the estimated time of arrival. Beyond that, as far as preventing the horrible destruction that it could wreak, the havoc that it could wreak on the country that it is directed towards, the United States cannot do anything. Fortunately, our President and this administration, as have some previous administrations, have made a very dedicated effort towards providing this country with a national security blanket for some type of defense against a threat by enemy missiles.

Now, I am amazed to read that some of my colleagues today in a committee hearing act as if a missile threat does not exist out there. Where were they a couple of days after September 11? Can

my colleagues recall what happened on September 11? We know September 11. Can my colleagues recall what happened a few days shortly after September 11? Think about it. Think about a missile, what happened with a missile. Do we remember what happened with that missile? A missile was accidentally fired in the Black Sea by the Ukrainian Navy by accident. Guess what that missile hit? It hit an airliner and it blew the airliner out of the sky.

Now, the horrible, horrible events of September 11 overshadowed this tragedy. The only reason I bring this tragedy back up to the House floor is there is a perfect example of a missile that was not intended, they did not intend to shoot down a commercial airliner, there was no intent to do that. That missile was targeted at that airliner by accident. Once that missile was launched off its ship, there was no way to stop it.

Some people think that the only missile threat to the United States of America is an intentional missile launch against this country. Wake up, folks. I am telling my colleagues that there is another threat out there. It is called an accidental launch against this country. Think of Russia, how many nuclear warheaded missiles they have in that land. It is possible. In fact, it is pretty possible that at some point in the future, one of these ballistic missiles may be, totally innocently and by mistake, could be fired by one nation against another nation. I hope that our country has in place a defensive mechanism that could stop the horrible, horrible events that could follow an accidental launch of a missile. I will talk about intentional firings here in just a minute.

But every peace activist in the world ought to be the biggest cheer leaders out there for a missile defense system. What would the United States do if, for example, a sequence of missiles fired by mistake were launched out of Russia against a major city in the United States of America? If the United States could stop those missiles before they did any damage, it is something that could be worked out at the bargaining table. But if the United States does not have, and some of my colleagues would wish upon the United States that we not have a missile defensive system, if we did not have a way to stop those, what would our response be if our Nation was hit by several simultaneous missiles from another country, and that country says, wait a minute, do not retaliate. We did it by accident, and we are sorry we wiped out four or five of your cities. We did it by accident. That is why I say peace activists. Let me tell my colleagues, it is a lot easier to sit down at a bargaining table if we were able to stop the incoming bullet than it is after we look around and see our colleagues dead and our cities destroyed.

Now, let me read a couple of quotes. Let me say that I am not going to use the names of the colleagues that these

quotes are attributed to, because I am not sure of the accuracy of these quotes, outside of the AP wire that I pulled it off of this evening. But let me say one of my colleagues says this: "Why would someone send a missile when they can just put it in a suitcase?" Well, my friend, my colleague, the fact is they can perhaps, we are not convinced of it, but they can, perhaps, put it in a suitcase, and we ought to prepare for that. But because they might put it in a suitcase does not mean they will not put it in a missile. I can tell my colleague right now that there are a lot more ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads sitting on them aimed at the United States than there are nuclear suitcases being carried around. Only because, frankly, they do not have the technology in a lot of countries to get their hands on a so-called nuclear suitcase. I can tell my colleagues that one ballistic nuclear missile makes that suitcase look like an amateur's program.

These nuclear missile heads can destroy entire cities. They can launch countries into war. We better prepare for those. I can remember Margaret Thatcher at the World Economic Forum, Beaver Creek, Colorado, 3 years ago. I cannot quote her exactly, but I can remember the quote pretty closely. She stood up and she looked at our Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen at the time, under the Clinton administration, and her words were similar to this: she says, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Secretary, your Nation has a fundamental and fiduciary responsibility to provide its citizens with a missile defense system. Failure to do so would be pure neglect and would shirk your responsibility as a leader of this country.

□ 1915

Now, that is pretty close to what Margaret Thatcher said, and that is right on point. Do not let some of my colleagues here be naysayers and say, well, it costs too much to defend ourselves. The fact is, we had better do something about these nuclear missiles. Do not try to convince our constituents that they do not exist, or that one is not going to be launched against the United States of America or one of our allies. We have the technology. We are almost there.

Sure, it seems like a huge challenge right now. But what do Members think the airplanes seemed like to the Wright brothers? What did it seem like when they wanted to fire a weapon through a propeller on one of our fighter planes, when they were doing that? Look at all the technology. It is all a challenge.

There were a lot of people who said it was impossible when they first did it, but we are talking about the future of this Nation, the security of our citizens. We have an absolute obligation, we have an inherent responsibility, to provide a security blanket for this country and for our allies.

Let me go on. This is a quote, again, from my colleague. And again, let me

say that this is from the AP wire, so I am not sure of its accuracy. That is why I am not mentioning which colleague said this. But if it is accurate, I will not hesitate next time I am up here to use the gentleman's name.

It is inexcusable for this administration not to recognize that possibility and act on it. Speaking of this, why would somebody send a missile, instead of just putting it in a suitcase? One of the reasons they might is because they have one. There are a lot of countries in this world that have missiles. Let me show a poster.

My poster: Ballistic Missile Proliferation. Look at this: Countries Possessing Ballistic Missiles. To my colleague who asked the question, Why would someone send a missile when they can just put it in a suitcase, well, maybe some of these countries here who do not have missiles would not send a missile. But look at these countries that have missiles. The reason they would send the missiles is because they have them. They have the capability. They have the accuracy of these missiles. Unfortunately, several of these countries have nuclear capability, nuclear warheads on the tops of those missiles.

The day of wishing that there were not missiles out there aimed at the United States has long since passed. Wake up. The reality of it is, the United States is going to be a target. It was a target on September 11, it was a target in 1941, and it is going to be a target in the future. We are the leaders of this country. We are the ones who are charged with some kind of capability to look forward into the future and say, All right, what do we see as future threats against this Nation?

One clue might be if Members have a map that looks like this, that has all of these countries in purple with missiles, one might kind of draw a conclusion, hey, in the future, one of the threats against our Nation is going to be a missile, a missile coming in, an incoming missile.

As I said not many days after September 11, do not forget, that is exactly what happened. A missile was not fired at a U.S. commercial aircraft, but it was fired at a commercial airplane and it blew it out of the sky. This is by the Ukrainian navy. This is not exactly the most sophisticated navy in the world. This is not a country that is known for its military might. Yet, they are able to have the accuracy to fire a missile from a moving ship being rocked in the sea, fire that missile up and hit a small airliner in the sky and blow it to smithereens.

We need to see these future threats. Those threats exist today; those threats exist in the future. We have a fundamental responsibility to address these threats.

Let us talk about this. Here is what the missiles look like. That is the proliferation of missiles in this world. Imagine what it is going to look like in 10 years. How many of these white

spots here are going to have ballistic missile capability?

Now let us look at the next poster. Nuclear proliferation. Look at this: Countries possessing nuclear weapons: Britain, China, France, Pakistan, India, Israel, Russia. Look over here: Of concern, we think Iran probably has nuclear capability. We think Iraq probably has nuclear capability. I am confident that North Korea has nuclear capability. Libya, I do not know; that one might be questionable.

Members are saying to me that there is some question whether or not we need a missile defense when this many nations in the world have missile capability and have nuclear capability combined. Let me go on with a quote further. Again, the accuracy of this quote, I am depending on the AP press release. It came out of a committee hearing, apparently, by some of my colleagues.

Here is one of my colleagues. By the way, he is a Democrat. The only reason I point out that my colleague is a Democrat is, come on, this is not a partisan issue. Do not just attack Bush on missile defense because he is a Republican. Put the partisanship aside. This is a threat to every one of us. Remember, these missiles are not going to discriminate between Republicans and Democrats. This is a bipartisan issue. Do not just attack the administration simply for political convenience.

Listen to what this colleague of mine says: "We can't afford to waste billions of dollars because of the Bush administration's theological fascination with missile defense." Now, this is the most ludicrous, ill-informed statement I have heard from any of my colleagues in my entire tenure in the United States Congress. This colleague of ours says, "No threat assessment exists to justify the spending."

My colleague is not on the floor this evening to hear this. I wish he was. I wish he could come up here and discuss this with me, "No threat exists today to justify it;" not nuclear proliferation, not ballistic missile proliferation, not any of these countries over here to my left that have ballistic missile capabilities. In my colleague's opinion, none of this justifies, none of this justifies a missile defense security blanket for this country.

Let me go on and read some other things. "The administration's comments followed news reports on its new nuclear posture review." By the way, every administration does this. It says, "The Pentagon is developing contingency plans for using nuclear weapons against countries developing weapons of mass destruction."

Let me ask my colleague, what are they going to do about a country like Iraq? Iraq poisoned its own people. They went out, and Saddam Hussein poisoned his own people in an attack against the Kurds. Do we think this guy is going to go to church with us on Sunday, or over to the temple or wherever? This is a very sick individual who

may very well have weapons of mass destruction and is on a fast, mad race to accumulate as many weapons of mass destruction as he can get his hands on. How else are we going to address this?

Do Members think they can trust this guy? Look at the history of Saddam Hussein. How many years did the United States deal with him on inspections? How often were the inspectors stopped at the gates, the inspectors? The United Nations finally threw their arms up in the air. They said, We cannot do it. We cannot get our inspections done. Why? Because this individual, Saddam Hussein of Iraq, has no intention of stopping their pursuit for weapons of mass destruction. That is a threat to the United States of America, and these weapons of mass destruction involve not only nuclear weapons, but ballistic missiles fired at the appropriate location.

For example, take a look at North Korea and South Korea. North Korea does not need a nuclear missile to wreak havoc on South Korea. All they need to do is fire a couple of missiles, I think, 35 miles away and they can hit the city of Seoul; ballistic missiles, not nuclear warheads. What do Members think would happen to a city with a population of 20 million people if a few missiles hit one morning? What kind of panic would happen? Those are threats. Those are viable threats.

The only way in the long run to provide some type of defense against these missiles is to build ourselves a security blanket. If we have a system that will stop an incoming missile, and the technology is there, or will be there, if we have that, it makes those missiles and it makes a lot of these countries' capabilities to strike not only at the United States less, but it also diminishes or eliminates their capability to strike at other countries in this world.

We are being completely naive. We are refusing, maybe because we are afraid to, and I am speaking of some of my colleagues, we are refusing to confront the reality that we are not loved by everybody in this world. There are a lot of nations that would love to see the United States fail and be a nation destroyed. There are a lot of nations that, once they get the capability, if we do not have the capability, one, to retaliate, or two, to defend ourselves, they will not hesitate. They will not hesitate to take what steps are necessary to destroy the United States, for all historical purposes.

How can we sit by idly and criticize the President, a President who realizes this, who has had the guts to step forward and say that we are going to confront it? No Chicken Little here. We have to face up to this fact.

It is kind of like discovering cancer on oneself. We say, look, if I do not confront it, do not irritate it, maybe it will not spread. Yes, right. Do Members know what that cancer is going to do? It is going to spread. Do Members think it will stop because we hope it

will not go any further; because we think by not confronting it, by not cutting it off, by not taking radiation or chemotherapy that it is going to stop; that it is going to stop because you are a great person? Do Members think it discriminates because of its victims?

Just as deadly as cancer are some of these countries and people out there who are developing these weapons of mass destruction. Take a look at what they do. What is the number one country they trash? What is the number one country? They take their children as soon as they can learn and they teach them to hate the United States of America. Yet, we have Congressmen of the United States of America willing to say that, Gee, there is no threat assessment that exists to justify spending money for a missile defense system.

I think Colin Powell said it best this weekend: One of the reasons for a nuclear policy, one of the reasons they called those missiles peacekeeping missiles, is because, and I am quoting Colin Powell, "We think it is best for any potential adversary to have uncertainty in his or her calculus." We want people out there to know that if they decide to fire one of these ballistic missiles against the United States of America, if they decide to launch a September 11 attack against the United States of America, they are going to have in the back of their minds what type of retaliation this will bring upon them.

□ 1930

Let me summarize what I have been saying here for the last 15 or 20 minutes.

I was surprised today to pick up an AP wire entitled Lawmakers Doubt the Need for a Missile Defense System for This Country." That is naive at its height. That is a remark based on kind of a shot from the hip, a reactionary remark.

Think about the kind of threat that this country faces. It is not imaginary. We know that missiles have been launched by countries, including our own country, by mistake. Missiles are very lethal weapons and we add on top of the missile the leadership of a country that is politically unstable; we add on top of the missile a missile system that is not adequate, does not have adequate safeguards and could be fired by accident; we had on a missile, put on top of the missile itself a nuclear warhead; we continue to see the ballistic missile proliferation spread around the world, and then our colleague has the audacity to sit up and tell the rest of their colleagues that we should not be building a missile defense system, or as I quote, we cannot afford to waste billions of dollars because no threat assessment exists to justify the spending. No threat assessment exists to justify this spending. The threat not only is out there, it exists in a very threatening mode, and I am telling my colleagues the consequences.

Do I think it is going to happen tomorrow? I hope not. Do I think a lot of countries are all of the sudden going to fire random missiles against the United States of America? No. But do I think countries throughout have that capability? There is no doubt they do. Do I think there are countries out there who are not friendly to the United States of America who, in fact, have made throughout their history open resentment towards the United States of America, had the capability and possessed missiles that could wreak destruction upon the United States of America today if they desire? The answer is yes.

One of my colleagues, and I said earlier, one of my colleagues, and let me quote that colleague, "Why would someone send a missile when they can just put it in a suitcase?" The reason they would send the missile is because they had the missile. They have got the capability to wreak destruction with these missiles, and the other reason they would launch a missile is because they know the United States of America cannot defend itself against an incoming missile.

What President Bush has done, Vice President DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, Condoleezza Rice, Colin Powell, what this administration has done is not run from it, not pretend that the threat does not exist; but they have confronted it, and they have said to the world, and many of our allies, by the way, have joined in this statement, they have said to the world, the United States of America no longer intends to go into the future without a defense mechanism to protect its citizens and the citizens of our allies and our friends from a rogue nation firing a missile against us.

It is unbelievable to me, unacceptable and frankly a violation of a fundamental obligation for any one of us on this floor to stand up and say that a missile threat does not exist against the United States of America in such a way that would justify us defending against it with a missile defensive system. That is stupidity, stupidity not referring to my particular colleague and his personality, but stupidity in the thought that by simply putting shades over your eyes, that the missile threat against the United States of America will just disappear. It makes as much sense as closing your eyes to cancer on your body and saying if I pretend it is not there or if I simply acknowledge that it is there and ignore it, saying that it does not justify me going to the doctor to see about this cancer, it will go away on its own. It will only grow, and it will only become more deadly and more threatening to a person's very existence; and the same thing happens here.

Every one of us, whether Republican, whether Democrat, regardless of party affiliation, September 11 was a wake-up call for all of us and not just in the United States. September 11 was a wake-up call for the world. There are

evil people out there who do not care who their victims are. It has been said 10 million times if it has been said once, the victims on September 11, they were not white Anglo, they were not U.S. citizens, restricted to those. They were every nationality, 80 different countries, all kinds of ethnic backgrounds. It did not matter. It was a son or daughter, mother or father, sister or brother.

It did not matter to these people who did not care, and some of my colleagues who think that some of these evil people will care and will not launch a ballistic missile, and let me tell my colleagues they have got them out there, there are countries out there, will not launch some type of harmful missile against this country is naive. It is going to happen. It is going to happen at some point in time.

The people who have made these remarks, if, in fact, they are accurate, I want my colleagues to put this in a little time keeper, and remember a few years from now, God forbid this ever happens to our country, but if it happens, I want my colleagues to remember the position they took in the U.S. House of Representatives with the statement, no threat assessment exists to justify the spending to build a ballistic missile system to protect our country.

Let me wrap it up by telling my colleagues, we do not stand alone in the world. In fact, I think it is safe to say that every country in the world that could get their hands on a missile defense system mechanism would deploy it. Why? It only makes sense. It is like getting a bulletproof vest. The other side may complain. Maybe the criminal is going to complain because the police officer gets the advantage of a bulletproof vest, but if the criminal had the opportunity they would put them on, too. Why? Because it gives them an advantage.

We have a lot of nations in this world that support the United States of America in building a missile defense system. We are in partnership with Canada. The Brits are supportive. The Italians are supportive. And I can guarantee my colleagues, once we get the technology mastered, there will be a lot of nations knocking on our door saying, hey, do you mind if we had that missile defense system; do you mind if we provide a security system for our citizens.

So I urge my colleagues to reconsider some of the statements they have made today in opposition to a missile defense system, and frankly, get ready for it. My colleagues can jump up and down all they want for media attention, for partisanship advantage; but the fact is, this administration will do what is necessary to protect the citizens of this country with the security blanket for a missile defense. It is a critical and fundamental obligation that we have to not only our generation but future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to shift my comments pretty dramatically here. I

was not going to speak about missile defense this evening because, frankly, I have had several discussions on the House floor here with my colleagues about that; but after I read those remarks today, I could not resist it. I mean, I felt fire in my belly to come up here to the House floor and talk about that.

Now I want to move towards more the direction I had planned all week to come tonight and the comments I wanted to make.

Let me start out as I said at the beginning of my comments, colleagues. My district's in the State of Colorado. For those of my colleagues that do not know, Colorado is the only State in the Union where all of its water runs out of the State. We have no water that comes into the State of Colorado for our use. All of our water goes out of the State, and Colorado's a very unique State in its geographical makeup and frankly in its geographical location and its elevation.

It is the highest point on the continent. In our area, for example, I think there are 64 mountains in the United States, including Alaska, I think 64 mountains that are over 14,000 feet, 64 of them. Fifty-six of those 64 mountains are located in the State of Colorado, 79 percent of the Nation's 14,000 foot peaks, and over 600 peaks at 13,000 feet. We have over 1,000 mountain peaks over 10,000 feet. The average elevation in the State of Colorado is 6,800 feet. That is a thousand feet over a mile. Well over a mile is the average elevation in the State of Colorado.

Take a look at the lowest point in the State of Colorado. It is about 3,400 feet. That is about the lowest point in Colorado. The difference between our lowest points and our highest points are 11,000 or 12,000 feet. So just as a result of the elevation alone, we have got dramatic weather; we have got dynamics that do not happen in other States.

The State of Colorado is a critical State for a number of different reasons, but first of all, look at what we find within the boundaries of the four corners. First of all, we find the plains. A lot of people think that Colorado's just a mountain State, that it is the State of mountains; but half of the State of Colorado are the plains, and when we look at Colorado, and I will just use my pointer here. To my left I have a better map of Colorado, but when we get on the very western edge, we actually have the desert plateaus. On the eastern side of the State of Colorado we have the plains, and then of course in between the desert plateaus and the plains we have the Colorado Rockies and some other mountains, not just the Rockies.

To give my colleagues an idea of the land mass of it, it is about the eighth largest State in the Nation. I guess it is number eight. It has got four major parks that are without trees. There may be a couple of trees but generally without trees, north park, south park, places like that.

Colorado's a very unique State and one of our most important assets in the State of Colorado is snow. Colorado's a very arid State. It does not get much rain. We cannot depend on our rainfall for our moisture. We have to depend on our winter snows. This year, for example, we have a lot to be concerned about because our winter snowfall is significantly below average. Now, not only Colorado that is dependent upon the snow fall in Colorado, but many, many States in the Union, well above 25 States in the Union, are also dependent for their water upon the snow fall in the high mountain peaks of the State of Colorado; and we not only depend on the snow fall in Colorado for our water, but we also depend on it for our economic well-being.

Our ski areas, as my colleagues know, Colorado probably has the finest ski areas in the United States. Certainly known throughout the world for skiing in Colorado because of its elevation, because of the light, dry snow. So snow is a critical factor out there in our mountain region.

Before I move much further, I want to give a little history. I have reviewed this history before, but it is important to remember Colorado is a State that is unique. On the western side we have the mountains and the eastern side we have the plains, generally speaking; and Colorado really is almost like two States. I am not suggesting it is two States or that it should become two States; but the dynamics in public ownership, public lands, where the forest lands are, where the Bureau of Land Management is, where the mountains are, one part of the State is water provider. The other part of the State is a water user.

There are lots of different dynamics that play within its boundaries for Colorado, but first of all, I thought we ought to look at the dynamics of the continental United States and where the West fits in, why life in the West is a little different than life in the east, why the water issues in the West for example are entirely different in many cases than the water issues in the East.

In many places in the eastern United States, the problem is getting rid of water. In the West, the problem is storing the water. In fact, if we drew a line down through Kansas and Missouri kind of like this, that portion of the United States gets about 73 percent of the water. If we took a look at the mountain region here, which is about half of the United States geographically, it only gets about 14 percent of the water.

□ 1945

When the good Lord created this continent of ours, for some reason there was not even distribution of the water. So water becomes a critical factor.

Now, let us take a look and kind of go back in time, go back in history, when our country was first being settled. The real comfort, and where most of the people lived, was on the East

Coast, over here to my left. And the West, really, if you went very deep into Virginia, you were considered in the West. There was not much settlement at all, except for the Native Americans, of course, and the Mexicans. This was the nation of Mexico here. We actually had France and a number of others, but I think my colleagues understand what I am saying.

The population of the United States in our early days was on the East Coast, and our leaders wanted to expand the United States of America. They wanted to make it a great country and they wanted to conquer and obtain as much land as they could. But in those days when the land was purchased, it did not mean much. Title to the lands did not mean much. What was important was who possessed the land. And to possess the land, you really needed to be on it with a six-shooter strapped on your side.

So as this young country began to grow and we began to expand to the West, our leaders said, Well, how do we encourage people to move from the comfort of their homes on the East Coast into the inner part of the country, into this new land we bought? How do we get them to possess it? And the idea they came up with was, Well, let us give away land, like we did in the Revolutionary War. Believe it or not, in the Revolutionary War is when we first had other land grants in this country. We would give land or offer land to British soldiers who would defect and come to our side. We would give them free land.

After all, our leaders correctly assessed that every person's dream, or most every person's dream was to own a piece of their own property, to build a home, to farm. Back then in the early days of our country, 99 percent of our population was involved in agriculture. So to be able to cultivate your own fields, to have your own wheat, your own cow, your goats, et cetera, et cetera, was everyone's dream. So they decided to offer land to encourage people to settle in the West. People would go out there, live on it, and they would be given 160 acres, or 320 acres, depending on the program they were involved in.

Well, that worked pretty successfully, except for one region of the country, and that region is depicted by the colors on this map to my left. You can see some of these States have very, very little Federal lands. In the East the only real big blocks of Federal lands are down there in the Everglades, the Appalachians, and a little up here in the Northeast. In a lot of States, when you talk about public lands, people think you are talking about the courthouse. That is because the government was able to successfully turn this land over to private ownership by encouraging people to go out and settle the land.

Well, the problem was that as soon as they hit the Rocky Mountains, and take a look at the State of Colorado,

right here, right where the white hits the color on this map in the State of Colorado is exactly where the mountains start. And what happened is, when the settlers began to hit the mountains, they discovered 160 acres would not even feed a cow. In eastern Colorado, again referring to my map and going over here to my left, in eastern Colorado, 160 acres could support a family. In Nebraska and in Kansas you could support families there. But as soon as you hit those mountains, boy, the dynamics changed pretty dramatically.

So they went back to Washington and they said, What do we do? We are not getting people to live in the mountains. They are not possessing the land so that we can lay claim to the land. Although we bought the lands, our Nation says we need people to be up there.

What happened was, they had discussions here in the Nation's Capital and they thought perhaps what they should do is give them an equivalent amount of land. If they gave 160 acres in eastern Colorado or in Nebraska, take what they can grow on that and see how many acres in the mountains it would take, and maybe give them 3,000 acres.

Well, what happened was that at the time they were making a lot of these land grants, the railroads had already been given large amounts of land and there was political pressure not to give any more government lands away. So the government, our leaders in Washington, D.C., consciously decided to hold the land in the government's name for formality purposes, but to let the people go out into the West and use it for multiple uses. A land of many uses. Those are enchanted words for us in the West. That is what we grew up under.

In my particular congressional district, which geographically is larger than the State of Florida, every community in my district, except one, every community in my district, which is about 120, 119 communities, is completely surrounded by government lands. We are totally, not partially, not just a fraction, but totally and completely dependent upon government lands for our water, for our highways, for our utility lines, for our telephones, for our agriculture, for our recreation, for our environmental needs, for our enjoyment, for our own open space. All of those are completely dependent upon public lands, and that is the major difference between the West and the East.

So I oftentimes find myself listening to some of my eastern colleagues, for whom I have great respect, talking about but not really understanding why we are so sensitive in the West when people in the East say, Well, let us just take this land out of bounds, let us get the people off this land, let us limit multiple use. Clearly, we have to manage these government lands, but we have an entire part of our Nation's population that live amongst those government lands and live on those government lands. And before we make

decisions here, we need to understand that. My colleagues need to put themselves in the same kind of living situation, in other words, completely surrounded by government lands as we are in the West. So that is the clear distinction between the West and the East.

As we move further, and now that we have a little description, let us move back to the State of Colorado and let me pull this other poster up here quickly. Now, this poster is a little cluttered, but I think I can go through parts of it. First of all, because Colorado has an average elevation of about 6,800 feet, because it is the highest point in the continent, obviously we are going to have a lot of water that runs off when that snow melts.

Now, in Colorado, we have all the water we need for about a 60-to-90-day period of time, and that is actually beginning as we speak. It is called the spring runoff. Colorado is known as the State of the Rivers, the Mother River State, because we have five major rivers that have their headwaters in our State. But as the snow begins to melt, the water available diminishes dramatically. For example, we supply water not only for other States, but we even supply water for the country of Mexico.

Here in the State of Colorado, this bright yellow section, basically, are the public lands of Colorado. That is what the public lands look like. All the rivers, all the headwaters are up here in the high mountains, and they run all directions out of the State of Colorado, as the mother rivers. Let me give a couple of the rivers. We have the Arkansas River, the Rio Grande, the South Platte River, the Colorado River, and so on.

Now, what I hope to do, what I wanted to do tonight, and I intended to get a little further in my comments than I have, but I wanted us to visit a lot about that missile defense system, so we did not get quite through the series that I wanted to this evening, more specifically, on water coming out of those mountains, and what the salinity issues are, what the dilution issues are, what the multiple use issues are, what the water storage issues are, what are the hydropower issues, and why is it critical that we have a good understanding all across this country of multiple use on public lands? What does it mean not to divert any water?

So these are issues that I kind of wanted to just tempt you with a little this evening. Now, I intend to continue my comments next week in much more depth on the dynamics of the high mountains, on the San Juans down in the southwestern part of the State, on the below-average snowfall that they have had this year and what the consequences of that is to fellow, down-river States; what down-river really means; what the wilderness areas are and what kind of impact the wilderness areas have; the government lands, the range management.

There are lots and lots and lots of issues that face us high in the Rocky Mountains that are unique to the mountains or unique to the West, not found very often in the East, in fact, in some States not found at all.

So I look forward next week to discussing these issues with my colleagues.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2146, TWO STRIKES AND YOU'RE OUT CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during special order of Mr. MCINNIS) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-374) on the resolution (H. Res. 366) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide life imprisonment for repeat offenders who commit sex offenses against children, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2341, CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2002

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during special order of Mr. MCINNIS) from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-375) on the resolution (H. Res. 367) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2341) to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, to outlaw certain practices that provide inadequate settlements for class members, to assure that attorneys do not receive a disproportionate amount of settlements at the expense of class members, to provide for clearer and simpler information in class action settlement notices, to assure prompt consideration of interstate class actions, to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow the application of the principles of Federal diversity jurisdiction to interstate class actions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me say in the beginning that myself and other Democrats over the last week, and certainly over the next few weeks, will take to the floor repeatedly to bring up the issue of the Social Security trust fund, and our concern that the President and the Republican leadership in the House are very deter-

mined to push for changes in Social Security that would lead to privatization, and at the same time, the budget that the Republican leadership will bring up to the floor, I understand it will be coming up as early as next week, unfortunately goes into deficit and effectively spends the Social Security trust fund, once again, we have not had this for a couple of years, in order to pay for current expenses.

The Republican proposal to privatize Social Security, as well as the proposal to spend the Social Security trust fund for basically ongoing government operations unrelated to a retirement benefit, both of these proposals by the Republican leadership in the House and by the President, will undermine Social Security and make it more difficult for Social Security to remain solvent, and basically shorten the time before we face a crisis in Social Security when benefits will be cut or will no longer be available.

That is the concern that I and other Democrats have, and we will be speaking out against it because we believe very strongly that none of these things should happen, that we should not privatize Social Security and that we should not be spending the Social Security trust fund to pay for ongoing expenses.

Let me start, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that Social Security is probably the most successful social program the Federal Government has ever implemented. It provides an unparalleled safety net for the vast majority of America's seniors. For two-thirds of the elderly, Social Security is their major source of income. For one-third of the elderly, Social Security is virtually their only source of income. And for these reasons, and a great many others, we must do everything in our power to protect and strengthen the existing Social Security program for the short and the long term.

Mr. Speaker, I gathered some information that gives us some idea about the importance of the Social Security program and also how successful it is, how unique it is, and I wanted to go through a little of that, if I could, in a little detail, not a great deal of detail.

Why is Social Security important? As I said, it is the single largest source of retirement income in the United States. For six in ten seniors, Social Security provides half or more of their total income. Among elderly widows, Social Security provides nearly three-quarters of their income, on average. And four in ten widows rely on Social Security to provide 90 percent or more of their income.

But it is not just a retirement income program. About 30 percent of Social Security beneficiaries receive disability or survivor benefits. We tend to forget that. We tend to think it is only a program for seniors. For a 27-year-old worker with a spouse and two children, Social Security provides the equivalent of a \$403,000 life insurance policy or a \$353,000 disability insurance policy. The

vast majority of workers would be unable to obtain similar coverage through the private market.

Social Security is also family insurance. It provides benefits for elderly widows and young parents who have lost a spouse. It provides a dependable monthly income to children who have lost a parent to death or disability. It even pays benefits to those who become severely disabled as children and remain dependent, as adults, on a parent who receives Social Security.

Now, a lot of people, and I find this to be often true about some of my Republican colleagues, they will say, Well, Social Security is just another government program, it is a waste of money, it is not administered well. We hear these kinds of criticisms. The reality is very different. There is no government program that is more successful than Social Security.

□ 2000

It is the single most effective anti-poverty program. Its benefits lift over 11 million seniors out of poverty. Thanks to Social Security, the poverty rate of elderly persons is only 8 percent. Without it, nearly half of retirees would live in poverty. That was the case before we set it up. More than half of the people over 65 lived in poverty before Social Security came on board.

Over the course of its 67-year history, Congress has prudently managed the Social Security program. Each year the Social Security board of trustees issues a report showing short-range and long-range 75-year projections of the income and costs of the system. Congress uses these projections to balance the promise to pay future benefits against workers' desire and ability to pay for them, and it has adjusted the program periodically in light of changing economic and demographic conditions. So we have had to change it, but we have always changed it in a positive way.

Finally, I would stress that Social Security is administered very efficiently. Only one penny of every dollar Social Security spends is for administration. The rest goes directly to beneficiaries in their monthly checks.

Let me say just a few more things about the uniqueness of Social Security. It is nearly universal. Over 95 percent of all workers are covered by it. In contrast, less than 50 percent of workers have employer pension coverage on their jobs. It is also totally portable. It goes with a worker from job to job. Traditionally, private sector pension plans lose value if a worker changes a job. It is also, and this is very important, a defined benefit. That is, its benefits are determined according to the level of a worker's earnings and years of work.

So this type of pension system provides income continuity in retirement by replacing a fixed percentage of a worker's preretirement earnings. Benefits are paid as long as the worker and his or her spouse lives and the monthly